



COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 7 December 2001
[tpvs2001\tpvs89e_2001.doc]

T-PVS (2001) 89

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

21st meeting
Strasbourg, 26-30 November 2001

REPORT OF THE MEETING

*Secretariat Memorandum
established by the
Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage*

*This document will not be distributed at the meeting. Please bring this copy.
Ce document ne sera plus distribué en réunion. Prière de vous munir de cet exemplaire.*

PRELIMINARY NOTE: SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN

1. The Standing Committee held its 21st meeting from 26 to 30 November 2001 in Strasbourg. The list of participants and the agenda appear in Appendices 1 and 2 to this document.
2. In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 1, the Standing Committee followed the application of the Convention and it elected Mr Patrick Van Klaveren (Monaco), Chair, and Mrs Ilona Jepsen (Latvia), Vice-Chair. Mrs Ana Isabel Queiroz (Portugal) was elected member of the Bureau.
3. The Committee welcomed the representatives of Morocco, which was represented at the meeting for the first time as Contracting Party.
4. The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following non-member states to attend its 22nd meeting: Algeria, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Holy See, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Uzbekistan.
5. The Committee decide to amend Appendix II of the Convention by the addition of two new species: *Carabus bessarabicus* and *Carabus hungaricus*.
6. The Committee adopted the following recommendations:
 - Recommendation No. 85 (2001) on the conservation of *Lithophaga lithophaga* (appendix 3);
 - Recommendation No. 86 (2001) on the conservation of the Black Sea bottle-nosed dolphin *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* (appendix 4);
 - Recommendation No. 87 (2001) on the European Plant Conservation Strategy (appendix 5);
 - Recommendation No.88 (2001) on the implementation of five new action plans for globally threatened birds in Europe (appendix 6);
 - Recommendation No. 89 (2001) on the conservation of the European Lynx in the Alps (appendix 7);
 - Recommendation No. 90 (2001) on the catching, killing or trading of protected birds in Cyprus (appendix 8).
7. The Committee approved a work programme and budget for the year 2002, for a total amount of 301,200 € using around 125,000 € provided by the Council of Europe, and a reserve of some 100,000 € remaining from non-spent voluntary contributions. Parties are expected to provide with new voluntary contributions in 2002. (appendix 9).
8. The Committee decided to hold its 22nd meeting from 2 to 5 December 2002.

As provided for in Article 15, the Standing Committee forwarded to the delegates of Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe the report on its work and on the functioning of the Convention.

PART I – OPENING

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 1 Draft agenda
T-PVS (2001) 45 Annotated draft agenda

The Chairman, Mr Patrick Van Klaveren, opened the 21st meeting of the Committee and welcomed participants (see Appendix I of this report).

The agenda was adopted as it appears in Appendix 2 to this report.

The Chairman gave the floor to the Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, Mr Bendik Rugaas, who delivered a welcoming address, and then to Mr José-Maria Ballester, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, who reported on the recent restructuring, which had led to the natural and cultural heritage sectors being grouped together within a single directorate. They assured the Committee of their personal support to the Council of Europe's environment activities and thanked the governments and non-governmental organisations for their commitment to the Convention.

2. Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and from the Secretariat. Reports from new Contracting Parties: Morocco

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 25 and 52 Reports of the Bureau meetings of May 2001 and September 2001
T-PVS (2001) ... Nature Conservation in Morocco

The Chairman reported on the development of the Convention since the last meeting of the Committee. He welcomed Morocco as new Contracting Party and welcomed also the new observers. The Bern Convention presently counts 45 Contracting Parties. Only 4 states of the 43 of the Council of Europe have not yet ratified and all are expected to do it in the near future.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Convention had successfully achieved its work programme for year 2001, completing the reports requested and holding all the meetings of the groups of experts and seminars that were foreseen. The Emerald Network had actually advanced more than was expected. Six new pilot projects had been started during 2001, which brought up to nineteen the number of states involved in this important exercise. The Chairman thanked the states that had made special voluntary contributions to this exercise and to other activities of the work programme.

Morocco presented a written report describing its legislation and organisation arrangements on nature conservation.

The Chairman paid special tribute to his predecessor, Mr Gerard Boere, for his great skills and effectiveness. Mr Boere had informed that it was no longer possible for him to form part of the Bureau.

The Standing Committee observed one minute's silence in memory of Mr Ferdinando Albanese, former Director of Environment and Local Authorities, who had died in November 2001.

The ACCOBAMS representative reported that the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area had entered into force and the Contracting Parties were to hold their first meeting (28 February - 2 March 2002).

The delegate of Switzerland and chair of the Committee for activities of the Council of Europe in the field of Biological and Landscape Diversity (CO-DBP) drew attention to the holding of the first Conference of the Contracting Parties and Signatory States to the European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention) and underlined the complementarity of the two conventions and the need for co-operation.

The delegate of Senegal stressed the importance of the Convention to his estate, and said that it was difficult to make progress with it because of the inadequacy of the co-operation among the countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

The delegate of Ukraine presented some points of the discussion on Commission of the Bucharest Convention (May 2001, Istanbul) and said that consideration had been given to signing a Memorandum of Co-operation between the Bucharest Convention and the Bern Convention.

The Secretariat announced that the Netherlands and Croatia had submitted written reports on implementation of the Convention on their territories. These reports, as well as other declarations made during the meeting of the Standing Committee appear in document T-PVS (2001) 89 addendum.

The Secretariat informed the Committee on the general implementation of the work programme for 2001, including the budgetary situation, presenting at the same time the reports of the meetings of the Bureau of the Committee.

The Committee took note of the information presented.

* Items for information:

— T-PVS (2001) 47 Chart of signatures and ratifications

PART II – MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGAL ASPECTS

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

3.1. Draft Recommendation on trade of *Lithophaga lithophaga*

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 24 Exploitation and commerce of *Lithophaga lithophaga*

Lithophaga lithophaga is a marine bivalve mollusc species which belongs to the Mytilidae family. Its habitat is the inner calcareous rocks of the Mediterranean coasts, being a highly interesting ecological element within the rocky marine ecosystem. Its capture implies the direct and irreversible destruction of its habitat. Some of its populations have been reduced in a great extent during these last years due to a demand of this product (as sea fruit) and due to the use of pneumatical hammers and other damaging percussion methods, including in some cases the use of explosives. *L. lithophaga* was included in the Appendix II of the Bern Convention – “Strictly protected fauna species” in Mediterranean sea populations – by an amendment that entered in force on the 6th of March 1998. However protected *L. lithophaga* seems to be subject to consumption and trade by some Contracting Parties.

The Secretariat presented the issue and a draft recommendation.

The delegate of Spain informed the Committee that his government had commissioned a report which confirmed that the species was not endangered, but that its exploitation methods were damaging for marine biocoenosis. The species had become fully protected in line with the obligations under the Convention. The special police for environmental offences (SEPRONA) was carrying particular action to enforce the prohibition of sale.

Interventions supporting the recommendation were made by Switzerland and the Secretariat of the Barcelona Convention.

Morocco wished to receive more information from Spain on the international trade of these species.

The Committee adopted Recommendation No. 85 (2001) on the conservation of *Lithophaga lithophaga*, as it appears in appendix 3 to this report.

3.2. Draft recommendation on trade of *Tursiops truncatus ponticus*

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 28 Conservation of *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* and possible listing in App 1 of CITES
T-PVS (2001) 28 addendum Projet de recommandation

Tursiops truncatus ponticus is the Black Sea subspecies of the bottle-nosed dolphin *Tursiops truncatus*. The subspecies is severely threatened by a number of factors, mainly the fact that it is confined to a relatively small geographical area severely affected by pollution and exhaustion of fishing resources. Trade, including international trade, has played a non-negligible role as a cause for the rarefaction of the subspecies and is still ongoing. The Bern Convention gives full protection to *Tursiops truncatus* and thus to all its subspecies. At the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP) to CITES, the United States of America and Georgia submitted a proposal to transfer *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* (Black Sea bottlenose dolphin) from Appendix II to Appendix I to this convention.

The Secretariat presented the draft recommendation. The Chairman noted the obligation of Parties in respect to this species, which was also listed in the Agreement ACCOBAMS.

Several delegations made interventions in favour of adopting the recommendation, some suggesting amendments: Norway, Germany, Switzerland, ACCOBAMS.

The delegate of Ukraine noted that, in his opinion, it had not been established that the species was threatened from international trade.

The Swiss delegate proposed that the Secretariat look more closely into the problems of regional trading in endangered species and the potential usefulness of regional conventions on biodiversity in relation to the CITES activities.

The Committee adopted its Recommendation No 86 (2001) on the conservation of the Black Sea bottle-nosed dolphin *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* (appendix 4).

3.3. Biennial reports (1999-2000) concerning exceptions made to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8.

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 2 Biennial Reports 1997-1998
T-PVS (2001) 46 Biennial Reports 1999-2000

The Committee took note of the 1997-1998 biennial reports presented.

The Committee decided that, given the small number of Biennial reports 1999-2000 presented in time, it was preferable to examine all at its next meeting. Four-years reports 1997-2000 will also be examined then.

3.4. Amendments to the Appendices : Amendments to Appendix II - Proposal from Moldova (two Carabus beetles)

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 43 Amendments to Appendix II: Proposal from Moldova

The delegate of Moldova presented a proposal concerning the inclusion in Appendix II to the Bern Convention of the following two species of carabid beetles, *Carabus bessarabicus* and *Carabus hungaricus*.

The delegations of the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Switzerland supported the proposal.

The delegate of Belgium, in the name of the European Community pointed out that the species *Carabus hungaricus* was present in the territory of the Union, in Austria, probably in areas that were already protected and will be proposed for inclusion in the Natura 2000 network. The species will most likely be included in the update of Annexe II of the Habitats Directive when the Union is enlarged.

Declaration of the European Commission: "The Commission supports inclusion of the species *Carabus hungaricus* from a scientific point of view, but none the less thinks it inadvisable to support their inclusion in Appendix II to the Bern Convention until the Natura 2000 network has been established. The Community decides not exercise its authority, and thus its right to vote, for the time being. It leaves the member states to exercise their right to vote."

The Committee adopted unanimously the proposal from Moldova, 38 states being present.

PART III – SCIENTIFIC SEGMENT: MONITORING OF SPECIES AND HABITATS

4. Monitoring of Species and Habitats and report to SBSTTA meetings

4.1. Invasive Alien Species. Input into SBSTTA-6 and proposed European Strategy on IASs

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 10 Bern Convention action on invasive alien species in Europe;
T-PVS (2000) 65 rev.2 – Guidelines for eradication of terrestrial vertebrates;
T-PVS (2001) 12 – Contribution to a European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species

The Secretariat informed the Committee that, following instructions from the Standing Committee, elements for a European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species were prepared at a meeting organised by the IUCN and the Council of Europe at the Italian National Wildlife Institute (Bologna, 26-27 January 2001). They were based on the “Guidelines for Eradication of Terrestrial vertebrates: a European contribution to the Invasive Alien Species Issues” (Genovesi 2000), a report commissioned by the Committee. The elements for such Strategy were presented at the 6th meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Montreal, 12-16 March 2001). Invasive Alien Species were also to be discussed at the next meeting of the Council of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (Budapest, 25-28 February 2002) where the Convention had been requested to present its views, in close co-operation with the delegations of Denmark, Hungary, Portugal and the United Kingdom.

Mr Piero Genovesi (IUCN) presented the elements for a European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species, pointing out in particular to the need of a strategic approach at the regional level, as it had been proposed at the SBSTTA meeting. The document presented contained the fundamental elements of a strategy, but could be further improved and completed.

The delegations of Switzerland, Malta, Belgium (in the name of the European Community), Denmark, Portugal, Germany, Senegal, Hungary and Norway made interventions pointing out the following:

- there was a unanimous appreciation of the quality of the document presented, which was valuable and to the point. The issue was of great interest for all Parties and should become one of the priorities in future work for the Convention;
- the present initiative needed to be carried out further taking into account work done in other fora, in particular the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), and the European Plant Science Organisation and in synergy with actions in EU and other relevant organisations;
- it was also important to examine all possible ways of implementing existing texts and guidelines while exploring other sides of the problem, including means of arrivals of IAS, threats on islands, prevention of arrivals, control and eradication programmes, legal and institutional aspects, aiming to propose priority action for prevention and mitigation, appropriate legal and administrative aspects, international co-operation, etc.

The Committee instructed the Secretariat to continue work on this topic (in collaboration with IUCN and interested states and organisations) taking into account the results of COP6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. A group of experts may meet after COP6 (in the framework of a workshop to be organised in Portugal) and continue work on the strategy. Technical studies will explore all relevant aspects, including those mentioned above. The group of experts should examine the results of the implementation of previous Bern Convention recommendations, the decisions of COP6 and make proposals to the Committee as on how to proceed with this activity.

4.2. Report from the 1st Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 88 Main points of the 1st Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles

The 1st Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles (Rome, 24-28 October 2001) was jointly organised by the Secretariats of the Barcelona Convention (Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas - RAC/SPA), Bern Convention and the Convention on Migratory Species (Bonn). The main objective of the Conference was to give the opportunity to marine turtle scientists and conservationists working in the Mediterranean to share the most recent scientific and technical knowledge and management experience on Mediterranean marine turtle biology and conservation issues. The Bern Convention contributed with two reports, one analysing the impact of tourism on marine turtle nesting (by A. Demetropoulos, document T-PVS (2000) 41) and another one proposing a Clearing-House Mechanism on Marine Turtles for the Mediterranean (by M. Kasparek, document T-PVS (2001) 40).

The Conference had a marked scientific character. Mr Dimitris Margaritoulis, chair of the scientific committee assisting the Organising Committee, presented the main points of the Conference, as referred to in document T-PVS (2001) 88. He considered the Conference had been a great success, for its high scientific level and also for the very positive collaboration of the three conventions. He hoped this initiative might be pursued in two or three years.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the idea of a Clearing House Mechanism on Marine Turtles in the Mediterranean had been very well received by the Conference and that contacts were being held with governments and governmental and non-governmental organisations to try to give it a more precise form. The IUCN Regional Centre for the Mediterranean had been mentioned in this context as a possible institution to host the initiative.

The representatives of the Secretariats of the Barcelona and Bonn Conventions expressed their satisfaction for the good results of the Conference, which helped provide information needed for the implementation of their Conventions, and were happy to examine the form of a possible future follow-up.

The representative of Spain welcomed the idea of the IUCN Mediterranean Centre in Malaga hosting a Clearing House Mechanism and said that his government would explore such possibility and inform the Committee on progress.

The representatives of France, United Kingdom and the observer of MEDASSET expressed their satisfaction for the success of the Conference, noted that preservation of marine turtles concern all states in Europe because of the impact of tourism from the whole continent, and expressed interest in keeping associated to further work on this field.

The chairman thanked Italy for having hosted the meeting, the "ICRAM" Institute for having provided its technical and practical help, the Secretariats of the three Conventions for having carried out such useful exercise, and all the independent scientists and non-governmental organisation for their support.

The Committee took note of the information presented.

4.3. Report from Planta Europa Conference - European Plant Conservation Strategy

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 44 Report of Group of experts on Plants
T-PVS (2001) 50 Draft European Plant Conservation Strategy & (2001) 50 add draft recommendation
T-PVS (2001) 34 Datasheets of threatened mushrooms of Europe, candidates for listing in Appendix I

The Convention's Group of experts on the Conservation of Plants met in Pruhonice (Czech Republic) on 27 June 2001, in the framework of the Planta Europa Conference. At the Conference was prepared a draft Council of Europe – Planta Europa "European Plant Conservation Strategy". The Strategy contains both long-term policy directions and a set of medium-term clear targets selected through a participating process at the Conference. The Strategy is a contribution to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation discussed in the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The contribution of the Bern Convention to the Strategy was in the form of a first draft containing the

policy directions (by H. Synge, document T-PVS (2000) 70) and in supporting its elaboration in the Planta Europa Conference.

The Secretariat presented the report of the meeting of the group of experts pointing out in particular, the positive reception of the group of the proposal of the European Council for the Conservation of Fungi (ECCF) to add 33 species to the appendices (document T-PVS (2001) 34).

Mr Koune from “Journées du Cortinaire” explained that the list of 33 species had been very carefully selected respecting scientific criteria and that it was – as pointed out by the group of experts – an excellent basis for a possible amendment of the appendices.

The delegations of Switzerland, Sweden and Hungary praised the work made by the ECCF and supported the idea of including mushrooms in Appendix I of the Convention.

* * *

Mrs Liz Radford, of Planta Europa, presented the European Plant Conservation Strategy, and informed the Committee of its examination by SBSTTA-7 (12-16 November 2001), which had recognised this project from the Convention as a valuable contribution to its work in the framework of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation. Furthermore she informed the Committee that both the Global Strategy and the European one had been much welcomed by SBSTTA-7 and that it was hoped that COP6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity endorsed such initiative and invited parties to collaborate in its implementation.

The delegations of the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Germany, Slovenia, Latvia, Switzerland, Denmark, Andorra, Hungary and the United Kingdom made interventions. They were unanimous in recognising the value and usefulness of this initiative and valued very positively the good input into SBSTTA-7, while making some suggestions to improve the text of the recommendation.

The delegations of Norway, Finland and Switzerland wished to be able to submit comments for integration in the Strategy and reserved their position concerning the recommendation at this stage.

