Joint Meeting of the Bern Convention Network of Special Focal Points on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds and the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean

(Online, 9 to 11 June 2021)

UNEP/CMS/MIKT4/Doc.5.3
T-PVS/Inf (2021) 18

COMPLETION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BERN CONVENTION TUNIS ACTION PLAN 2020 [RECOMMENDATION NO. 164 (2013)] AND THE PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE UN-ENVIRONMENT/CMS INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ILLEGAL KILLING, TAKING AND TRADE OF MIGRATORY BIRDS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (MIKT)

COMPILATION OF NATIONAL REPORTS

(Prepared by the Bern Convention and CMS Secretariats)

UNEP/CMS/MIKT3/Doc.5.3
T-PVS/Inf (2021)18

Strasbourg, 3rd June 2021 **T-PVS/Inf(2021)18**
[Inf18e_2021.docx]

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS
Standing Committee

41st meeting
Strasbourg, 30 November - 3 December 2021

Joint Meeting of the Bern Convention Network of Special Focal Point on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds and the UN-Environment/CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean
(Online, 9 to 11 June 2021)

COMPLETION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BERN CONVENTION TUNIS ACTION PLAN 2020 [RECOMMENDATION NO. 164 (2013)] AND THE PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE UN-ENVIRONMENT/CMS INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ILLEGAL KILLING, TAKING AND TRADE OF MIGRATORY BIRDS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (MIKT)

- COMPILATION OF NATIONAL REPORTS -

Document prepared by the Directorate of Democratic Participation

Contents

ALBANIA 4
CZECH REPUBLIC 13
GERMANY 22
MALTA 31
POLAND 45
SERBIA 54
SPAIN 63
TUNISIA 73
UNITED KINGDOM 84

ALBANIA

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	ALBANIA
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted] biodiversity expert at the Environment Development Programs Directory
Institution/Organization	Ministry of Tourism and Environment (MT&E)
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	No
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	CMS MIKT Member
Date of completing the form	27.5.2021

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	A. Identification of National Priorities
	B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

List of priorities is identified and included in the revised NBSAP of Albania to 2020.

The main national priority is to prevent and minimize the illegal killing of migratory water bird huntable species and other wild-animals in general.

Actually a 5 year hunting ban has been approved in Albania (from June 2016 to June 2021), by the law 61/2016 and is in force.

1.1 Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1	To prevent and minimize the illegal killing	Administrative offence	The migratory water bird huntable species	High	Hunting ban law enforcement	Better control to the country territory	National Inspectorate of Territory Protection, the control/ inspection structures in the municipalities and in the Protected Areas and State Police	Administrations of PA (protected areas) and National/Regional Environment Agency
2								
3								

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

No changes since last report

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since last report

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

National Inspectorate of Territory Protection, the control/inspection structures in the municipalities and in the Protected Areas, in cooperation with the State Police.

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Implementation of provisions of the Law no. 10006, dated 23.10.2008, "On wild fauna protection", amended, as well as the provisions of the hunting ban law may be considered as the control mechanisms in place.

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since last report

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

N/A for Albania

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

We have completed the Scoreboard

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The control / inspection structures in the municipalities and in the Protected Areas report cases of wildlife and prosecution.

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since last report

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The amendments to the Criminal Code of Albania were implemented in July 2019 and include three types of criminal penalties, two of which for endangered wild fauna. Although there is no focal point to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing / locating expert knowledge providers, there are national expert providers capable to provide assistance.

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

With the changes in the forest law, today there are 61 municipalities / communes with the relevant control / inspection structures operating in each municipality, which in cooperation with the Ministry of Tourism and Environment and the State Agency responsible for forests, collect the information on this issue.

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

As a result of the hunting ban, the national platform has not been formalized yet, but there has been established a database platform (named BIONNA) that contains inter alia data about hunting activities.

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

We have completed the Scoreboard

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

This process is in very initial steps in Albania. There have not been any cases subject to the attention of the judiciary.

2. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Mechanisms in place consist on the national network for the data gathering and analysis at the Biodiversity Sector in General Directorate of Policies and Environmental Development at the MT&E.

Protocols remain still to be developed due to the limited budget and staff capacities, but also due to the fact that hunting has been banned and the instances of illegal killing of birds have been spontaneous.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes/updates since last report

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

We have completed the Scoreboard

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

There is still no such genuine study, but data for specific cases continue to be collected by various NGOs.

3. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

We have completed the Scoreboard

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

There is not any operational platform in place, but institutional environmental structures work towards awareness raising of wider public. In addition, the environmental NGO-s make efforts to raise awareness through their dedicated websites on the negative impact of illegal killing of birds.

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No, there is no adopted communication strategy, but as mentioned above, a 5 year hunting ban law is in place.

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

We have completed the Scoreboard

4. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

The cooperation between the Special Focal Point under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member, (both designated from the General Directorate of Policies and Environmental Development at the MT&E) and CITES enforcement officers from general Directorate of Customs in Albania, is very good. As for the EU Ornis Committee this is not applicable for Albania as the country is not a Member State to the EU currently.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No information on this point by the enforcement agency.

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Exchange of information exists between the enforcement bodies, whilst for the prosecutors as explained above, although the criminal sentences have been enforced by virtue of law, there have not yet been cases subject to the attention of the judiciary.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or

MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Not so far

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes/updates since last report

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Albania is addressing the issue of illegal killing of birds by coordinating and cooperating with national network led by the Ministry of Tourism and Environment. The engagement of the scientific and research institutions, specialized NGO-s, administration of protected areas and the Ministry of Interior is proving to be successful. More remains to be done to ensure the full cooperation of the local Government units (municipalities).

CZECH REPUBLIC

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	Czech Republic
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted]
Institution/Organization	Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	**Yes**
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	**Yes**
Date of completing the form	28/05/2021

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	A. Identification of National Priorities
	B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

1.1 Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1	To establish a common methodology of investigation of illegal killings of wild species (with clear definition of procedures and duties of relevant actors)	illegal killings	wildlife				Police Presidium, Czech Environmental Inspectorate, State Veterinary Administration, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic	
2	To enforce and monitor that above mentioned methodology and best practice is followed during the investigation of illegal killings	illegal killings	wildlife				Police Presidium, Czech Environmental Inspectorate, State Veterinary Administration, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic	
3	To develop a common database of illegal killing cases and to ensure that data is shared among key actors	illegal killings	wildlife				Police Presidium, Czech Environmental Inspectorate, State Veterinary Administration, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic	
4	To enhance the investigation by special training of dog units	illegal killings (poisoning)	wildlife (birds)		Life PannonEagle project		Police Presidium, Czech Society for Ornithology, Czech Environmental Inspectorate, Ministry of the Environment	

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

The priorities were identified in the National Strategy to prevent illegal killing and poisoning of wildlife, adopted by the government in 2020. The strategy does not tackle the issue of lead poisoning, as it was decided to address it separately.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The National Strategy was developed by a special working group and supported by other experts, with the involvement of relevant ministries (Environment, Interior, Justice, Agriculture, Health), institutions (Police Presidium, Czech Environmental Inspectorate, State Veterinary Administration, Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic, Krkonoše Mountains National Park) and NGOs (Czech Society for Ornithology, Czech-Moravian Hunting Association).

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The institution responsible for the implementation of the National Strategy is the Ministry of the Environment. However, the cooperation and cooperation among all other actors involved in its preparation is necessary.

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The working group shall asses the progress in implementation of the National Strategy on a yearly basis. In addition, a midterm and final review is expected in 2025 and 2030.

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Development of such mechanisms is foreseen in the National Strategy.

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

2. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

4. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

The networking, cooperation and exchange of information is currently being facilitated by a series of webinars and workshops.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The need is addressed in the National Strategy and the cooperation is enhanced through an inter-sectorial working group established for the development and implementation of the Strategy.

GERMANY

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	Germany
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted], Policy Advisor
Institution/Organization	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	No
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	No
Date of completing the form	26 May 2021
Additional information by Germany	Due to Germany's federal structure, most of the points raised in the reporting template fall within the competence of the federal states. The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety has asked all 16 federal states to fill out this template, but has received very little response. Hence, the information provided does not depict an image for the whole of Germany.