The delegation of Ukraine pointed out that presented draft of document, elaborated in line of ideas initiated by Ukrainian scientists twenty years ago and fixed in “*Green Book of Ukraine*” (1987), special government regulation (1997) and chapter in Law on Plant Kingdom (1999) may be supported in principle. The important matters are structure, composition and content of draft document proposed by Planta Europa, which should become a policy document. It would seem very appropriate to develop clear documents, namely, Strategy, Explanatory Notes and Action Plan, based on the document presented.

The Chairman, expressing the view of the Committee, thanked the Czech authorities for having hosted the Planta Europa Conference, expressed his satisfaction for the good synergy of Bern Convention activities with Planta Europa, and thanked Planta Europa for having organised the Conference. He invited Parties to submit before the end of the year possible comments on particular points to integrate into the EPCS.

The Committee adopted Recommendation No (87) on the European Plant Conservation Strategy (appendix 5)

4.4. Draft Recommendation on Action Plans for Birds

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 3, 4, 5, 29, 30 Action Plans for Birds
T-PVS (2001) 55 Draft Recommendation on 5 new Action Plans for Birds

BirdLife International prepared for the Convention five new Action Plans for Globally Threatened Birds, some of them on the basis of Action Plans elaborated for the European Commission in the framework of the ORNIS Committee. They concerned the following species: *Phalacrocorax aristotelis desmarestii*, *Porphyrio porphyrio*, *Hieraaetus fasciatus*, *Gypaetus barbatus*, *Tetrax tetrax*. These five Action Plans continued the series of 23 Action Plans on Globally Threatened Birds referred to in Recommendation No. 48 (1998) of the Standing Committee and the 4 Action Plans mentioned in

Recommendation No. 75 (1999) of the Standing Committee. The plans had been circulated to the Parties for information.

The representative of BirdLife presented the draft recommendation and the plans and informed the Committee that BirdLife was ready to continue working with the Committee on action plans with the final objective of drafting and implementing action plans for all globally threatened birds present in Europe. They would co-organise with the Secretariat the meeting of the group of experts on conservation of Birds in 2002.

The Committee took note with satisfaction of the progress on bird conservation action in the framework of the Convention.

The delegation of Andorra presented small amendments to the Action Plans on *Gypaetus barbatus* and informed the Committee on the new law protecting species in the Principality.

The Committee adopted its Recommendation No 88 (2001) on the implementation of five new action plans for globally threatened birds in Europe (appendix 6).

4.5. Implementation on Action Plans for Large Carnivores - Draft recommendation on Action Plan for Alpine lynx

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 42 Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy for Lynx
T-PVS (2001) 33 Draft Recommendation on Conservation of European Lynx
T-PVS (2001) 83 Implementation of Action Plans for Large Carnivores

The Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe (LCIE) held a plenary session close to Krakow (Poland) on 11 and 12 October 2001. The status of different large carnivore populations in Europe was discussed, as well as the implementation of the LCIE Action Plans. Mr William Pratesi Urquhart, from LCIE, informed the Committee on the results of the LCIE plenary session. He presented document T-PVS (2001) 83 on the implementation of Action Plans for Large Carnivores. He called the attention of the Committee on the critical situation of the Iberian lynx and expressed the concern of LCIE on the situation. Another species which raised concern and needs to be carefully monitored is the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) in Scandinavia.

Norway strongly objected to the presentation as well as discussion of document (T-PVS (2001) 83) which had not been circulated before the meeting. According to the rules of procedure, documents were to be distributed one month in advance of the meeting. Delegates attending international meetings were responsible to their own institutions as well as ministers; consequently time was needed before the meeting to discuss the papers and, as appropriate, answer to concerns that were raised concerning their own states.

The Secretariat presented its apologies and informed the Committee that such document was presented for information only.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Government of Spain had agreed to co-organise with the Convention, IUCN SSC cat specialist group and LCIE a workshop on the Iberian lynx, aimed at discussing conservation priorities and presenting on-going conservation work.

The delegate of Senegal drew the Committee's attention to the precarious situation of certain large African carnivores, particularly the lion *Panthera leo* and the African hunting dog *Lycan pictus* which were endangered.

The delegate of Ukraine mentioned also the Carpathian initiative, aiming to elaborate new regional convention and stressed the importance in this light the Alpine experience, e.g. in the field of Large Carnivores Conservation.

The Committee took note of the information presented.

* * *

In the framework of the LCIE Action Plans for Large Carnivores endorsed by the Standing Committee (Recommendation No. 74 (1999)), the Group SCALP (Status and Conservation of Lynx in

the Alps) submitted a draft Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy, which was circulated for comment to Parties and to members of the Alpine Network of Protected Areas. Mrs Anja Jobin-Molinary presented the Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy and a draft recommendation inviting governments to reinforce lynx conservation in the Alps taking into account such strategy.

The delegations of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Switzerland, Slovenia, Germany, Finland and LCIE made interventions, congratulating SCALP for such a remarkable document. The delegate of Germany presented complementary information regarding lynx in his state and proposed an alternative text for the recommendations of the Strategy regarding Germany.

The delegate of Finland added that his state recognised the need to have additional action plans to the Large Carnivore Action Plans in case of small and isolated populations, however the same kind of need cannot be seen in cases of larger and non-isolated populations.

The chairman expressed the satisfaction of the Committee for such useful initiative and invited relevant parties to submit additional comments to the authors in a written form and pointed out the interest to reinforce contacts with activities carried out in the framework of the Alpine Network of Protected Areas established in the Alps Convention.

The Committee adopted Recommendation No. 89 (2001) on the conservation of the European Lynx in the Alps (Appendix 7).

4.6. Habitats: setting up of ecological networks. Development of the Emerald Network: Group of experts and pilot projects

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 79 Report of Emerald Network Group of Experts
T-PVS (2001) 51 Emerald Network information document
T-PVS (2001) 64 rev. Sites of Geological Interest for the Emerald Network

The Chair of the Group of Experts and the Secretariat reported on the results of the meeting of the Group of Experts that had been held in Istanbul on 4 and 5 October 2001, together with the Committee of Experts of the Pan-European Ecological Network. They thanked the Turkish authorities for their hospitality.

Great progress had been made in 2001 with the implementation of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest. Pilot projects to launch the process of designation of sites had started in 6 new Contracting Parties: Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta and Ukraine. Training workshops had been held in Cyprus, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta and Ukraine. Switzerland had continued its activities with a view to establishing the Emerald Network and had organised a training workshop at its own expense. The number of member states outside the European Union participating in the network had therefore risen to 19, including 14 in central and eastern Europe. Norway had indicated its desire to start activities for implementing the network at national level, subject to the availability of the necessary funding. The reports on the pilot projects organised in Estonia, Latvia, Moldova, Romania, Slovakia and Turkey in 2000 had been submitted to the Secretariat. They would be made available to the Standing Committee.

Subject to the availability of funding, pilot projects could be organised in Albania, Georgia, Tunisia and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” in 2002, at the request of the national authorities of the countries concerned. The delegate of Senegal reiterated his country’s interest in joining the Emerald Network process and informed the Standing Committee that a national team had already been set up to that end. The delegate of Senegal wished that a specific activity, to be defined by the Secretariat, be prepared for his country in the framework of the Emerald Network.

The Secretariat presented the map of the biogeographical regions of the Emerald Network, as updated on the basis of the pilot project activities.

The Chair of the Group of Experts underlined the difficulties arising from some differences between the softwares of the Emerald Network and Natura 2000. The Secretariat reported on the plans to improve the Emerald Network software with a view to adapting it to the Natura 2000 Network. The

relevant activities were covered by the memorandum on co-operation with the European Environment Agency. This was also true of the work that had been carried out in 2001 regarding the classification of Palaearctic habitats, specifically in Croatia, Malta, Iceland, Russia and Ukraine.

The Standing Committee was informed of the launch of an Emerald Network electronic newsletter, which was published in partnership with the WWF.

The Secretariat announced that the Emerald Network activities were due to be presented, along with those of the Pan-European Ecological Network, at the next international events concerned (6th and 7th Conferences of the Parties to the CBD and the "An environment for Europe" ministerial conference).

The Standing Committee expressed satisfaction with the rapid progress of the Emerald Network and its programme of pilot projects. It approved the updated map of the biogeographical regions. It felt that the programme of pilot projects was a useful tool for starting implementation of the network and urged all non-EU countries that were not yet parties to join. However, the programme would have to be followed up by a second phase in development that would require the availability of adequate funding.

Items for information:

- T-PVS (2001) 51 General document on Emerald Network
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 2 Pilot project Slovakia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 5 Pilot project Latvia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 6 Pilot project Moldova
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 11 Pilot project Turkey
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 14 Pilot project Romania
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 15 Pilot project Estonia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 7 Palaearctic habitat classification in Malta
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 8 Palaearctic habitat classification in Iceland
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 9 Palaearctic habitat classification in Croatia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 10 Palaearctic habitat classification in Russia and Ukraine

Sites of geological interest

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 64 rev. Sites of geological interest for the Emerald Network

The Secretariat presented the document and the draft recommendation based on the discussions of the Group of Experts of the Emerald Network, which had requested that the Standing Committee hold a fresh discussion on whether the Bern Convention should be opened up to include the protection of such sites.

The United Kingdom welcomed the report but expressed a number of concerns::

- It was not clear the Convention had a legal basis for taking or recommending action in respect of geological issues as the motivation for the protection of geological sites was not primarily for the conservation of flora and fauna;
- It had not been established that there was a clear need for action at the international level, rather than at national level;
- Even if international action was necessary, it was not clear whether incorporation in the Emerald Network was appropriate for possible loss of link with Natura 2000;
- If it was established that a legal basis for action under the Bern Convention existed, the United Kingdom would be happy to support a recommendation which explored in more detail the scope and purpose of existing geological programmes to see whether further action at the international level was necessary.

The Swiss delegation, supported by the French delegation, underlined the importance of protecting the geological heritage and agreed with the views expressed by the British delegation. It stressed that the protection machinery that existed at national and global level (UNESCO) could be used for the sites. The problem of trading in the fossils found at these sites, which was a serious matter, could not be covered by the provisions of the Bern Convention. The delegation suggested that an inventory of the protection machinery available at national level should be drawn up before any decision was taken on the plan to include geological sites in the scope of the Convention.

The Ukrainian delegation indicated that elements of legal framework for the protection of geosites had been put in place in its country. The British position was supported in terms of necessity of further legal justification of activity in this area, as well as development of possible new Protocol to the Bern Convention as legal instrument for these purposes was proposed.

The Belgian and Finnish delegations recognised the importance of the geological heritage and said that it needed adequate protection. However, they believed that such protection could not be provided under the Bern Convention.

In his capacity as representative of the Presidency of the European Union, the delegate of Belgium said that the inclusion of geological sites in the Bern Convention would have the effect of creating two types of sites within the Emerald Network: EU sites included through Natura 2000 and other sites that could include areas of geological interest.

The Icelandic, Czech, Hungarian and Norwegian delegations expressed support for the draft recommendation. They believed that the Bern Convention was a tool for the conservation of nature and, as such, should cover all of its aspects, including geological sites. Although many texts existed at national level, there was no protection machinery at European regional level. Instead of creating a new protection instrument, they felt that the Bern Convention could be used for this purpose. In their view, it would be possible to add a third component covering geological sites to the “habitats” and “species” components in the Emerald Network.

The Hungarian delegation indicated that sites of geological importance were protected in its country and that the majority of geological sites were home to living organisms, which underlined the link between biodiversity and geological sites.

The Icelandic delegation believed that there was no incompatibility between the designation of geological sites under Natura 2000 and Emerald and pointed out that geological sites had been designated as Natura 2000 sites in Portugal.

The Chairman concluded saying that the discussions had shown that there was great interest in the protection of the geological heritage but that there was not a sufficient majority for the adoption of a recommendation. He suggested that other types of co-operation should be examined so as to enable those Contracting Parties which so desired to give consideration to the types of protection that could be developed outside of the machinery of the Bern Convention. He pointed out the interest to work closely on this issue with the European Landscape Convention.

In his capacity as head of the Natural Heritage Division, Mr Fernández-Galiano said that the Council of Europe was willing to give consideration to appropriate specific activities on geological heritage outside the Convention next year. In co-operation with the interested governments, the Council would begin work to research the protection of sites of geological interest in different European sites and examine the feasibility of drawing up a European charter of sites of geological interest and/or other activities that might be necessary.

4.7. Forest biological diversity. Input in SBSTTA-7 - Marine and coastal biological diversity - Input in SBSTTA-8

The Secretariat presented to the Committee the input from the Convention into the Technical and Scientific meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SBSTTA), on matters related to conservation of forest biological diversity. At the seventh meeting of SBSTTA (November 2001) the Convention had held two side events, one with Planta Europa and the “Gran Canaria Group” on the

European Plant Conservation Strategy and another with the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe in which the Convention's action on forest biological diversity had been presented. He thanked LCIE for its support and Mr Henryk Okarma (Poland) for his participation in that event. The draft European Plant Conservation Strategy had been regarded as a major contribution to the global strategy.

The Committee took note of the results and expressed satisfaction that its work had been recognised by the SBSTTA.

* * *

The Secretariat announced that the eighth meeting of the SBSTTA would mainly be devoted to marine and coastal biodiversity. The Convention could contribute to the preparation of the meeting by presenting its achievements in the area, in particular the results of the first Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles, while bearing in mind the proposals contained in the draft programme of activities for 2002. The Secretariat said that a consultant would be commissioned to analyse the various conventions that existed on the matter and to make proposals on future action by the Bern Convention in this area.

Input into SBSTTA-8 will be placed in the agenda of the next meeting.

* Items for information:

- Report to SBSTTA-6: T-PVS (2001) 10 Bern Convention action on invasive alien species in Europe
- Report to SBSTTA-7: T-PVS (2001) 81 Bern Convention action in the field of forest biological diversity
- T-PVS (2001) 3, 4, 5, 29, 30 Action Plans for Birds:
- T-PVS (2001) 41 Baltic Large Carnivore Initiative
- T-PVS (2001) 40 Euro-African Clearing House Mechanism on marine turtles
- T-PVS (2000) 65 rev Guidelines for eradication of terrestrial vertebrates
- T-PVS (2001) 51 General document on Emerald Network
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 2 Pilot project Slovakia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 5 Pilot project Latvia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 6 Pilot project Moldova
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 11 Pilot project Turkey
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 14 Pilot project Romania
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 7 Palaeartic habitat classification in Malta
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 8 Palaeartic habitat classification in Iceland
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 9 Palaeartic habitat classification in Croatia
- T-PVS/Emerald (2001) 10 Palaeartic habitat classification in Russia and Ukraine

PART IV – MONITORING OF SPECIFIC SITES AND POPULATIONS

5. Specific sites and populations

5.1. Files

- *Caretta caretta* in Patara (Turkey)

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 76 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 85 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 72 NGO report

This case first got the attention of the Standing Committee in 1988, after Patara was identified as one of the major nesting beaches for the marine turtle *Caretta caretta* (Appendix II to the Bern Convention) in the Mediterranean. Recommendation No. 24 (1991) recommended Turkey to consider urgent practical steps to protect the seventeen nesting beaches. With reference to Patara, it recommended to halt construction activities at this beach until management plan for this area was drawn up. At the time, MEDASSET informed the Secretariat that there were several building projects in this area, which posed serious threat to the beaches. At the same time, Turkish authorities reported that there were no specific threats to this area. In view of this situation, at its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee took the decision to send an expert to Patara to carry out an on-the-spot appraisal. At its 16th meeting, the Standing Committee examined the report produced by the expert, which contained recommendations on enhancement of the site protection, and decided to open a case file. It also adopted Recommendation No. 54 (1996) on this issue, which proposed practical measures that the Turkish government has to undertake in order to ensure adequate protection of this area, which is an important turtle nesting beach and a unique ecological site. The Standing Committee discussed this case at its 17th, 18th –when another recommendation was adopted on nesting beaches for marine turtles in Turkey-19th, and 20th meetings. While some progress has been achieved, conservation problems subsist. The Committee has recognised the positive steps taken by the government but insisted on the fact that the Recommendations No. 54 (1996) and No. 66 (1998) have not been implemented in full.

The delegate of Turkey reported on the new measures that had been taken, i.e. the carrying out of monitoring studies, the installation of screens to prevent the plundering of nests, the recruitment of wardens, controls on car access, the ending of investment projects, the prohibition of hunting and information measures for tourists. Action was also being taken to end sand extraction.

MEDASSET felt that, even though the Turkish Government was continuing its efforts, the situation was still not satisfactory: sand extraction was continuing, cars were driving round the barriers, problems of waste disposal remained, sun beds had increased and remained on the beach at night, tourists were offered turtle watching at night by locals.

Professor Lescure, who had carried out the appraisal in 1995, believed that progress had been made. It was important to stop sand extraction and resolve the problem of waste.

The Committee took note of the information submitted.

Although some problems remained to be resolved, in view of the generally positive development in the situation, it decided to close the file and asked Turkey to continue submitting reports to the Standing Committee on progress made.

It reserved the right to reopen the file if the measures advocated in the relevant recommendations were not implemented in full.

- Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 76 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 61 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 62 Report by the NGOs

This case concerns plans to develop for tourism 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 16th meeting of the Standing Committee, where it was decided to

carry out an on-the-spot appraisal. This appraisal took place on 21-23 July 1997 and was carried out by Professor Lescure. Its main findings confirmed that present regulations in this area offer some protection to a part of the nesting beaches, but not enough to assure a long-term preservation of all areas of importance. A study commissioned by the World Bank had reached similar conclusions and recommended a sustainable (limited) tourism development of the villages in the Peninsula and the designation of a National Park. At its 17th meeting the Standing Committee adopted a text on those lines: Recommendation No. 63 (1997) on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula, Cyprus, and, in particular, of the nesting beaches of *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas* (Appendix 1). At subsequent meetings (18th, 19th and 20th), the Standing Committee urged the Government of Cyprus to implement all points in the recommendation, so as to secure the ecological balance of the area and to advance towards the declaration of a National Park for the Akamas peninsula, and expressed frustration on the lack of progress of this issue. Important beaches for marine turtle nesting remain unprotected and are threatened by development. In 2001 the bureau, alarmed by the news of still new tourism development projects contrary to the recommendations made, proposed the realisation of an on-the-spot appraisal during 2001.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that for technical reason it had not been possible to carry out the appraisal, which was now planned for mid January 2002.

The delegate of Cyprus informed the Committee that the government main goal for the area was sustainable management involving all major stakeholders. A decision of the Council of Ministers was pending and was expected soon, aiming to protect key biodiversity sites and avoid unsustainable tourism development. She explained in details some of the problem issues, as they figure in document T-PVS (2001) 61. She concluded stressing that the government main concern was to put in place a management status for the broader areas of Akamas that would secure environmental protection and socio-economic development. The beach of Limni was to be proposed for Natural 2000.

The representative of the Cyprus Conservation Foundation, in the name of several NGOs informed the Committee that lack of action by the government had allowed the situation to change for the worse. More licences to hotels have been given and a very unsustainable tourism is being developed around the core area of Akamas. The government had not followed up the recommendation of the Bern Convention and the findings of the World Bank Report, and despite the decision of the Attorney-general of the Republic that the beach in front of the Anassa Beach Hotel should remain unobstructed, this had not been implemented. Proposals for a new road and a 'community centre' at Lara Bay would introduce further pressure and impact on nature conservation needs. The nomination of some areas as Natura 2000 sites was not enough, as these small protected areas would be surrounded by intensive tourism activities. Besides, since Cyprus was not yet in the European Union, legal redress through the European Court was not available. Thus it was important that the Committee remained active on this file

The delegates of France, Sweden and the observer of MEDASSET regretted the worsening of turtle situation in Akamas and spoke in favour of keeping the file open.

MEDASSET pointed out the similarity of this case to that of Zakynthos when it was first presented to the Secretariat in 1985. This case should not become another Zakynthos saga.

The Committee expressed one more time its deep frustration on the lack of progress on the issue and its concern for the conservation of the many areas of biological interest in the Akamas peninsula, including the Limni beach. It firmly urged Cyprus to fully implement without delay the terms of its Recommendation No. 63 (1997). The Committee estimated that the lack of priority of environmental concerns for the Government of Cyprus on this issue resulted in a direct threat to the long-term conservation of important sites. The file is kept open.

- **Green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) in Turkey**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 39 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 85 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 70 Report by the NGO

Green turtles are extremely threatened in the Mediterranean, where a very small nesting population remains. Nesting beaches in Turkey are of paramount importance for the survival of the species. At its last meeting the Standing Committee decided to open a case file on Turkish nesting beaches for this species, as an encouragement for positive conservation action. The implementation of a number of Recommendation No. 66 (1998) of the Standing Committee on different beaches could do much to help their conservation. While it appears that some new regulations are being prepared for those beaches, actual measures are still lacking and some problems have got worse. In the beach of Kazanli, for instance, uncontrolled toxic spills by nearby industry have caused pollution that may have resulted in mortality of nesting females on two different occasions. The Turkish Government informed the Secretariat that an application had been made to the LIFE Programme with a view to restoring Kazanli beach, where a hotel had been demolished and, a monitoring centre for marine turtles had been set up. The Bureau welcomed the positive attitude of the Turkish Government and encouraged Turkey to take more stringent measures for pollution control in that beach and to fully implement Recommendation No. 66 (1998).

The delegate of Turkey informed the Committee that the 17 nesting beaches in Turkey would be re-evaluated in 2002 with the participation of a number of universities and the institutions. A commission with relevant related ministries and institutions, local authorities, scientists and NGOs has been established. An education study for the awareness of teachers and students had been realised in Kazanli region and an education programme for the fishermen, farmers and tourism sector was foreseen for the year 2002 in Kazanli and Adana region. A research for physical methods to clean polluters on the beaches will be launched next year and the plastics come from sea would be removed in Akyatan and Samandağ beaches. Despite all efforts, illegal sand extraction from the Samandağ beach by local people was still a problem. A study for determination of prevention methods of nest predation in Akyatan would be made in 2002 and education seminars on "shoreline erosion" would be held in Kazanli, Anamur et Samandağ in 2002. A project on "Development of Management Plan of Kazanli Seashore and Rehabilitation of Nesting Area of Sea Turtles" which was submitted to LIFE Programme, but unfortunately was not chosen. Other financial sources were looked for. Monitoring studies of sea turtles in Kazanli Beach have been realised with the financial support of RAC/SPA, the results of which will be very useful.

For 2002 the Ministry had charged the Dokuz Eylul University to carry on the monitoring and nest relocation studies in Kazanli. A Kazanli Environmental Territorial Plan was being prepared by the Planning Department of the Ministry and would be finalised by the end of the year. Pursuant to the Recommendation No. 66, Turkish scientific and Technical Research Institution would start a project in 2002 for the rehabilitation of the Kazanli beach. Turkey believed that actions taken without solid information would not help the protection of sea turtles. In this context, to determine the effects of the Soda-Chromium factory on the environment and to find out the reasons of the sea turtle deaths in Kazanli region, the Ministry of Environment had financed a project carried out by the Pamkhale University with involvement of international researchers. Depending on the results, the necessary measures would be taken (Full statement of the Turkish delegation appears in document T-PVS (2001) 89 addendum.)

The RAC/SPA representative announced that the countries that had adopted the plan of action for threatened turtles in the Mediterranean had made efforts to put their commitments into practice. Real progress had taken place in Turkey.

The representative of Societas Europaea Herpetologica and of MEDASSET underlined the very critical situation of the species, which was on the point of disappearing, and the need to provide legal protection for the three main nesting beaches of Kazanli, Samandağ and Akyatan. In particular, they mentioned the problems caused by plastic waste horticulture, the plundering of nests, beach erosion, fishing pressure and chemical pollution involving soda and chromium. During a video projection,

Mr Corbett showed a video taken on the 6th March 2001, with an embedded tape date, the day of the first discharge of toxic waste from the factory into the sea, showing the bulldozed retaining walls, huge heaps of 1.5 million tons of hazardous solid waste and chromium effluent released into the sea, with the consequent red colouration of the sea near the shore.

Mr Ertürk, from the Chemical Company, maintained that the death of marine turtles was not related to the episodes of accidental pollution and presented a file to the Standing Committee about two reports which were referenced by various groups. Mr Ertürk presented “The facts and the scientific evaluation of the reports on Kazanli case”. In his opinion:

- There were no scientific data or proven evidence of the effect of the spill on the death of any species including the green turtles in Kazanli Turkey;
- The chemical spill was caused by an accident;
- The effect was controlled by the Ministry of Environment as given in their presented report to Standing Committee;
- The old technology wastes were tightly covered before the deadline of December 2001;
- There are two NGO reports which were not based on any scientific data and mainly speculative;
- The solid and liquid waste treatment plants of the company are under compliance with the national standards, which are also in compliance with European standards.

The Standing Committee believed that, as the second most threatened species in the Mediterranean, the green turtle should receive high priority and financial support from bodies such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF). It decided to keep the file open and to accept the invitation from Turkey to carry out an on-site visit focused on the pollution aspects.

In this discussion, the delegate of Senegal pointed out that his country had taken steps to protect green turtles.

- **Exploitation and trade of *Lithophaga lithophaga* in Spain**

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 24 Secretariat report

Lithophaga lithophaga is a marine bivalve mollusc species which belongs to the Mytilidae family and is included in the Appendix II of the Bern Convention. After news that the species was subject to exploitation and trade in Spain, the Standing Committee opened a case file at its previous meeting. Since, the Region that had authorised its exploitation changed its laws, to comply with the obligations of the Convention. The bureau discussed this case and found there were no longer reasons to keep this file open, as Spain had complied with the measures proposed. The Secretariat presented the file and the draft recommendation, pointing out that as, it was still possible that the species was being illegally captured and traded in some Contracting Parties, the Bureau had proposed a draft recommendation.

As this case had been discussed under point 3.1 of the Agenda and Spain had taken the necessary measures, the Committee decided to close the file.

5.2 Possible Files

- **Olympic rowing Centre in Schinias-Marathon (Greece)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 24 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 86 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 67 NGO report

This case concerns the development of a rowing centre in a wetland of importance for species protected by the Convention. The case is also being subject to discussions in the framework of the Ramsar Convention and between the European Commission and the Greek government. The Secretariat said that it had received a complaint from the Hellenic Society for the Protection of Nature, supported by WWF-Greece, concerning the Greek Government’s choice of the site of Schinias-Marathon for the construction of a rowing and canoeing centre for the 2004 Olympic Games. The site was a wetland of ecological importance.

The delegate of Greece presented in detail all aspects of the restoration project in Schinias-Marathon, part of which is the creation of an artificial lake, that will be the venue of the sports of rowing and canoeing, during the Olympic Games of 2004. The whole restoration project will contribute decisively to the restoration and conservation of the area's original hydrology, the wetland's functions and habitats, the stone pine forest and the landscape and soil. As it was explained by the technical experts of the Greek Government, the Schinias biotope has been facing serious environmental pressures for the last 80 years and that led to the degradation of its ecological characteristics. It was also explained that the main principles of the biotope's restoration project, amongst others, are the removal of an airport and extensive abandoned military installations off the wetland, the creation of a lake and the return of fresh water from a nearby spring into the wetland. All those are accomplished through: i. the designation of the whole area as National Park (Presidential Decree issued in June 2000); ii. the establishment of a Management Committee responsible for the implementation of a Management and Operational Plan, which already has been prepared and aims at the restoration, conservation and protection of the National Park and iii. the thorough Environmental Impact Assessment procedure followed and the approved Environmental Terms (issued in June 2000, by a joint Ministerial Decision for the Olympic Project of the Rowing and Canoeing Centre in Schinias). It was noted that all the above were based on studies (E.I.A., Ecological Baseline Study, Management Study) carried out during the last ten years by a multidisciplinary team of more than 40 experts. It was also noted the positive side effect of the NGO's intervention in the optimal elaboration of the restoration project.

The WWF representative challenged the assertion that the area was degraded and condemned the lack of transparency and of precise data, pointing out that the site had been excluded from the Natura 2000 list. She believed that the park was only a facade designed to hide the reality of the situation.

The representative of BirdLife also expressed concern.

The delegate of the Netherlands and of several other countries expressed interest in the project. Some of the delegates wondered about the funding arrangements.

The delegate of Greece started that the restoration work in the biotope will be materialised in parallel to the construction of the Olympic Project. Moreover the Greek delegate stressed that the site has never been included in the National List of the Natura 2000 candidate sites and that the European Commission is in a very good contact with the National Authorities with regard to required relevant information, but not in the context of any infringement procedure.

Speaking on behalf of the member states of the European Union, the delegate of Belgium indicated that the Commission had opened a file on the matter.

The WWF representative asked the Standing Committee to take great care to make sure that the project was carried through properly, both before and after the Olympic Games, and to keep track of developments.

The Standing Committee took note of the information submitted on the project, with which the environment should be restored while sports facilities were created at the same time. It did not believe that it was necessary to open a file, but decided to keep a very close eye on the matter. It asked Greece to keep it regularly informed about developments in the situation.

- Windfarms in Smøla Archipelago (Norway)

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 21 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 53 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 54 NGO report

This case concerns the proposed establishment of two wind farm complexes in the Archipelago of Smøla, in an area of importance for nesting of white-tailed eagles and other species. The government recognised the international importance of the area but found that the impact of the development on the white-tailed eagle will be relatively moderate, and decided to authorise the second phase of the project only if the environmental impact assessment proves that such type of installations have little impact on the wildlife of Smøla. The Bureau found that there were reasons for concern, even if the impact of the

development on the Norwegian population of white-tail eagle were not disproportionate, as the species has been recovering well in the last years.

The Secretariat informed the Standing Committee that this case was submitted by SEO/BirdLife International. It stressed the exceptional ornithological interest of the site, which was home to numerous bird species including 70 pairs of White-tailed eagle. The implementation of such a scheme (which would comprise 72 windmills on 18 km²) in the middle of the largest concentration of breeding grounds of White-tailed eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*) might adversely affect this unique natural phenomenon.

The Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management had provided the Secretariat with information on the different stages of the procedure and the standpoints of the different ministries involved. The normal procedures required by Norwegian law had been followed especially regarding environmental impact assessment and public inquiry. The Ministry of the Environment considered that more knowledge about the actual effects on the eagles and the biodiversity was needed before accurate statements could be made about their significance for further development at Smøla. It had recommended that the impact of the first phase (20 windmills) be assessed before proceeding with the second phase (52 windmills) and that measures be taken to mitigate the adverse effects as far as possible.

The Norwegian delegate reviewed the energy situation in Norway. He said that the authorisation procedure had been complied with. Permits had been granted for the two phases. The first phase comprising 20 windmills would be built and mitigation measures would be taken. He said that the government was aware of the possible adverse effects of the scheme: noise, risk of collisions, resiting of nesting pairs. For the time being, there was no strategic plan for developing wind farms. The ensuing discussion focused on the question of the choice of site and the urgent need for impact assessments and research programmes on the consequences of this type of installation for bird-life.

The delegate of Germany informed the Committee that the Scientific Council under the Bonn Convention on Migratory species was working on barriers to migration, including wind farms at sea. The representative of Denmark mentioned the work carried out under the OSPAR Convention and the expertise on Denmark on this field, on which they were particularly interested.

The Chair noted that, even if the conventions such as those on climatic change or desertification already studied the impact on biological diversity of measures taken, the Bern Convention could also examine possible negative effects of such measures. He proposed that, in parallel to work done in CMS or OSPAR Conventions, the scope be enlarged to the impact of wind farms on the sea to cetaceans.

The representative of BirdLife acknowledged that wind farms were potentially very positive environmentally, but it was very important that a full Environmental Impact Assessment be carried out. 13 proposals had been put forward in Norway and BirdLife has opposed only this one in Smøla which was recognised by the Government to be the most controversial. Norway could achieve its target for production of energy from wind farms without the construction of the Smøla site. He thought that Norway had an important international responsibility in the conservation of this flagship species and regretted that there was no strategy for conserving the species at national level. He thought that the scheme was in contradiction with Articles 4 and 6 of the Convention. Supported by the WWF, he asked that a file be opened.

The Committee took note of these different statements and viewpoints. It thought that wind power was an interesting alternative; the important point was whether such installations had an impact on bird populations. The Committee acknowledged that there was little data on the subject at present.

It decided not to open a file on this question and asked Norway not to authorise the second phase before assessing the results of the first.

- **Motorway construction project at Kresna Gorge, Struma (Bulgaria)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 22 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 77 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 66 NGO report

This case refers to the building of a road through an Emerald Network site, the Kresna gorge, home to a variety of habitats and species listed in the Convention appendices, which may be severely affected by the development. Additionally it could affect local economy based on eco-tourism activities.

The Secretariat said that it had received a complaint from a group of NGOs concerning plans to build a motorway funded by the European Union (PHARE programme). This was a CORINE biotope site that had been selected for designation in the Emerald and Natura 2000 Networks. The area was home to a variety of habitats and species (birds, fish, amphibians and reptiles, bats) that were included in the appendices to the Bern Convention and EU directives. The project, which had been under consideration since 1997, was likely to have a negative impact on local communities which derived benefit from eco-tourism involving the discovery of the natural heritage. In its reply, the Environment Ministry had informed the Secretariat that it was aware both of the importance of this transport infrastructure project to the country's economy and also of its international obligations under the Bern Convention, and requested that alternative solutions not including the gorge should be found. It had also proposed that a site visit be organised.

The government delegate explained that the motorway would be part of the pan-European Transport Corridor No 4 (Branch-Sofia-Salonika). Her ministry had rejected the conclusions of the impact surveys carried out to date, and alternatives involving only the widening of the existing road had been proposed.

The delegate of Switzerland praised the Environment Ministry's attitude.

The WWF representative said that the ecological value of the area had not been taken into account in the funding programme.

The delegate of "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" said that the area was part of the Balkans green network and that his country wished to co-operate.

After hearing the information submitted, the Committee decided that it was not necessary to open a file. It felt that it was preferable to respond to the Bulgarian authorities' proposal that a site visit be organised. It instructed the Secretariat to make contact with the various Commission directorates general concerned by the project and send them the conclusions of the appraisal

- **Exotic forest plantations in areas of biological importance in Iceland**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 48 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 75 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 59 NGO report

This case refers to a wide afforestation programme planned by the government of Iceland. Unfortunately the scheme is planned on some areas of high biological value, especially for birds protected under the Convention. BirdLife has provided with a long list of species the populations of which would be severely affected in several degrees. The schemes risks to be highly detrimental to species protected by the Convention in a very fragile area. The afforestation is partly to be carried out with tree species, which are not native of Iceland, which would add further damage.

Document T-PVS (2001) 49 was introduced by the Secretariat.

The Government of Iceland stated that it found unlikely that any bird species protected under the convention might be likely to suffer considerable impact from the current afforestation plans. His government was, however, aware of potential threats and that species and habitats that may be affected should be properly taken care of in the future. The government did not accept that its afforestation policy contravened the Bern Convention, as only 5.5% of low lands were affected, a small proportion for a state with a poor 1.1% forest cover. The government had the legal framework to address possible impact to afforestation activities and intended to reduce such impacts on Icelandic biological diversity

to a minimum. To obtain better information for such assessment, it would be preferable not to open a case file, but to encourage appropriate research and find solutions. The government would welcome an on-the-spot appraisal, the results of which would be communicated to the Standing Committee.

The delegate of BirdLife expressed the view that such afforestation was indeed likely to cause significant impacts and that there were still important gaps in the Environmental Impact Assessment relating to such wide afforestation. In his view, the afforestation could be in contradiction with several articles of the convention for its important impact on bird populations and rare habitats. He welcomed the positive attitude of the Government of Iceland to search for appropriate assessment and satisfactory solutions.

The delegate of Belgium informed the Committee of a recent international colloquy entitled "carbon sinks and biodiversity" organised during the Belgium presidency and whose results were presented at a side event SBSTTA-7. He announced that the proceedings would be sent to all participants.

The delegate of Denmark supported the idea of an on-the-spot appraisal.

The Committee accepted the offer from Iceland regarding the on-the-spot appraisal and decided to place the issue in the agenda of its next meeting as a "possible case file".

- Illegal killing and trade of birds in Cyprus

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 49 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 69 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 63 NGO report

This case refers to the lack of enforcement of laws protecting the capture, killing and trade of small birds in Cyprus. The problem was already discussed by the Committee in 1986, when "Recommendation N° 5 (1986) on the prosecution of persons illegally catching, killing or trading in protected birds" was adopted by the Committee and rapidly implemented by most Parties. The extent to which the illegal catch of protected birds is still practised in Cyprus and the very common offering for sale in restaurants are proofs that the efforts of the government to stop these practices are largely insufficient. A draft recommendation has been proposed to call the attention of the government to the little enforcement of a fundamental article of the Convention regarding protected birds.

The Secretariat presented document T-PVS (2001) 49 and the draft recommendation. He noted, in particular, the little enforcement in Cyprus of legislation protecting birds and the lack of applications Recommendation No. 5 (1986) of the Committee. In the 15 years since that recommendation had been adopted, progress had been very small.

The government of Cyprus informed the Committee that the use of non-selective method of taking was strictly prohibited in and violators were prosecuted to the Court. Also trading and selling of wild birds was illegal. The game wardens and the police were instructed to combat these illegal actions and to prosecute all offenders. Cyprus placed great emphases on the issue of illegal trapping and liming as well as conducting appropriate research on game and non game species. The Game Fund Service was strengthened with about 100 garden wardens which enforce the relevant legislations. As a result, there was better monitoring and more convictions decided by the Court. As a result of increased pursuing of trapping operations these illegal activities had been reduced. Fines and penalties were also much higher at present. Over the last two years the Republic of Cyprus and the Sovereign Bases Areas (SBA) authorities had been working closely together in handling the problem of illegal trapping in the SBA.

The issue of trapping and liming should not be mixed with that of legal hunting. The numbers of birds killed mentioned by some organisations were not based on scientific information. Scientific information shows is that annual game harvest ranges between 1,696,000-2,962,000 birds per year taken in a sustainable way. The government of Cyprus recognised that a problem with illegal trapping of birds did exist. The situation though is perceived as a major concern by the Republic and this illegal activity should be eliminated. Harmonisation with the EU would act as a catalyst to fully stop this practise. New, more enforceable and strict legislation was under way to fully transpose the EU

environmental acquis into national law. Measures would include higher penalties, fines on the spot for minor offences, hunter education, public awareness and a more comprehensive approach in habitat protection. Based on the above, the government did not believe it was appropriate at this time to open a file on illegal killing of birds (Full intervention of Cyprus in document T-PVS (2001) 89 addendum).

The representative of the Cyprus Ornithological Society pointed out that government efforts were very insufficient and that there was great tolerance to the offering for sale of migratory birds in restaurants, where the police does not prosecute owners, thus creating a sense of impunity. The problem was very serious as it affected several million birds and the lack of action by government was unacceptable and a clear breach of the Convention.

The United Kingdom delegation informed the Committee that the United Kingdom was extending the Bern Convention to the UK Sovereign Base Area. The United Kingdom was already tackling the issue, reinforcing controls and increasing prosecution of offenders. Such policy was already proving effective in controlling illegal activities. Amendments were suggested to the draft recommendation so as to cover Sovereign Base Areas

The delegates of Poland, Hungary, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Belgium (in the name of European Union), the Bonn Convention Secretariat and WWF made interventions, expressing concern and wishing a quicker and more efficient control of the illegal capture and offering for sale of birds protected under the convention. Particular concern was expressed by delegates over the offering for sale of birds, and activity on which the government is expected to take specific and effective measures in the short term. The delegate of Ukraine expressed his concern on lack of efficient co-ordination, i.e. in regulation of spring hunting and absence of spirit of co-operation in this case.

As opinions were divided regarding the opening of a file, the Committee decided to place the issue again in its agenda next year as a possible file. If there is marked progress on the issue, the Standing Committee will not consider the opening of a file appropriate but if in the coming year no substantial progress is made, the Committee will be inclined to open a file.

The Committee decided to adopt the draft recommendation proposed, as amended by the United Kingdom delegation. It appears in appendix 8 to the present document.

The Government of Cyprus and the United Kingdom would be invited to report on progress to the Bureau.

- Bald ibis (*Geronticus eremita*) and tourism development in the National Park of Souss Massa (Morocco)

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 78 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 84 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 82 NGO report

The Secretariat informed the Committee that Club Méditerranée was planning to build a holiday centre in Tifnit, in the Souss Massa national park, located 60 kilometres from Agadir (south-west Morocco). The park contained the last remaining wild population of Bald ibis (*Geronticus eremita*). There were 65 pairs breeding there. The park had been set up in 1991 to guarantee the survival of this species. The case was presented by the SEO/BirdLife association.

The Secretariat had written to the Moroccan government, drawing its attention to the country's international responsibility in conserving this species. In their reply, the Moroccan authorities had said that the project was justified by socio-economic considerations and given assurances that the government would do its utmost to reconcile economic imperatives with preservation of the environment, pointing out that protection of the Bald ibis was a central concern to all the parties involved. They had informed the Secretariat that a study to assess the impact of the project on the environment in general and the Bald ibis in particular had been launched. The terms of reference had been drawn up in collaboration with BirdLife and the results were to be taken into account at the level of the project specifications given to the developer. An outline agreement had been signed with the Club Méditerranée, providing *inter alia* for the possibility of funding from the French government, via the conversion of debts into investments, which had been agreed between the Moroccan and French

governments. The Club Méditerranée had told the Secretariat that it had commissioned a firm renowned for the quality of its environmental studies to carry out an environmental impact assessment for the area and to check that the projects could suitably be integrated into the Tifnit site.

The delegate of Morocco described the project in detail, assuring the Committee that it would be implemented in collaboration with all the partners and would not adversely affect the biodiversity and the Bald ibis in particular. He pointed out that several proposals had been submitted by investors envisaging major development projects with an accommodation capacity of 10,000 beds but, given that this was a sensitive and fragile site, the government had opposed these projects in their initial form. Following the creation of the Souss Massa National Park in August 1991, the Tifnit site had been included within the boundaries of the protected area, which covered 34,000 ha and provided a habitat for a Bald ibis population in its wild state. He stressed that the aforementioned outline agreement stated, in article 4, that the development and the surface area to be used for the project had to take account of the imperatives of fauna and flora conservation to be defined in collaboration with the authorities.

The Park's management had entered into negotiations with the Club Méditerranée, with the following results:

- the reduction by more than half of the surface area solicited – from 260 ha to 120 ha;
- the commitment of the Club Méditerranée to an initial phase of development with a capacity not exceeding 3,000 beds;
- the preparation of an environmental impact assessment to determine optimal capacity, which in any case was not to exceed 6,000 beds;
- the recovery of 196 ha for the benefit of the Park and the Bald ibis population;
- the willingness of the Club Méditerranée to contribute funding towards measures to conserve the national park's natural resources in accordance with its management plan.

Finally, he said that Morocco was prepared to receive a fact-finding delegation from the Standing Committee.

The delegate of France said that it would be expedient to have both additional information on the presence and use of the site by the Bald ibis and the conclusions of the impact assessment. France was willing to provide assistance.

Other delegates, notably Belgium, welcomed the fact that Morocco had consulted BirdLife from the outset, stressing the need to raise awareness concerning the uses of the site, were the project to go ahead after a favourable environmental impact assessment.

The delegates of Andorra, Sweden and Senegal thought that great caution would be necessary in implementing this project since, once infrastructure was in place, the temptation was great to further develop it.

The delegate of Switzerland stressed that foreign investors should be aware of what was at stake in the protection of the natural heritage and that impact studies had to offer alternatives. The representative of BirdLife emphasised the very positive attitude of the government which was striving to find compromise solutions with the NGOs (Full statement in document T-PVS (2001) 89 addendum).

The Standing Committee took note of all these statements and congratulated the Moroccan government on its very positive attitude. It noted that many foreign partners and investors were involved in tourism development projects and they should ensure that environmental considerations were properly taken into account.

The Standing Committee thought that it should provide assistance to the Moroccan government so that the objectives of the Convention were fully taken into account. It decided to organise a fact-finding visit and to monitor the situation via the Bureau and to examine this case at its next meeting.

It asked Morocco to present a report at its next meeting.

5.3. Follow-up of selected recommendations from previous meetings

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 74 Government reports (Greece, Hungary, Italy, United Kingdom)

The Secretariat pointed out that two Contracting Parties had sent their reports on time and thanked them for doing so. Greece had sent its report too late for it to be distributed at the meeting. Italy had not submitted reports. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Bureau had asked the Parties concerned to submit reports on the implementation of the following recommendations:

- Rec. No. 84 (2000) on the conservation of Western Milos and in particular of the Milos' viper *Macrovipera schweizeri*

The delegate of Greece referred to the progress of the Physical Planning procedure, on the basis of Law 2742/99, for the Southern Aegean Region (in which Milos island is comprised), and its significance in the legal adoption of zoning conservation measures. She also mentioned that the elaboration of the Specific Environmental Study, for the designation and management, of a Protected area (covering the coastal area as well), is in progress taking into consideration the Recommendation No. 84 (2000). With regard to the Natura 2000 site, the National Competent Authorities are examining the extension of the proposed site 4220020 – 'Profitis Elias' taking into consideration the available scientific data. Moreover the national and regional authorities were preparing the appropriate proposals (studies/technical works), candidate for funding through the 3rd Community Support for Greece and that those proposals cover the points 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the said Recommendation, whilst the Environmental Service of the Ministry of the Environment has started the procedure for imposing an extra condition, related to prohibition of the night-time quarry-lorries transportation. The Greek delegate said that the authorities worked out to reconcile the different interests namely the mineral exploitation and the protection of the Milos viper.

The delegate of Sweden expressed his disappointment with this report. He felt that not enough progress had been made.

SEH reminded the meeting that there were now four Recommendations dealing with this problem since 1988, with minimal signs of progress. For the current Recommendation 84 (2000), element 6 dealt with road mortality from night-time quarry lorries, now known to equal or exceed recruitment. The Government's "starting the administrative procedure" was an inadequate response. Elements 3 and 4 deal with the mining permissions, a basic consideration not available to the previous on-the-spot appraisal, nor, despite assurances last year, are they yet available here. He asked consideration therefore to the opening of a File on the long-outstanding case.

The Committee took note of these reports and thanked the governments for the information provided on the follow-up to recommendations. It asked Greece to submit a fuller report. The delegate of Greece undertook to do so in time for the next meeting of the Bureau.

- Rec. No. 78 (1999) on the conservation of the Red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*) in Italy

No report from Italy was received.

- Point 30 of Rec. No 26 (1991) concerning the conservation of *Natrix natrix* in Sardinia and point 20 of Rec. No 27 (1991) concerning conservation of *Euproctus platycephalus* in Sardinia (Italy)

No report from Italy was received.

The Chairman reminded that documents should be presented in time as the adoption of recommendation and their implementation help meet the objectives of the Convention and avoid the opening of files and that the Committee can only assess a problem fully after examining the measures taken.

The Committee regretted the absence of a report on the implementation of Recommendation No. 79 (1999) on the conservation of the Red Squirrel in Italy as the Grey Squirrel may become invasive in the neighbourhood Alpine countries.

The Committee instructed the Bureau to approach the Italian authorities regarding their failure to attend meetings and submit reports.

- Rec. No. 70 (1998) on the conservation of the great crested newt *Triturus cristatus* in Orton Brick Pits (United Kingdom)

The United Kingdom delegate informed the Committee of the measures taken to transfer 25,000 great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*) to new areas. The newts had established themselves, breeding and producing young in 26 of the 30 ponds to which they have been moved. Follow-up work was in progress and a five-year management plan was available in draft for consultation.

SEH confirmed that this was (or had been) the largest known European population of this Annex II species. The major new town had been effectively built over the past decade with the newts moved out of the way.

1. The success of their re-location remained non-quantified.
2. Necessary mitigation measures had been shown to be outside the necessary planning control.
3. Ten years on, there was neither an agreed management plan nor any sign of long-term funding.
4. A main road to bisect the remaining newt reserve was not planned as a low viaduct as was needed.

The reason for these failures was the quite inadequate "Statement of Intent" drawn up between the developers and English Nature. In terms of the requested national field survey, Scotland and Wales had made good progress; little yet attempted in lowland England. This needed modest funding and he offered NGO assistance, especially the Amphibian and Reptile Groups network. He urged the UK to better implement elements 1, 3, 4 and 5 of Recommendation 70 (1998).

- Rec. No. 23 (1991) on the protection of the habitat of *Vipera ursinii rakosiensis* in Hungary and point 26 of Recommendation No. 26 (1991) on the same species in Hungary

The delegate of Hungary reported on the measures taken to implement Recommendations No 23 and No 26 on *Vipera ursinii rakosiensis*. He pointed out that the known habitats of this species were protected except one military area and that agreements with the army and the acquisition of land had been valuable tools. The effects of road traffic had been reduced. He thanked SEH for its help. An action plan had been drawn up in view of the critical situation facing this species.

SEH was concerned that, following many years of positive co-operation with the Hungarian Government, this taxon's status had continued to decline alarmingly, mainly due to inappropriate habitat management, especially within the two relevant National Parks. The best meadow which had been purchased for the Government had been damaged by successive mechanical mowing in the summer, over-grazing, and winter flooding "restoration"; all within the Kiskunsag National Park. A recent four-day seminar in Budapest on this snake, by IUCN's CBSG, had concluded many extinction scenarios without appropriate conservation intervention. Previously submitted Recovery and Action Plan proposals had not yet been officially adopted. Neither the Nature Conservation Service nor the National Parks had been able to afford this threatened snake all necessary national priority. SEH strongly recommended that a National Recovery Programme be urgently adopted and implemented by both relevant ministries and National Parks.

5.4 Items for information

- Wolf (*Canis lupus*) management in Norway

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 56 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 57 NGO Report

The Secretariat introduced the issue, reminding the Committee that the Bureau had not found substance to open a file on the matter but that this issue was placed by the Committee at its previous meeting as a point of information and Sweden had wished it discussed.

The delegate of Norway explained the difficulties of managing a carnivore species that had recovered only recently after bordering extinction in both Norway and Sweden. On a medium term the wolf population of South Scandinavia could be considered to have recovered spectacularly from near extinction to 87-97 wolves last winter. This had been better than expected and had been reached thanks to a sustained conservation effort. As this population had an annual increase of 20-30% it was expected to continue growing. Norwegian policy was for the establishment of viable populations of all carnivores. Conflicts with free-ranging sheep were not absent, so that compensation measures for an amount of 16.5 Million Euros per year had been put in place. Management had also involved the removal of some wolves outside "wolf zones" designated by the government. The tools used are aimed to making carnivore management predictable and affordable. A firm policy for keeping viable populations of wolves was not likely to change, respecting Bern Convention obligation. Collaboration with Sweden in the management of the transboundary population was highly desirable.

The delegate of Sweden explained the reasons why this matter was of interest for his government and had wished a discussion. The Scandinavian wolf population was shared between Norway and Sweden and consisted of maximum 100 animals (April 2001). The small population size made the future development very uncertain. In 1998, the Swedish EPA and the Directorate for Nature Management in Norway agreed on the management of the common population. Recent Norwegian decisions to (i) accommodate for wolf hunting all over the country, (ii) not to give family groups and established pairs special protection and (iii) design a wolf management zone, covering only about 15% of the Norwegian territory, were according to Swedish opinion, not in line with this agreement. Sweden harboured about 80% of the common wolf population and realised that wolves under certain circumstances might have to be killed. However, during the last 10 years, Sweden had issued licence for only one wolf. In sharp contrast, 10 wolves were legally killed in Norway in the previous winter, and there were plans to kill additional numbers this winter. By doing so, Norway unilaterally monopolised the whole potential margin available for management. The Swedish EPA was prepared to discuss a new agreement with Norwegian authorities, with the objective to achieve a viable wolf population in both countries.

The representative of 8 non-governmental organisations in Sweden, Finland and Norway expressed the view that present and proposed Norwegian wolf policies, seemed to be in violation of Article 9 of the Bern convention for a number of reasons, including the fact that the killing of protected species requires that there is no other satisfactory solution, and that it is not detrimental to the survival of the population. The first reason related to all the shortcomings of the wolf management zone, situated East and West of Oslo. Such zone was far too small to be able to serve as a refuge for a wolf population. Neither its size, location or protective status were adequate for protecting wolves, and the area appeared to have been selected on political rather than biological grounds. Secondly, wolf regulations and other policies in Norway needed to be related to the *Norwegian* population, and not to the entire *Scandinavian* population. Thirdly; - whether the Norwegian wolf population could tolerate culls of a certain magnitude or not needed to be determined only on scientific grounds, which were lacking in Norway. She concluded that it was important to continue the discussion on the need for improvements in Norwegian wolf management practises, in order to ensure a viable wolf population in Scandinavia.

The Chair expressed his wish that this exchange of opinion had permitted a better understanding of the respective positions of Norway and Sweden and hoped both states could start contacts aiming to a renewed co-operation on this issue.

- ***Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay, Zakynthos (Greece)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 90 Government report
T-PVS (2001) 71 NGO Report

Not discussed.

- ***Cricetus cricetus* in France, Germany and the Netherlands**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 87 Government report

Not discussed.

- ***Dam in Vistula River (Poland)***

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2001) 18 Secretariat report
T-PVS (2001) 60 Government Report

The document was presented by the delegate of Poland.

The Committee took note of the information presented.

PART V – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONVENTION

6. Strategic development of the Convention

6.1. Implementation of Resolution No. 7 (2000) on strategic development of the Convention

- Select Group on Strategic Development

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 27 Report of the select group on strategic development of the Convention

The Secretariat presented the main points of discussion:

Resolution No. 7 had been fully implemented, in particular on the following:

- input of the Convention's work of SBSSTA had been increased, as was shown by the side events, the documents presented to SBSTTA-6 and SBSTTA-7 and, especially, by the important contribution made in two of the main issues discussed in SBSTTA: Invasive Alien Species and the Global Strategy for the Conservation of Plants, to which the European Plant Conservation Strategy was a good contribution;
- a greater synergy had been obtained with activities of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy, as all biodiversity related activities had been grouped in the same Division of Natural Heritage;
- financially the Convention was in reasonable state thanks to the help of financial contributions from Parties, so the budget spent had been greater than in previous year;
- the Strategic group had suggested that some selected recommendations be followed up at each Standing Committee meeting.

The Committee agreed with the finding of the Strategic group and took note with satisfaction of the continuation of its activities and the very successful implementation of its Resolution No. 7 (2000).

- Memoranda of co-operation with the European Environment Agency and other partners

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2000) 14 rev.2 Memorandum of Co-operation with the EEA
T-PVS (2001) 58 Memorandum of Co-operation with the CBD
T-PVS (2001) 11 Draft Memorandum of Co-operation with the LCIE
T-PVS (2001) 13 Draft Memorandum of Co-operation with the EIS
T-PVS (2001) 14 Draft Memorandum of Co-operation with the ECNC
T-PVS (2001) 35 Draft Memorandum of Co-operation with BirdLife
T-PVS (2001) 36 Draft Memorandum of Co-operation with Planta Europa

Memoranda of Co-operation were signed with the Convention on Biological Diversity (on 13 March 2001) and the European Environment Agency (on 3 July 2001). Other similar memoranda were contemplated with the Barcelona and Bucharest Conventions.

The delegate of Sweden spoke in favour of strengthening also partnership with the Societas Europea Herpetologica.

Partnership with several non-governmental organisations had progressed and common working programmes had been established with a number of them. However it had not been possible to conclude Memoranda of co-operation as the Directorate of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe has suggested other collaboration arrangements. As all the organisations and observers to the Convention, the Secretariat will hold meetings with them to decide, on an annual basis, the activities to be carried out in common concerning the issues mentioned in the draft memoranda. The possibility of concluding administrative arrangements for specific tasks was a possibility to be used. The Committee took note of this information.

- Advisory Scientific Committee

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 19 Draft Terms of Reference of a possible Advisory Scientific Committee

At its previous meeting the Committee had wished to be presented with the draft Terms of Reference of the possible Advisory Scientific Committee mentioned in its Resolution No. 7 (2000). Such

Committee, which could meet back to back with the Standing Committee, was intended to discharge the Standing Committee of more technical work so it may focuss its work in more substantial issues.

The Strategic group had not found the need for a Scientific Committee but was in favour of a “Scientific Session” during Standing Committee meetings, which could also be shortened.

The Committee agreed with this proposal of the Strategic group.

6.2. Draft Programme of Activities for 2002

Relevant document: T-PVS (2001) 20 Draft Programme of Activities for 2002

The Secretariat presented a proposal of activities for 2002 drafted following discussions at the Bureau.

The delegation of Ukraine wished a more strategic view to be developed in the mid-term, which would also permit an assessment of the effectiveness of the Convention.

The delegates of Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Moldova, Iceland, Norway, the “former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and the Chair made intervention, some suggesting modifications of detail in the draft programme.

The Committee adopted its working programme for year 2002 as it figures in appendix 9 to this report.

The Chair invited Parties to make voluntary contributions for the activities planned.

The Committee instructed its Secretariat and invited its Chairman to play a very active part in, and contribute to meetings of special relevance for the work of the convention, including, in particular for 2002 the following events:

- 6th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity and 8th meeting of its Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention if this was held in 2002;
- Conference RIO+10
- meetings of co-ordination with LCIE, IUCN, European Invertebrate Survey, SEH, BirdLife, Planta Europa and other organisations with responsibility on working groups;
- Conference of the Parties and technical meetings of the Bonn Convention and its agreements (EUROBATS, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS, AEWA);
- Habitat Directive Scientific Committee meetings;
- meetings of co-ordination with the European Environment Agency, in particular those of the Task Force of the EC Clearing House Mechanism and meetings of the ETC/NPB;
- meetings of the Council of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy,
- meeting with Russian authorities to work on the ratification of the Convention.

The Committee encouraged participation in the above events and authorised the Chairman and the Secretariat –in the respect to present Council of Europe rules- to use funds from the Convention budget for attendance to the above.

6.3. States to be invited as observers to the 22nd meeting

The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following States (non member States of the Council of Europe) to attend its 22nd meeting as observers: Algeria, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Holy See, Kazakhstan, Kyrghystan, Mauritania, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Uzbekistan.

PART VI- OTHER ITEMS

7. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Committee elected Mr Patrick Van Klaveren (Monaco), Chair, Mrs Ilona Jepsen (Latvia), Vice-Chair and Mrs Ana Isabel Queiroz (Portugal), member of the Bureau.

8. Date and place of the 22nd meeting and adoption of the report

The Committee decided to held its 22nd meeting on 2-5 December 2002.

The Committee adopted its report.

9. Other business (items for information only)

The delegate of "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" proposed the establishment of a "Bern Convention" day. The Chair thought that the matter could be further examined.

The delegate of Germany called the attention on two important events in 2002, the Seventh Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Migratory Species (COP-7 of the CMS) and the Second Conference of the Parties of AEWA, both to be held in Bonn. He encouraged Parties to attend. International Governmental Organisations and non-Governmental Organisations are also welcome.

The delegate of Monaco informed the delegates on the first Meeting of the Parties of ACCOBAMS and encouraged all Mediterranean and Black Sea riverine States to attend, as well as those from the contiguous Atlantic Area.

The delegate of the Holy See informed the Committee that the 5th Klingenthal Symposium, on "Animals and fauna: from pets to threatened species", had been held from 4 to 8 July 2001. all the functions performed ty animals had been reviewed – environmental, economic (industrial farming of chickens and salmon, hunting, etc), social (increasing number of animals kept as pets), cultural – as had the socio-cultural role of animals in the different religions (from Christianity to Shintoism) and among the various indigenous peoples (in Australia, Russia, the Amazon, etc) and non-belivers.

Detailed conclusions were available in English and French. The Secretariat of the Bern Convention and the Directorate General of Legal Affairs had worked together in close co-operation.

Appendix 1**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****I. CONTRACTING PARTIES / PARTIES CONTRACTANTES****ALBANIA / ALBANIE****ANDORRA / ANDORRE**

Mrs Patricia QUILLACQ, Conseillère juridique, Ministeri de Relacions Exteriors, Edifici Administrativ de Govern, c/Prat de la Creu, 62-64, ANDORRA LA VELLA, Principauté d'Andorre.
Tel : +376 875 704. Fax : +376 869 599. E-mail : pquillacq.gou@andorra.ad (F/E)

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Ms Dr Edda-Maria BERTEL, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Division II/5 U, Stubenbastei 5, A-1010 VIENNA.
Tel: +43 1 515 22 1414. Fax: +43 1 515 22 7402. E-mail: edda-maria.bertel@bmu.gv.at (E)

Mr Mag. Harald GROSS, Amt der Wiener Landesregierung, Magistratsabteilung 22, Ebendorfer Strasse 4, A-1082 VIENNA.

Tel: +43 1 4000 88 344. Fax: +43 1 4000 88 344. E-mail: gro@m22.magwien.gv.at (E)

AZERBAIJAN / AZERBAÏDJAN**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 (F)

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Mrs Rayna Hristoforova HARDALOVA, Expert, Direction "Office national pour la protection de la nature", Ministère de l'Environnement et des Eaux, 22 Maria Luisa Blvd., 1000 SOFIA.
Tel: +359 2 940 65 54. Fax: +359 2 980 96 41. E-mail: hardalovar@moew.govrn.bg (F)

BURKINA FASO / BURKINA FASO**CROATIA / CROATIE****CYPRUS / CHYPRE**

Mrs Myroula HADJICHRISTOPHOROU, Fisheries Officer A', Environment, Service, Ministry of Agriculture Natural Resources and Environment, NICOSIA 1411.
Tel: 357 2 303851. Fax 357 2 774945. E-mail: myroulah@hotmail.com (E)

Mr Panicos PANAYIDES, Game Fund Officer, Game Fund Service, Ministry of Interior, NICOSIA 1453.

Tel: 357 2 867786. Fax: 357 2 867780. E-mail: wildlife.thira@cytanet.com.cy (E)

CZECH REPUBLIC / RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE

Dr Jan PLESNÍK, Deputy Director, Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection of the Czech Republic, Kališnická 4-6, CZ-130 23 PRAHA 3.

Tel: +420 2 697 0562. Fax: +420 2 697 00 12. E-mail : plesnik@nature.cz (E)

Ms Libuše VLASAKOVA, Ministère de l'Environnement, Vršovická 65, 100 10 PRAHA 10
Tel: +420 2 6712 2372... Fax: +420 2 673 110 96... E-mail: libuse_vlasakova@env.cz (mF)

DENMARK / DANEMARK

Mr Lars RUDFELD, Head of Section, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Haraldsgade 53,
DK-2100 COPENHAGEN Ø.

Tel : + 45 39 47 20 00. Fax: + 45 39 27 98 99. E-mail: lar@sns.dk (E)

Mrs Anni H. DALGAS, Head of Section, Danish National Forest and Nature Agency, Haraldsgade 53,
DK 2100 COPENHAGEN Ø.

Tel : + 45 39 47 20 00. Fax: + 45 39 27 98 99. E-mail: ahd@sns.dk (E)

Mr Peter POUPLIER, Head of International Division, Danish National Forest and Nature Agency,
Haraldsgade 53, DK 2100 COPENHAGEN Ø.

Tel : + 45 39 47 26 51. Fax: + 45 39 47 26 90. E-mail: ppo@sns.dk (E)

ESTONIA / ESTONIE

Mr Jaak TAMBETS, Member of Board Wildlife Estonia, Keskk 44 15, 50114 TARTU

Tel : +372 5 174 661. E-mail : mtambets@ut.ee (E)

Mrs Riinu RANNAP, Senior Officer of Nature Conservation, Ministry of the Environment,
Toompuiestee 24, 15172 TALLINN.

Tel: +372 6262 889. Fax: +372 6262 901. E-mail : Riinu.Rannap@ekm.envir.ee (E)

Mr Hanno ZINGEL, Director General of Nature Conservation Department, Ministry of the
Environment, Toompuiestee 26, 15172 TALLINN.

Tel: +372 51 39 079. Fax: +372 6262 901. E-mail : hanno.zingel@ekm.envir.ee (E)

EUROPEAN COMMISSION / COMMISSION EUROPÉENNE

Mr Antonio FERNÁNDEZ DE TEJADA, National Expert, Environment Directorate-General, Rue de
la Loi 200, B-1049 BRUXELLES, Belgium.

Tel.: +32 2 296 8723 Fax: + 32 2 299 0895 E-mail : antonio.fernandez-de-tejada@cec.eu.int (E)

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Mr Esko JAAKKOLA, Environmental Counsellor, Ministry of the Environment, P.O. Box 380,
FIN-00131 HELSINKI.

Tel: +358 9 1991 9371. Fax: +358 9 1991 9364. E-mail : esko.jaakkola@vyh.fi (E)

Mr Seppo VUOLANTO, Councillor, Land Use/Nature Conservation, Ministry of the Environment,
[Kasarmikatu 25]P.O. Box 380, FIN-00131 HELSINKI.

Tel: +358 9 1991 9721. Fax: +358 9 1991 9364. E-mail : seppo.vuolanto@vyh.fi (E)

Mr Sami NIEMI, Senior Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, P.O. Box 232,
FIN-00171 HELSINKI

Tel: +358 9 160 3374. Fax: +358 9 160 4285.
E-mail : sami.niemi@mmm.fi (E)

FRANCE / FRANCE

Prof. Jean LESCURE, autorité scientifique, Laboratoire de Zoologie (Reptiles et Amphibiens),
Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 57, rue Cuvier, F-75005 PARIS.

Tel : +33 1 40 79 34 95. Fax : +33 1 40 79 34 88 (F)

Mrs Catherine CARO, Sous Directrice de la chasse, de la faune et de la flore, Direction de la nature et des Paysages, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, 20, avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP.

Tél : +33 (0)1 42 19 19 62. E-mail : catherine.caro@environnement.gouv.fr (F)

Mrs Martine BIGAN, Direction de la nature et des Paysages, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, 20, avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP.

Tél : +33 (0)1 42 19 18 70. E-mail : martine.bigan@environnement.gouv.fr (F)

Mrs Laure VIGNERON, Direction de la nature et des Paysages, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, 20, avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP.

Tél : +33 1 42 19 19 85. Fax: +33 1 42 19 19 30.
E-mail : laure.vigneron@environnement.gouv.fr (F)

Mr Hervé HOYAMI, Direction de la nature et des Paysages, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, 20, avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP.

Tél : +33 1 42 19 19 12. Fax : +33 1 42 19 19 79
E-mail : herve.hoyami@environnement.gouv.fr (F)

Mrs Nathalie LACOUR, Direction de la nature et des Paysages, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, 20, avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP.

Tél : +33 1 42 19 19 39. Fax : +33 1 42 19 19 30.
E-mail nathalie.lacour@environnement.gouv.fr (F)

Mr Henri JAFFEUX, Direction de la nature et des paysages, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, 20 avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP

Tel : +33 1 42 19 19 14. Fax : +33 1 42 19 19 98.
E-mail : henri.jaffeux@environnement.gouv.fr (F)

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Mr Gerhard ADAMS, Regierungsdirektor, Ministère de l'Environnement, Ref. N I3, Godesberger Allee 90 D-53175 BONN.

Tel: +49 2288 305 2631. Fax: +49 228 305 2684. E-mail: adams.gerhard@bmu.de (E)

Mr Joachim SCHMITZ, Ministère de l'Environnement, Postfach 12 06 29, D-53048 BONN.

Tel: +49 228 305 2634. Fax: +49 228 305 2684. E-mail: schmitz.joachim@bmu.de (E)

Mrs Petra STEFFENS, Regierungsoberamtsrätin, Bundesministerium für Verbraucherschutz und Landwirtschaft, Referat G3, Postfach 14 02 70, D-53123 BONN.

Tel : +49 228 529 4163. Fax : +49 228 529 4332. E-mail : petra.steffens@bmvvel.bund.de (E)

GREECE / GRÈCE

Mrs Demetra SPALA, Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works, Environmental Planning Division, Natural Environment Management Section, 36 Trikallon Str., 11526 ATHENS.

Tel: +30 1 698 3467. Fax: +30 1 691 84 87. E-mail: tdfp@minenv.gr (E)

Mr Epaminondas TOLERIS, Ministry of the Environment, Special Environmental Service, 11 Alexandras Avenue, 11473 ATHENS

Tel: +30 1 6412 3701. Fax: +30 1 6451 914 E-mail: eype-yphode@forthnet.gr (E)

Mrs Ep. KARKAKOU, Organisation for Planning and Environmental Protection of Athens, ..

Tel: ... Fax: ... E-mail: ... (E)

Mr G. KAZATZOPOULOS, Athens 2004 Olympic Games, Olympic Committee, Director en Environnement, ...
Tel: ... Fax: ... E-mail: ... (E)

Mr Spyros PAPAGRIGORIOU, Technical Expert, Enveco SA., 1 Perikleous Street, 15122 MAROUSSI, ATHENS
Tel: +30 1 6141 357 Fax: +30 1 8025 619 E-mail: enveco@hol.gr (E)

Mr George KOTZAGEORGIS, Technical Expert, Biologist, Enveco SA, 1 Perikleous Street, 15122 MAROUSSI, ATHENS
Tel: +30 1 6125 027 Fax: +30 1 8025 619 E-mail: gkotz@otenet.gr (E)

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Mr Gábor NECHAY, Senior Special Adviser, Ministry for Environment, Authority of Nature Conservation, Kolto u. 21, H-1121 BUDAPEST.
Tel: +36 1 395 7458. Fax: +36 1 395 74 58. E-mail: nechay@mail2.ktm.hu (E)

Mr András DEMETER, Director General, Department of Nature Conservation, Authority of Nature Conservation, Ministry for Environment, Kolto u. 21, 1121 BUDAPEST
Tel/fax +36 1 275 4504. E-mail: demeter@mail2.ktm.hu (E)

ICELAND / ISLANDE

Dr Jön Gunnar OTTÓSSON, Director General, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Hlemmur 3, 125 REYKJAVIK
Tel: +354 562 9822. Fax: +354 551 5185. E-mail: jgo@ni.is (E)

IRELAND / IRLANDE

Mr Bernard MOLONEY, National Parks & Wildlife, 7 Ely Place, DUBLIN 2.
Tel: +353 1 647 2404. Fax: +353 1 662 0283. E-mail: bmoloney@ealga.ie (E)

ITALY / ITALIE

Dr Aldo COSENTINO, General Director, Ministero dell' Ambiente, Via Assisi 163, I-00185 ROME.
Tel : ... Fax: ... E-mail: ...

LATVIA / LETTONIE

Mr Vilnis BERNARDS, Senior Desk Officer, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, 25 Peldu Str., LV-1494 RIGA.
Tel: +371 7 026 524. Fax: +371 7 820 442. E-mail: mopsis@varam.gov.lv (E)

Mrs Ilona JEPSEN, Director of the Nature Protection Department, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, Peldu 25, LV-1494 RIGA.
Tel: +371 7 026 517. Fax: +371 7 820 442. E-mail: daba@varam.gov.lv (E)

LIECHTENSTEIN / LIECHTENSTEIN

Mr Michael FASEL, Head of Department, Amt für Wald, Natur und Landschaft (Office pour la forêt, la nature et le paysage), St. Florinsgasse 3, FL-9490 VADUZ.
Tel : +423 236 6405. Fax : +423 236 6411. E-mail: michael.fasel@awnl.llv.li (E)

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Mr Jonas AUGUSTAUSKAS, Chief Officer, Nature Protection Department, Ministry of Environment, A. Jaksto 4/9, 2694 VILNIUS.
Tel: +370 2 62 58 30. Fax: +370 2 61 20 23. E-mail: jonas.august@aplinkuma.lt (E)

LUXEMBOURG / LUXEMBOURG

MALTA / MALTE

Mr Alfred E. BALDACCHINO, Head of Biodiversity / Protected Species Unit, Environment Protection Department, Ministry for the Environment, Corradino PLA 08

Tel: +356 2169 966 122. Fax: +356 21 66 77 79.

E-mail: admin@environment.gov.mt / alfred.e.baldacchino@magnet.mt (E)

MOLDOVA / MOLDOVA

Mrs Stela DRUCIOC, Senior specialist in General Directorate of Protected Areas and Biodiversity, Ministry of Environment, 9, Cosmonautilor str, 2005 CHISINAU.

Tel: +373 2 22 62 73. Fax: +373 2 22 07 48.

E-mail: stela.drucioc@mediu.moldova.md ; biodiver@mediu.moldova.md (F/E)

Dr Angela BOLBOCEANU, Geobotanical lab./ "Protection of Biodiversity" ONG, Botany Garden, Office 473, str.Padurii, 18, MD 2002, CHISINAU

Tel / fax 373 2 50 71 62 (E)

Dr Vladimir GOLUB, Geobotanical lab./ "Protection of Biodiversity" ONG, Botany Garden, Office 473, str.Padurii, 18, MD 2002, CHISINAU

Tel / fax 373 2 50 71 62 (E)

MONACO / MONACO

Mr Patrick VAN KLAVEREN (Président/Chairman), Conseiller technique du Ministre Plénipotentiaire, Chargé de la coopération internationale pour l'Environnement et le Développement, Relations extérieures, Villa Girasole, 16 bd de Suisse, 98000 MONACO

Tel : +377 93 15 81 48. Fax : +377 93 50 95 91. E-mail : pvanklaveren@gouv.mc (F)

MOROCCO / MAROC

Mr Abdellah EL MASTOUR, Chef du Service de la protection de la nature, Ministère chargé des Eaux et Forêts du Maroc, B.P. 605, RABAT-CHELLAH.

Tel : +212 37 76 25 65. Fax : +212 37 66 08 26. E-mail: hajib@athena.online.co.ma (F)

THE NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Mr Jan-Willem SNEEP, Deputy Head of the International Affairs Division, Department of Nature Management, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, P.O. Box 20401, NL2500 EK THE HAGUE.

Tel: +31 70 378 52 55. Fax: +31 70 378 61 46. E-mail : j.w.sneep@n.agro.nl (E)

NORWAY / NORVÈGE

Mr Olav BAKKEN-JENSEN, Adviser, Ministry of the Environment, (Myntgt. 2), P.O. Box 8013 Dep., N-0030 OSLO.

Tel: +47 22 24 58 72 Fax: +47 22 24 27 560. E-mail: obj@md.dep.no (E)

Mr Terje BØ, Head of Section, Directorate of Nature Management, Tungasletta 2, N-7485 TRONDHEIM

Tel: +47 73 58 05 00. Fax: +47 73 58 05 01. E-mail: terje.bo@dirnat.no (E)

Mrs Gunn M. PAULSEN, Senior Advisor, Directorate for Nature Management, Tungasletta 2, N-7485 TRONDHEIM

Tel: +47 73 58 05 00. Fax: +47 73 58 05 01. E-mail: gunn.paulsen@dirnat.no (E)

POLAND / POLOGNE

Professor dr hab. Wojciech MAJEWSKI, Director, Institute of Hydroengineering, Kosciarska 780-953 GDANSK.

Tel: +48 58 5523903. Fax : +48 58 5524211. E-mail: wmaj@ibwpan.gda.pl (E)

Mr Dariusz PIECHOWSKI, Senior Inspector, Department of Forestry, Nature Conservation and Landscape, Ministry of the Environment, Wawelska 52/54, 00-922 WARSAW.

Tel: +48 22 57 92 489. Fax: +48 22 57 92 555. E-mail : dariusz.piechowski@mos.gov.pl (E)

PORTUGAL / PORTUGAL

Mrs Ana Isabel QUEIROZ, Biologist, Instituto da Conservaçad da Natureza, Rua Filipe Folque 46-1º, 1050-114 LISBOA.

Tel : +351 21 351 0440. Fax : +351 21 357 4771. E-mail : aiqueiroz@icn.pt (E/F)

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Mrs Adriana BAZ, Directrice, Direction de la Conservation de la Nature, Ministère des Eaux, Forêts et de la Protection de l'Environnement, Libertatii 12, sector 5, BUCAREST.

Tel : +40 1 335 37 04. Fax : +40 1 410 02 82. E-mail : baz@mappm.ro (F)

SENEGAL / SÉNÉGAL

Mr Demba Mamadou BA, Directeur des Parcs nationaux, B.P. 5135 DAKAR-FANN.

Tel : +221 824 4221/825 0540. Fax : +221 825 05 40.

E-mail: dpn@sentoo.sn / dpn@telecomplus.sn (F)

SLOVAKIA / SLOVAQUIE

Mrs Eva VIESTOVÁ, European legislation and International relations, Department of Nature and Landscape Protection, Ministry of Environment, Nam. L. Stura 1, 812 35 BRATISLAVA.

Tel: +421 2 5956 2211. Fax: +421 2 5956 2533. E-mail: viestova.eva@lifeenv.gov.sk (E)

SLOVENIA / SLOVÉNIE

Mrs Štefanija NOVAK, Councillor to the Minister, Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, Dunajska Ulica 48, SI-1000 LJUBLJANA.

Tel: +386 14787315. Fax: +386 14787425. E-mail: stefanija.novak@gov.si (E)

Mr Peter SKOBERNE, Assistant to the Director, State Authority for Nature Conservation, Vojkova 1b, SI-1000 LJUBLJANA.

Tel: +386 1 4784 539. Fax: +386 1 4784 051. E-mail: peter.skoberne@gov.si (E)

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Mr Borja HEREDIA ARMADA, Jefe Area Acciones Conservacion, Direccion General de Conservacion de la Naturaleza, Ministerio Medio Ambiente, Gran Via de San Francisco 4, 28005 MADRID

Tel: +34 91 597 5594. Fax: +34 91 597 5566. E-mail: borja.heredia@dgcnmma.es (E)

SWEDEN / SUÈDE

Mr Torsten LARSSON, Principal Administrative Officer, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, 106 48 STOCKHOLM

Tel : +46 8 698 8141. Fax : +46 8 698 1662. E-mail : torsten.larsson@environ.se (E)

Mr Anders INGMAN, Legal Advisor, Ministry of the Environment, S-103 33 STOCKHOLM

Tel : +46 8 405 24 46. Fax : +46 8 14 09 87. E-mail : anders.ingman@environment.ministry.se (E)

Mr Anders BJÄRVALL, Ph. D., Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, 106 48 STOCKHOLM

Tel: +46 (0)8 698 13 66. Fax : +46 (0)8 698 14 02. E-mail : anders.bjarvall@environ.se (E)

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

Mr Raymond-Pierre LEBEAU, Chef de Section compensation écologique, Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage (DETEC), Worblentalstrasse 68, CH-3063 ITTIGEN

Tel : +41 31 322 80 64. Fax : +41 31 324 75 79.

E-mail : raymond-pierre.lebeau@buwal.admin.ch (F)

« THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA » / L'EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE

Mr Aleksandar NASTOV, National Focal Point of Bern Convention, Dept of Biodiversity, Agency of Environment, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, Drezdenska 52, MK-1000 SKOPJE.

Tel: +389 2 366 930. Tel: +389 2 366 931. E-mail : infoeko@moe.gov.mk ; anastov@hotmail.com(E)

TUNISIA / TUNISIE**TURKEY / TURQUIE**

Mr Güner ERGÜN, Expert, Ministry of Environment the Authority for the Protection of Special Areas, Koza Sokak No. 32, 06700 G.O.P. ANKARA

Tel : +90 312 440 85 51. Fax : +90 312 440 85 53. E-mail : guner66@hotmail.com (E)

Mr Hakan BAYKAL, Expert, Ministry of Environment, General Directorate of Environmental Protection, Çevre Bakanligi, Eskişehir Yolu 8 Km, TR-06530 ANKARA, Turkey.

Tel: +90 312 287 9963 ext. 2009. Fax: +90 312 286 2271. E-mail: cevko@marketweb.net.tr; hbaykal99@yahoo.com ; hakan700@hotmail.com (E)

Dr Yakup KASKA, Pamukkale University, Faculty of Arts & Science, Department of Biology, DENIZLI

Tel: +90 258 21340 30 Fax: +90 258 212 5546 E-mail: caretta@pamukkale.edu.tr (E)

Representatives of Soda-Chromium Factory in Kazanlı-Mersin

Dr Eyüp ERTÜRK, Business Development, IS Kuleleri Kule 3, Kat. 15 80260, 4 Levent ISTANBUL.

Tel: +90 212 350 36 47. Fax: +90 212 350 4647. E-mail: EERTURK@sisecam.com.tr (E)

Mrs Emir Asuman AKSAL, Development Manager, Soda San A.S. Kazanlı Mevkii, 33004 MERSIN, P.K. 654

Tel: +90 324 451 34 42. Fax: +90 324 451 34 95. E-mail: ahaksal@sisecam.com.tr (E)

UKRAINE / UKRAINE

Dr Yaroslav MOVCHAN, Director of the Department of the Protection, Use and Restoration of Natural Resources, Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Ukraine, 5 Khreshchatyk Str., 601 KYIV.

Tel/fax: +380 44 450 7712. E-mail: jar@i.com.ua (E)

Mrs Oksana DOBROVOLSKA, Head of Ecological Systems Division, Department of the Protection, Use and Restoration of Natural Resources, Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Ukraine, 5 Khreshchatyk Str., 601 KYIV.

Tel/fax: +380 44 228 1135. (E)

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Mrs Hilary NEAL, Head, Biodiversity Policy Unit, European Wildlife Division, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Kite Zone, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square Temple Quay, BRISTOL BS1 6EB.

Tel: +44 117 372 8233. Fax: +44 117 372 8182. E-mail: hilary.neal@defra.gsi.gov.uk (E)

Mr John Louis ANGELL, Senior Executive Officer, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Kite Zone, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square Temple Quay, BRISTOL BS1 6EB.

Tel: +44 117 372 8138. Fax: +44 117 372 8182. E-mail : john.angell@defra.gsi.gov.uk (E)

Dr Stephen David GIBSON, International Advisor, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Monkstone House, City Road, GB PETERBOROUGH PE1 1JY.

Tel: +44 1733 562626 Fax: +44 1733 555948 E-mail: steve.gibson@jncc.gov.uk (E)

II. MEMBER STATES NON CONTRACTING PARTIES / ETATS MEMBRES NON PARTIES CONTRACTANTESB

GEORGIA / GÉORGIE

RUSSIA / RUSSIE

SAN MARINO / SAINT-MARIN

III. OTHER STATES / AUTRES ÉTATS

ARMENIA / ARMÉNIE

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE

HOLY SEE / SAINT SIÈGE

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

Tel : +33 5 56 59 13 64. Fax : +33 5 56 59 68 80. E-mail: jeanpierrribau@wanadoo.fr (F)

BELARUS / BÉLARUS

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

European Environment Agency (EEA) / Agence européenne de l'environnement (AEE)

[Apologised for absence / Excusés]

European Environment Agency (EEA) / Agence européenne de l'environnement (AEE)

European Topic Centre on Nature Conservation and Biodiversity (ETC/NC) / Centre thématique européen pour la conservation de la nature et la biodiversité(CTE/CN)

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) / Organisation de coopération et de développement économiques (OCDE)

[Apologised for absence / Excusés]

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 Bert LENTEN, Executive Secretary of the AEWA Secretariat(UNEP/CMS Secretariat), United Nations Premises in Bonn, Martin-Luther-King Str. 8, D-53175 BONN / Allemagne.

Tel: +49 228 815 2414. Fax: +49 228 815 2450. E-mail : aewa@unep.de (E)

Secretariat of the Convention on wetlands of international importance especially as waterfowl habitat (Ramsar) / Secrétariat de la Convention relative aux zones humides d'importance internationale particulièrement comme habitats des oiseaux d'eau (Ramsar)

Mr Tobias SALATHE, Regional Co-ordinator for Europe, 2, rue Mauverney, CH-1196 GLAND, Switzerland.

Tel: +41 (0)79 22 999 01 73; Fax: +41 (0)22 999 01 69. E-mail: salathe@ramsar.org (E)

Secretariat for the Convention on international trade in endangered species of wild fauna and flora / Secrétariat de la Convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacées d'extinction (CITES)

Secretariat of the Convention on the conservation of migratory species of wild animals (UNEP/CMS) / Secrétariat de la Convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage (Bonn) (PNUE/CMS)

Mr Andreas STREIT, see UNEP/EUROBATS

Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS) / Secrétariat de l'Accord sur la conservation des chauves-souris en Europe (EUROBATS)

Mr Andreas STREIT, Executive Secretary, UNEP/EUROBATS, CMS Secretariat, United Nations Premises in Bonn, Martin-Luther-King Str. 8, D-53175 BONN, Germany.

Tel: +49 228 815 2420. Fax: +49 228 815 2445. E-mail: eurobats@eurobats.org (E)

Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS) / Secrétariat de l'Accord sur la Conservation des Cétacés de la mer Noire, la Méditerranée et la zone Atlantique adjacente (ACCOBAMS)

Mr Andreas STREIT, see UNEP/EUROBATS.

Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS)

[Apologised for absence / Excusés]

Secretariat of the Protocol concerning Mediterranean specially protected areas / Secrétariat du Protocole relatif aux aires spécialement protégées de la Méditerranée (Geneva / Genève)

United Nations Environment Programme – Mediterranean Action Plan

Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) – Tunis / Centre d'activités régionales pour les aires spécialement protégées (CAR/ASP)

Mr Mohamed Adel HENTATI, Directeur, Boulevard de l'Environnement, BP 337, 1080 TUNIS Cedex

Tel : +216 71 795 760. Fax: +216 71 797 349. E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org.tn (F)

V. OTHER ORGANISATIONS / AUTRES ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International

Royal Society for Protection of Birds (RSPB) / Société royale pour la protection des Oiseaux (RSPB)

Mr Umberto GALLO-ORSI, Conservation Projects Officer, BirdLife International, Droevendaalsesteeg 3a, PO Box 127, NL-6700 AC WAGENINGEN, The Netherlands.

Tel: +31 317 478 833. Fax: +31 317 478 844. E-mail: U.GalloOrsi@BirdLife.agro.nl (E)

Mr David BOREHAM, European Treaties Office, RSPB, The Lodge, GB-SANDY Beds. SG19 2DL, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 1767 680551. Fax : +44 1767 683211. E-mail : david.boreham@rspb.rg.uk (E)

Mrs Melis CHARALAMBIDES, International Relations Officer, Cyprus Ornithological Society (COS), P.O. Box 28076, NICOSIA 2090, Cyprus.

Tel: +357 2632155. Fax: +357 2383310. E-mail: melis@cytanet.com.cy (E)

Mr Alv Ottar FOLKESTAD, Project Leader "Project Sea-Eagle", NOF/BirdLife International, Elksund, N-6065 ULSTEINVIK, Norway.

Tel: +47 70017050 / +47 70017516. Fax: +47 70017511. E-mail: alv.o.folkestad@ulstein.kommune.no (E)

Mr Morten REE, Director, NOF/BirdLife Partner Norway, Seminarplassen 5, N-7540 KLAEBU, Norway.

Tel: +47 72831166. Fax: +47 72831255. E-mail: morten@birdlife.no (E)

Cyprus Conservation Foundation

Mrs Artemis YIORDAMLI, Executive Director, P.O. Box 50257, 3602 LIMASSOL, Cyprus.

Tel: +357 5 369 475. Fax: +357 5 352657. E-mail : ccf@cylink.com.cy (E)
<http://www.conservation.org.cy>

Mr Adrian AKERS-DOUGLAS, Executive Director, P.O. Box 50257, 3602 LIMASSOL, Cyprus.

Tel: +357 4 332 129. Fax: +357 4 332 909. E-mail: adrian@spidernet.com.cy (E)

Das & Boom / Badger to Bear Foundation

European Public Law Centre

Eurogroup for Animal Welfare

Mr Bjarne CLAUSEN, Rue des Patriotes, B-1000 BRUSSELS, Belgium.

Tel: +32 2 740 08 20. Fax: ++32 2 740 08 29. E-mail: info@eurogroupanimalwelfare.org or clausnar@get2net.dk (E)

Federation of Hunting and Conservation of the EU (FACE)/ Fédération de la chasse et de la conservation de l'UE (FACE)

Mr Kai-Uwe WOLLSCHIED, Conservation Officer, 82 rue F. Pelletier, B-1030 BRUSSELS, Belgium.

Tel: +32 2 732 69 00. Fax: +32 2 732 70 72. E-mail: conservation@face-europe.org (E)

Mr Jan KAPPEL, European Anglers Alliance (EAA), 82 rue F. Pelletier, B-1030 BRUSSELS, Belgium.

Tel: +32 (0) 2 732 0309. Fax: +32 (0) 2 736 2858. E-mail: jan.kappel@skynet.be; aaa.aepl@skynet.be (E)

France Nature Environnement – Réseau Nature

Mr Frédéric DECK, administrateur de France Nature Environnement, Réseau Nature de France Nature Environnement, 18, rue du 22 novembre, 67000 Strasbourg

Tel : +33 3 88 32 91 14. Fax : +33 3 88 22 31 74. E-mail : nature@fne.asso.fr (F)

Mr Christian HOSY, chargé de mission Nature de France Nature Environnement, Réseau Nature de France Nature Environnement, 18, rue du 22 novembre, 67000 Strasbourg

Tel : +33 3 88 32 91 14. Fax : +33 3 88 22 31 74. E-mail : nature@fne.asso.fr (F)

Il Nibbio – Antio 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 Giovanni BANA, President, Via Sant Antonio 11, I-20122 MILANO, Italy.

Tel: +39 02 58304902. Fax: +39 02 58305005. E-mail: fein@nibbio.org. <http://www.nibbio.org>(E)

Mrs Paola MAGNANI, Wildlife Technician, Via Sant Antonio 11, I-20122 MILANO, Italy.

Tel: +39 02 5830 4902. Fax: +39 02 5830 5005. E-mail: fein@nibbio.org (E)

Mr Mirko MAURI, Office Manager, Via Sant Antonio 11, I-20122 MILANO, Italy.

Tel: +39 02 5830 4902. Fax: +39 02 5830 5005. E-mail: fein@nibbio.org (F)

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

Dr Robert Eyres KENWARD, Director for Technology Transfer, Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Winfrith Technology Centre, Dorchester, DT2 8ZD, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 1305 213 606. Fax: +44 1305 213 600. E-mail: reke@ceh.ac.uk (E)

International Wolf Federation – Environment Action (IWFEA)

Mr François VAN MEULEBEKE, Vice-Chairman, 101 avenue Rommelaere, B-1020 BRUSSELS, Belgium.

Tel: +32 2 479 6996 Fax: +32 2 479 6795 E-mail: francois.vanmeulebeke@advalvas.be (F)

Journées européennes du Cortinaire (JEC) / European Council for Conservation of Fungi (ECCF)

Mr Jean-Paul KOUNE, Vice-Président JEC et Délégué ECCF, 27 rue du Commandant François, F-67100 STRASBOURG, France.

Tel : +33 3 88 34 67 76. E-mail : jean-paul.koune.jec@wanadoo.fr (F/E)

Large Herbivore Initiative for Europe – WWF / Initiative en faveur des grands herbivores en Europe – WWF (LHIE-WWF)**Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe – WWF / Initiative en faveur des grands carnivores en Europe – WWF (LCIE-WWF)**

Mr William PRATESI-URQUHART, Co-ordinator, WWF Med Po, Via Po 25c, ROMA, Italy.

Tel: +44 7770945313 / +39 06 689 2784. E-mail: wpratesi@csi.com (E)

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

Mrs Lily VENIZELOS, President, 1c Licavitou St., 106 72 ATHENS, Greece.

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

Tel: +3010 3613572 / +3010 3640389. Fax: +3010 3613572. E-mail: medasset@hotmail.gr
<http://www.euroturtle.org/medasset>. <http://www.exeter.ac.uk/MEDASSET> (E/F)

Dr Max KASPAREK, Member of MEDASSET's Scientific Committee, Mönchhofstr. 16, 69120 HEIDELBERG, Germany.

Tel: +49 6221 475069. Fax: +49 6221 471858. E-mail: kasperek@t-online.de (E)

National Federation of Badger Groups (United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni)**National Society for Nature Protection (SNPN) (France) / Société nationale de protection de la nature (SNPN) (France)**

Mr Alain ZECCHINI, administrateur de la Société nationale de protection de la nature, 9 rue Cels, F-75014 PARIS, France

Tel : +33 1 47 07 44 97 Fax : +33 1 47 07 44 97 E-mail : a.zecchini@worldnet.fr (F)

Migratory Birds of the Western Palaearctic / Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental (OMPO)

Mr Frédéric CHEVALLIER, Coordonnateur, OMPO, 5 avenue des chasseurs, 75017 Paris

Tel : +33 1 44 01 05 10. Fax : +33 1 44 01 05 11. e-mail: ompo@ompo.org (F)

Planta Europa - Plantlife

Mrs Elizabeth RADFORD, Planta Europa Co-ordinator, Plantlife, 21 Elizabeth Street, LONDON SW1W 9RP, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 20 7808 0100. Fax: +44 20 7730 8377. Email: liz.radford@plantlife.org.uk

Web: <http://www.plantlife.org.uk> (E)

Pro Natura - Swiss League for Nature Protection / Pro Natura – Ligue suisse pour la protection de la nature

Societas Europaea Herpetologica (SEH)

Mr Keith F. CORBETT, SEH Conservation Chair, Herpetological Conservation Trust, 655a Christchurch Road, Boscombe, Bournemouth, DORSET BH1 4AP, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 1202 391319. Fax: +44 1202 392785. E-mail: Corbett@HerpConsTrust.org.uk (E)

Study, Research and Conservation Centre for Environment in Alsace / Centre d'étude, de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace (CERPEA)

Mr Gérard BAUMGART, Président, Centre d'étude de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace (CERPEA), 12, rue de Touraine, 67100 STRASBOURG, France.

Tel/Fax : +33 3 88 39 42 74. E-mail : baumgart@noos.fr (F)

Mr Guy HILDWEIN, Docteur es Sciences, 1, avenue d'Alsace, 67000 STRASBOURG. (F)

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

Mr Piero GENOVESI, Researcher, National Wildlife Institute, Via Ca' Formacetta 9, I-40064 OZZANO EMILIA (BO), Italy.

Tel: +39 051 6512 228. Fax: +39 051 796 628. E-mail : infspapk@iperbole.bologna.it (E)

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

Ms Sandra JEN, European Ecological Networks Policy Officer, WWF European Policy Office, 36, avenue de Tervuren – Boîte 12, B-1040 BRUSSELS, Belgique.

Tel : +32 2 743 88 13. Fax : +32 2 743 88 19. E-mail: sjen@wwfepo.org (E/F)

Mrs Ann DAHLERUS, WWF Sweden, Ulriksdals Slott, 17081 SOLNA, Sweden

Tel : +46 8 624 74 00. Fax : +46 8 85 13 29. E-mail: ann.dahlerus@telia.com (E)

Mrs Theodota NANTSOU, WWF-Greece, Conservation Manager, 26 Filellinon St, 105 58 ATHENS, Greece.

Tel: +30 1 331 4893. Fax: +30 1 324 7578. E-mail: t.nantsou@wwf.gr (E)

VI. GROUPS OF EXPERTS' CHAIR / PRÉSIDENCE DES GROUPES D'EXPERTS

Prof. Dr. Klaus AMMANN, Director Botanical Garden, University of Bern, Altenbergrain 21, CH-3013 BERN, Switzerland.

Tel: +41 31 631 49 37. Fax: +41 31 631 49 93. E-mail: klaus.ammann@ips.unibe.ch (E)

Mr Urs BREITENMOSER, Swiss Rabies Centre, Institute of Veterinary Virology, University of Bern, Laenggass-Str. 122, CH-3012 BERN, Switzerland.

Tel: +41 6312378. Fax: +41 6312534. E-mail: breitenmoser@ivv.unibe.ch (E)

Mr Piero GENOVESI, Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica, Via Ca' Formacetta 9, I-40064 OZZANO EMILIA (BO), Italy.

Tel: +39 051 6512111. Fax: +39 051 796628. E-mail : infspapk@iperbole.bologna.it (E)

Mr Ovidiu IONESCU, Head of Wildlife Unit, Forest Research and Management Institute, Str. Closca 13, 2200 BRASOV, Romania.

Tel: +40 68 413 772. Fax: +40 68 330 567. E-mail: wildcarp@deltanet.ro (E)

Mrs Anja JOBIN-MOLINARI, Status and Conservation of the Alpine Lynx Population (SCALP), Chappeli, CH-3852 RINGEENBERG, Switzerland.

Tel/Fax: +41 33 823 89 32. E-mail: JobinMolinari@aol.com (E)

Dr Bohumil KUČERA, Agency for Nature and Landscape Preservation, Kališnická 4, 130 23 PRAGUE 3

Tel. +420 2 830 692 52. Fax: +420 2 8697 24 23. E-mail : kucera@nature.cz (E)

Mr Dimitris MARGARITOULIS, Regional Vice-Chair for Mediterranean IUCN's Marine Turtle Specialist Group, P.O. Box 51154, GR-145 10 KIFISSIA, Greece.

Tel: +30 1 620 3873. Fax: +30 1 620 3663. E-mail: margaritoulis@archelon.gr (E)

VII. CONSULTANTS / EXPERTS CONSULTANTS

Mr Marc ROEKAERTS, Ringlaan 57, B-3530 HOUTHALEN, Belgium.

Tel : +32 11 60 42 34. Fax : +32 11 60 24 59. E-mail : eureko@pophost.eunet.be (E/F)

VIII. INTERPRETERS / INTERPRETES

Mrs Ingrid CATTON-CONTY, 26, rue de l'Yvette, F-75016 PARIS, France.

Tel: +33 1 45 44 22 52. Fax: +33 1 40 50 04 22. E-mail: Ingcattton@aol.com

Mrs Starr PIROT, Chemin des Mollards, CH-1261 St. GEORGE, Suisse.

Tel/Fax : +41 22 368 20 67

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.vakl@wanadoo.fr

IX. SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT

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 Bendik RUGAAS, General Director / Directeur Général, Directorate General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport / Direction générale Education, Culture et Patrimoine, Jeunesse et Sport

Tel: +33 3 88 41 22 35. E-mail: bendik.rugaas@coe.int

Mr José-Maria BALLESTER, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage / Directeur de la Culture et du Patrimoine Culturel et Naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 50. E-mail : josé-maria.ballester@coe.int

Mr Eladio FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, Head of Natural Heritage Division / Chef de la Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 59. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : eladio.fernandez-galiano@coe.int

Mrs Françoise BAUER, Principal administrative assistant / Assistante administrative principale, Natural Heritage Division / Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 61. Fa : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : francoise.bauer@coe.int

Mrs Hélène BOUGUESSA, Principal administrative assistant / Assistante administrative principale,
Natural Heritage Division / Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 64. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : helene.bouguesa@coe.int

Mrs Laetitia ANTONI, 3, impasse du Saule, F-67270 KIENHEIM, France.

Tel : +33 6 61 97 14 54. E-mail : antoni@caramail.com

(F)

Mrs Véronique de CUSSAC, Natural Heritage Division / Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 34 76. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : veronique.decusac@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. Reports from new Contracting Parties: Morocco**

PART II – MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGAL ASPECTS**3. Monitoring of the implementation of the legal aspects of the Convention**

- 3.1 Draft Recommendation on trade of *Lithophaga lithophaga*
- 3.2 Draft recommendation on trade of *Tursiops truncatus ponticus*
- 3.3 Biennial reports (1999-2000) concerning exceptions made to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8.
- 3.4 Amendments to the Appendices
 - Proposal from Moldova on *Carabus bessarabicus* and *Carabus hungaricus* (Appendix II);
 - Proposal from France on 33 Fungi species (Appendix I) (to be confirmed)

*** Items for information:**

- T-PVS (2001) 47 Chart of signature and ratifications
- Reports on the implementation of the Convention on some states: Morocco

PART III – SCIENTIFIC SEGMENT: MONITORING OF SPECIES AND HABITATS**4. Monitoring of Species and Habitats and report to SBSTTA meetings**

- 4.1 Invasive Alien Species. Input into SBSTTA-6 and proposed European Strategy on IASs
- 4.2 Report from 1st Mediterranean Conference on marine turtles
- 4.3 Report from Planta Europa Conference: Draft European Plant Conservation Strategy
- 4.4 Draft Recommendation on Action Plans for Birds
- 4.5 Implementation on Action Plans for Large Carnivores. Draft recommendation on conservation of Lynx in the Alps
- 4.6 Habitats: setting up of ecological networks. Development of the Emerald Network: report on group of experts and pilot projects
- 4.7 Forest biological diversity. Input in SBSTTA-7. Marine and coastal biological diversity. Input in SBSTTA-8

*** Items for information:**

- Report to SBSTTA-6: T-PVS (2001) 10 Bern Convention action on invasive alien species in Europe
- T-PVS (2001) 6 Non-native freshwater fish in Europe
- Report to SBSTTA-7: T-PVS (2001) .. Bern Convention action in the field of forest biological diversity
- T-PVS (2001) 9 European Red List for Threatened Vascular Plants
- T-PVS (2001) 3, 4, 5, 29, 30 Action Plans for Birds

- T-PVS (2001) 41 Baltic Large Carnivore Initiative: reports of specialised meetings
- T-PVS (2001) ...: Baltic Large Carnivore Initiative: status of species and Action plans
- T-PVS (2001) 40 Clearing House Mechanism on marine turtles in the Mediterranean
- T-PVS (2000) 65 rev Guidelines for eradication of terrestrial vertebrates

PART IV – MONITORING OF SPECIFIC SITES AND POPULATIONS

5. Specific sites and populations

5.1. Files

- Loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta* in Patara (Turkey)
- Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)
- Green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) in Turkey
- Exploitation and trade of *Lithophaga lithophaga* in Spain

5.2 Possible Files

- Olympic rowing Centre in Marathon (Greece)
- Windfarms in Smola Archipelago (Norway)
- Motorway construction project at Struma (Bulgaria)
- Exotic forest plantations in areas of biological importance in Iceland
- Illegal killing and trade of birds in Cyprus
- Tourist development in Souss Massa National Park (Morocco)

5.3 Follow-up of selected recommendations from previous meetings

- Rec. No. 84 (2000) on the conservation of Western Milos and in particular of the Milos' viper *Macrovipera schweizeri* (Greece)
- Rec. No. 78 (1999) on the conservation of the Red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*) in Italy
- Point 30 of Rec. No 26 (1991) concerning the conservation of *Natrix natrix* in Sardinia and point 20 of Rec. No 27 (1991) concerning conservation of *Euproctus platycephalus* in Sardinia (Italy)
- Rec. No. 70 (1998) on the conservation of the great crested newt *Triturus cristatus* in Orton Brick Pits (United Kingdom)
- Rec. No. 23 (1991) on the protection of the habitat of *Vipera ursinii rakosiensis* in Hungary and point 26 of Recommendation No. 26 (1991) on the same species in Hungary

5.4 Items for information

- *Canis lupus* management in Norway
- *Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay, Zakynthos (Greece)
- *Cricetus cricetus* in France, Germany and the Netherlands
- Dam in Vistula River (Poland)

PART V – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONVENTION

6. Strategic development of the Convention

6.1 Implementation of Resolution 7 (2000) on the strategic development of the Convention

- Select group on the strategic development
- Memoranda of co-operation with the European Environment Agency and other partners
- Advisory scientific committee

6.2 Draft Programme of Activities for 2002

6.3 States to be invited as observers to the 22nd meeting

PART VI- OTHER ITEMS

- 7. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**
- 8. Date and place of the 22st meeting, adoption of the report**
- 9. Other business (items for information only)**

* 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.

Appendix 3



Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

Recommendation No. 85 (2001) of the Standing Committee (adopted on 30 November 2001) on the conservation of *Lithophaga lithophaga*

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

Having regard to the aims of the convention, which are 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;

Noting that the Mediterranean populations of *Lithophaga lithophaga* are threatened by unregulated exploitation and trade;

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

Recalling that *Lithophaga lithophaga* was listed in Appendix II of the convention so as to protect it from exploitation;

Recalling that *Lithophaga lithophaga* is also listed in Annex II (list of endangered or threatened species) in the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention);

Recalling that exploitation of *Lithophaga lithophaga* usually requires very intensive extraction methods, including hammers and pneumatic drills, which results in habitat degradation;

Recalling that Article 6 of the convention prohibits, for species listed in Appendix II:

- all forms of deliberate capture and keeping;
- the deliberate damage to or destruction of breeding sites;
- the possession of and internal trade in these animals, where this would contribute to the provisions of this article,

Recommends concerned Contracting Parties:

1. to adapt as a matter of urgency their legislation so as to prohibit the exploitation of the species;
2. to stop any trade in *Lithophaga lithophaga*, as well as keeping for sale, transport for sale or offering for sale of the species.

Appendix 4



Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

Recommendation No. 86 (2001) adopted on 30 November 2001 on the conservation of the Black Sea bottle-nosed dolphin *Tursiops truncatus ponticus*

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 fauna and its 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;

Noting that the bottle-nosed dolphin *Tursiops truncatus* is listed in Appendix II of the Convention and that the Black Sea subspecies *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* is critically endangered;

Recalling that Article 6 of the Convention prohibits the possession and internal trade of species listed in its Appendix II, while the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES) regulates international trade of species listed in its annexes;

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological diversity in the continent;

Aware of the obligations under the Agreements concluded in the framework of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn), of the CMS Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Areas (ACCOBAMS) and the Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (Bucharest);

Recalling Resolution (77) 7 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the protection of threatened mammals in Europe;

Recalling its own Recommendation No. 43 (1995) on the conservation of threatened mammals in Europe, in which Contracting Parties and other states are invited to consider recovery plans for *Tursiops truncatus* and other species;

Conscious that the trade of *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* is an important threat factor for this subspecies,

Recommends that Contracting Parties to the Convention or invites other states, as appropriate, to:

1. Strictly enforce the prohibition of capture and keeping of *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* and avoid as far as possible the use of exceptions in Article 9 of the Convention on this subspecies, unless for conservation reasons;
2. Support efforts of other states to provide an improved protection of this subspecies from international trade in the framework of the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species and other relevant treaties and agreements;
3. Support regional coordination of efforts on the conservation of this subspecies.

Appendix 5



Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

Recommendation No. 87 (2001) adopted on 30 November 2001 on the European Plant Conservation Strategy

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 specified in Appendix I;

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

Referring to its Recommendation No. 40 (1993) on the elaboration of conservation or recovery plans for species in Appendix I to the convention;

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

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

Referring to the joint Council of Europe and Planta Europa European Plant Conservation Strategy;

Recognising that the European Plant Conservation Strategy is a valuable contribution to the Global Strategy on Plant Conservation discussed in the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

Recommends that Contracting Parties:

1. formulate and implement, or reinforce, as appropriate, national plant conservation strategies or have them incorporated as an integral part of national biodiversity conservation strategies; take note, in that context, of the European Plant Conservation Strategy as presented to the seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Appendix 6



Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

Recommendation No. 88 (2001) of the Standing Committee adopted on 30 November 2001 on the implementation of five new action plans for globally threatened birds 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 fauna and its 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 their Recommendations No. 48 (1996) on the conservation of European globally threatened birds, No. 60 (1997) on the implementation of the actions plans for globally threatened birds in Europe, No. 61 (1997) on the conservation of the White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*), No. 62 (1997) on the conservation of regionally threatened birds in the Macaronesian and Mediterranean regions, No. 75 (1999) on the implementation of new action plans for globally threatened birds in Europe;

Noting that a considerable number of bird species of Europe have suffered a decreased in their numbers, a reduction in their geographical distribution or have critically endangered populations;

Aware that the design and implementation of Recovery Plans may be a useful tool to redress the situation of European globally threatened birds and recalling in this context Recommendation No. 59 (1997) on the drafting and implementation of actions plans of wild fauna species;

Referring to the Action Plans on European globally threatened birds presented by BirdLife International;

Desirous to take prompt action for the conservation of Europe's most threatened birds;

Recommends that Contracting Parties and observer states to the Convention:

- carry out (or, if appropriate, reinforce) National Action Plans for the species listed in the Appendix to the recommendation.

Appendix to Recommendation No. 88

Gypaetus barbatus

Hieraaetus fasciatus

Tetrax tetrax

Phalacrocorax aristotelis desmarestii

Porphyrio porphyrio

Appendix 7

Convention on the Conservation
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

Recommendation No. 89 (2001) adopted on 30 November 2001 on the conservation of the European Lynx in the Alps

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

Having regard to the aims of the convention to conserve wild fauna and its 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;

Considering that the European lynx (*Lynx lynx*) is a fundamental part of the European natural heritage;

Noting that the population of lynx in the Alps is still fragmented and vulnerable;

Conscious that international co-operation by all Alpine States is necessary for the long-term preservation and management of the species in the region;

Recalling that one of the aims of the convention is to conserve wild fauna and its habitats, specially those species whose conservation requires the co-operation of several states, and to promote such co-operation;

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological diversity in Europe and wishing to promote co-existence of viable populations of lynx in the Alps with sustained development of its rural areas;

Aware that the implementation of the Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy for the lynx (PACS) 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 Recommendations No. 20 (1991) on the conservation of the European lynx (*Lynx lynx*), No. 74 (1999) on the conservation of large carnivores, and No. (82) on urgent measures concerning the implementation of action plans for large carnivores in Europe;

Referring to the Action Plan for the conservation of the European lynx in Europe presented by the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe sponsored by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) (Nature and Environment Series, No. 112) and the Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy for the lynx (PACS) [document T-PVS (2001) 42];

Desirous of taking prompt action for the conservation and appropriate management of lynx in the Alps;

Considering the Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy for the lynx (PACS) as a guideline for competent national authorities;

Recommends Contracting Parties to the convention from the Alpine Region to reinforce lynx conservation in the Alps, taking account, in that context of the Pan-Alpine Conservation Strategy for the lynx (PACS).

Appendix 8

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee



Recommendation No. 90 (2001) adopted on 30 November 2001 on the catching, killing or trading of protected birds in Cyprus

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 fauna and its 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, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species;

Recalling that Article 6 compels Parties to take the necessary and administrative measures to ensure the special protection of the wild fauna species specified in Appendix II, prohibiting in particular all forms of deliberate capture and keeping, and deliberate killing, as well as the possession and internal trade in these animals, alive or dead;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 5 (1986) on the prosecution of persons illegally catching, killing or trading in protected birds, which encouraged Parties to ensure the prosecution of persons illegally catching or killing birds or establishments commercialising live or protected birds;

Noting with satisfaction that since that recommendation was adopted by the Committee, many Parties took decisive measures to eradicate the illegal killing and trading of birds, resulting in a much more effective enforcement of the provisions of the Convention;

Noting with regret that, although Cyprus and the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas took some initiatives in that respect, enforcement of the legislation on killing and trading of protected birds is still poor, and sale and offering for sale of protected birds is still common,

Recommends Cyprus and the United Kingdom to:

1. fully implement without delay the obligations of Article 6 concerning protected birds;
2. put into practise, as a matter of urgency, the actions suggested in Recommendation No. 5 (1986) of the Standing Committee, paying particular attention to the following items:
 - increase of the penalties for these offences, so that they may become dissuasive;
 - increase of wardening in areas where birds are illegally caught;
 - regular and frequent control of restaurants selling protected birds, ensuring prosecution of owners;
 - prevention of importation of mistnets and prohibition of their possession without license, imposing heavy fines for their illegal possession and use;
 - strict control of illegal capture, killing, possession, trade, sale and offering for sale of protected birds;
3. launch a wide information campaign to the general public on the illegal catching, killing and trade of protected birds, as well as on the need to conserve birds and their habitats.

Appendix 9

Activities for 2002

in Euro

1. Monitoring of the legal application of the Convention	
<p>1.1. Reports on the implementation of the Convention in two Contracting Parties and legal assistance to new Contracting Parties</p> <p>Reports will make a legal analysis of the implementation of the Convention in two Contracting Parties, suggesting way to improve such implementation and adapt it to the provisions of the Convention (for new Parties).</p> <p>Fixed appropriation for consultant</p>	6,000
2. Conservation of natural habitats	
<p>2.1. Group of experts for the setting up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Strasbourg: 3 days</p> <p><i>Terms of reference</i></p> <p>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>Travel and subsistence expenses for one expert from each 30 states:</p> <p>ALBANIA, ANDORRA, ARMENIA, AZERBAIJAN, BULGARIA, CROATIA, CYPRUS, CZECH REPUBLIC, ESTONIA, GEORGIA, HUNGARY, ICELAND, LATVIA, LIECHTENSTEIN, LITHUANIA, MALTA, MOLDOVA, MONACO, MOROCCO, NORWAY, POLAND, ROMANIA, RUSSIA, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA, SWITZERLAND, "THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA", TUNISIA, TURKEY, UKRAINE</p> <p>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 consultant</p>	29,400
<p>2.2. Pilot projects for the setting-up of the Emerald Network at national level in some states</p> <p>Financial contribution for the setting-up of the Network in 4 States</p>	44,000
<p>2.3. Meeting of team leaders of on-going pilot projects</p> <p>Subsistence expenses for one expert (one day) from 15 states</p>	2,000
<p>2.4. Consultants</p> <p>Consultants will be hired to manage the setting-up of the Emerald Network and to do the necessary technical work required, included software, lists, handling of data, etc.</p>	10,000
3. Monitoring of species and encouraging conservation action	
<p>3.1. Invasive Alien Species</p> <p>– Workshop on Invasive Alien Species on European Islands and evolutionarily isolated ecosystems. Group of experts on IAS (Bern Convention, IUCN).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Portugal: 3 days</p> <p><i>Terms of reference</i></p> <p>Organised in co-operation with the government of Portugal and IUCN, the workshop will examine the incidence of Invasive Alien Species in geographically or evolutionarily isolated ecosystems, proposing specific measures to deal with the impact of those species on native species and habitats. A meeting of a group of experts will also be held, dealing on more general topics and incorporating results from COP 6 of CBD.</p> <p>Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for one expert of each of the following 20 states:</p> <p>BELGIUM, CROATIA, CYPRUS, CZECH REPUBLIC, DENMARK, ESTONIA, FINLAND, FRANCE, GREECE, HUNGARY, ICELAND, IRELAND, ITALY, MALTA, MOLDOVA, MONACO, THE NETHERLANDS, SLOVENIA, SPAIN, UNITED KINGDOM</p>	20,800
<p>Travel and subsistence expenses for 3 consultants</p>	2,900

<p><i>Participants</i> All Contracting Parties</p> <p><i>Observers</i> All observer states and qualified organisations active in this field</p> <p>- Elaboration of a European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (IAS)</p> <p><i>Terms of reference</i> This report will make precise proposals on how to prevent introduction of Alien Species, manage Invasive Aliens from the practical and legal point of view and will identify priorities for action. The strategy on IAS will include a European recommendation by possible adoption by the Standing Committee.</p>	
<p>Appropriation for consultants and technical meetings</p>	15,000
<p>3.2. Bird Conservation</p> <p>- Group of Experts on Bird Conservation [in co-operation with BirdLife International and Wetlands International]</p> <p><i>[Terms of reference for the group:</i> To review current problems of bird conservation in the Convention area and to suggest appropriate action. The group will in particular monitor the implementation of Bird Action Plans, specially those covered by recommendations of the Standing Committee. The group will receive and review the reports submitted by Parties on their implementation and will inform the Standing Committee on the progress made and the points where urgent action is required. The group will propose any other measures and activities appropriate for the conservation of threatened birds.]</p> <p>Travel and subsistence expenses for one expert from each 15 states (2 days): ALBANIA, AZERBAIJAN, BULGARIA, CROATIA, ESTONIA, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, MOLDOVA, POLAND, ROMANIA, SLOVENIA, SLOVAKIA, "THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA", TURKEY, UKRAINE</p>	12,800
<p><i>Participants</i> All Contracting Parties</p> <p><i>Observers</i> All observer states and qualified organisations active in this field</p>	
<p>- Elaboration of European species action plans</p> <p>Development and production of new action plans</p>	4,000
<p>Consultants</p> <p>-Environmental impact of windfarms and guidelines for site selection</p> <p>The report will analyse impact on windfarms on birds, establish criteria for their environmental impact assessment and develop of guidelines for site selection</p>	6,000
<p>Consultants</p> <p>3.3. Large Carnivores</p> <p>These activities are carried out in co-operation with LCIE. Within the Large Carnivores Initiative for Europe, a working group has been set up for South East Europe. This group is to adapt European Action Plans on Brown bear, Lynx and Wolf to the region.</p>	
<p>Consultants and co-ordination meetings</p>	10,000
<p>Workshop on Iberian lynx in Spain (3 days), in co-operation with the Government of Spain, IUCN'SSC Cat Specialist Group</p>	p.m.

<p>3.4. Plant Conservation</p> <p>In co-operation with Planta Europea, elaboration of a European Strategy on Plant Conservation.</p> <p>Consultant, publication and meeting of rapporteurs</p>	6,000
4. Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity	
<p>- The 8th meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SBSTTA-8 of CBD) will deal on marine biological diversity. It would be useful to present at that meeting, what the Bern Convention and other bodies (the regional seas conventions and the Bonn Convention) are doing at the European level.</p> <p>This activity will be carried out in co-operation with other appropriate international partners.</p> <p>Reports and meeting of rapporteurs</p> <p>NOTE: This conference may be delayed to early 2003</p> <p>[- Workshop on Marine & Coastal Biological Diversity in European seas 3 days</p> <p>The workshop will discuss appropriate European input into SBSTTA-8.</p> <p>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from 15 states: ALBANIA, BELGIUM, BULGARIA, CROATIA, CYPRUS, ESTONIA, GREECE, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, MALTA, MOROCCO, ROMANIA, TURKEY, TUNISIA, UKRAINE</p> <p>Travel and subsistence expenses for 2 consultants</p> <p>Travel and subsistence expenses for 6 co-organisers</p> <p><i>Participants</i> All Contracting Parties</p> <p><i>Observers</i> All observer states and qualified organisations active in this field]</p>	<p>12,000</p> <p>p.m.</p>
5. Monitoring of sites and populations at risk and Emergencies	
5.1. On-the-spot visits	
<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>	4,500
5.2. Sites at risk as a result of an emergency	
<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 be only used under instruction of the Bureau and will be paid both from Council of Europe or by voluntary contributions</p>	
5.3. Possible effects on Europe's biological diversity of climatic change and of remedial measures	
<p>Climatic change is likely to affect negatively some threatened species and natural habitat types, such as evolutionarily isolated ecosystems or endemic species of islands and mountains tops in South Europe on Macaronesia. Remedial measures, such as new forest plantation (carbon sinks), may also affect natural habitats. A report will analyse this issue and make appropriate conservation recommendations, indicating in particular the type of monitoring to be established by States, proposing species (or groups of species) that may be used as indicators and giving some guidance to governmental action..</p>	10,000
<p>Fixed appropriation for consultant</p>	6,000

5.4. Indicators of biological diversity in agricultural systems	p.m.
6. Awareness and visibility	
Funds for the conception, the translation, the photocomposition and publication of technical documents, posters, brochures, stickers, postcards, making of buttons, other documents. It includes publication in Internet and conception and update of a Website. Publication of a report on the positive action of the Convention in solving biodiversity related conflicts	18,000
7. Operational expenditure of the Standing Committee's Secretariat	
Fixed appropriation to cover travel expenses to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee and of the Bureau	
7.1. Chairman's expenses	
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 Chairman to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee	
7.2. Delegates of African states and of some delegates of Central and Eastern Europe	p.m.
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	16,300
7.3. Travels of experts and Secretariat	
Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by experts to attend meetings of special relevance under instruction from the Committee or the Chairman and Secretariat official journeys	12,000
7.4. Meetings of the Bureau	
Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the three members of the Bureau to attend the Bureau meetings	5,000
7.5. Full-time secretary	40,000

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 125,000 € for the implementation of the programme of activities. A reserve of about 100,000 € from non-spent voluntary contributions will also be used. Parties are expected to provide with new voluntary contributions in 2002.

Bern Convention Programme of Activities and Budget for 2002 (Summary)

in Euro

1. Monitoring of the legal application of the Convention	
1.1. Report on the implementation of the Convention in two Contracting Parties	6,000
2. Conservation of natural habitats	
2.1. Group of experts for the setting up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest	30,400
2.2. Pilot projects for the setting-up of the Emerald Network at national level in some states	44,000
2.3. Meeting of team leaders of on-going pilot projects	2,000
2.4. Consultants	10,000
3. Monitoring of species and encouraging conservation action	
3.1. Invasive Alien Species	38,700
3.2. Bird Conservation	22,800
3.3. Large Carnivores	10,000
3.4. Plant Conservation	6,000
4. Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity	
	12,000
5. Monitoring of sites and populations at risk: Emergencies	
5.1. On-the-spot visits	4,500
5.2. Sites at risk as a result of an emergency	10,000
5.3. Effects on Europe's biological diversity of climatic change and of remedial measures	6,000
5.4. Indicators of biological diversity in agricultural systems	p.m.
6. Awareness and visibility	
	18,000
7. Operational expenditure of the Standing Committee's Secretariat	
7.1. Chairman's expenses	p.m.
7.2. Delegates of African states and of some delegates of Central and Eastern Europe	23,800
7.3. Travels of experts and Secretariat	12,000
7.4. Meetings of the Bureau	5,000
7.5. Full-time secretary	40,000
TOTAL	301,200