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds

- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	D. Identification of National Priorities
	E. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	F. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern in relation to raptors, first priority is illegal nest removal and second priority is illegal killing. Raptors are critically endangered and offences are documented and prosecuted. The lower nature conservation authority and law enforcement agency are in charge of enforcement and the lower nature conservation authority is in charge of monitoring.

a. Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1								
2								
3								

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: Agency for Environment, Nature Conservation and Geology

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: lower nature conservation authority

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: Central database for controlling and documentation for wildlife crime

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: Central database for controlling and documentation for wildlife crime

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: The database only documents wildlife crime

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

In the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: Central database for controlling and documentation for wildlife crime

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

2. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

In some federal states, illegal activities related to birds of prey are documented at the respective Ministry of Environment.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In the state of Baden-Wuerttemberg: Existing hunting statistics include the number of animals shot, animals found dead and traffic losses due to road traffic and railroads. The hunting statistics for the state of Baden-Wuerttemberg are available at https://lazbw.landwirtschaft-bw.de/pb/site/pbs-bw-new/get/documents/MLR.LEL/PB5Documents/lazbw_2017/lazbw_wfs/Wildforschungsstelle/Jagdstatistik/WfsM_Jagdstrecke.pdf

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

In the federal state of Baden-Wuerttemberg: Cases of illegal killings of birds of prey are detected yearly. There are only isolated cases, except for the years 2011 and 2015/16, when an increase of cases were detected.

The federal state of Hessen has no statistics, but assumes that IKB plays only a minor role compared to other causes of death (traffic, glass surface, overhead line, wind energy).

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

3. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

https://www.greifvogelverfolgung.de

https://www.komitee.de/en/campaigns-and-operations/germany/raptor-persecution-in-germany/raptor-persecution-monitoring-scheme-edgar/

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The federal state of Baden-Wuerttemberg has published a joint declaration of ministries, environmental organisations and hunting organisations to fight illegal killing of birds of prey: https://mlr.baden-wuerttemberg.de/fileadmin/redaktion/m-mlr/intern/dateien/PDFs/Stuttgarter_Memorandum_Greifvoegel.pdf

The federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern has not adopted such communication.

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

4. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

MALTA

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	Malta	Malta	Malta
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted], Assistant Director	[redacted], Deputy Director	[redacted], Police Inspector
Institution/Organization	Wild Birds Regulation Unit	Environment and Resources Authority	Environmental Protection Unit - Malta Police Force
E-mail	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	Yes	Yes	No
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	Yes	Yes	No
Date of completing the form	30/04/2021	18/05/2021	12/05/2021

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	G. Identification of National Priorities
	H. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	I. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.
In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

IKB has been an enforcement priority for Malta for nearly three decades. Throughout this time, efforts were made to adopt an effective regulatory regime coupled with the designation of specialist enforcement structures to assist law enforcement bodies to detect and prosecute bird crime.

More recently, in June 2016, the EU Members States' environment ministers adopted Council conclusions on the EU Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking endorsing the three priorities of the plan and calling for timely implementation of the relevant actions by the several institutions and the EU Member States. The Council supported the three priority areas of the EUAP, that is, preventing wildlife trafficking and addressing its root causes, implementing and enforcing existing rules and combating organised wildlife crime more effectively, and strengthening the global partnership of source, consumer and transit countries against wildlife trafficking.

Moreover, the Maltese Government strives to ensure that its enforcement authorities are equipped with the necessary knowledge and resources to conduct effective enforcement throughout both open and closed seasons to fight IKB. Each year during the reporting period, the Wild Birds Regulation Unit continued to deliver specialised training sessions to enforcement

officers from the Malta Police Force and the Armed Forces of Malta. These training sessions are organised ahead of each hunting / live-capturing season in order to provide training on basic ornithology, wildlife crime detection techniques, inspection procedures, applicable regulations and prosecution processes. Through this initiative, around 60 enforcement officers are provided with specialised training on average twice a year. In addition, as from autumn 2018, enforcement authorities assigned an even higher priority to spot-checks on individual licensees during open hunting / live-capturing seasons thus leading to an increase in compliance monitoring during each season.

In general, enforcement actions are shared between three main entities, namely the Wild Birds Regulation Unit, the Environment & Resources Authority and the Malta Police Force, the latter including the Police Environmental Protection Unit (EPU). In addition, in 2020, Ambjent Malta within the Ministry for the Environment, Climate Change and Planning engaged environmental wardens who are responsible for dissemination of information in terrestrial Natura 2000 sites, other protected and scheduled areas and public rural areas.

4.1 Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

National priorities have been established in line with the Conservation of Wild Birds Regulations (SL 549.42) which is the main legal instrument which regulates conservation of wild birds and their hunting and taking. These Regulations are administered by the Wild Birds Regulation Unit and fully transpose EU Birds Directive into Maltese law.

Issues linked with selected nature permitting processes and wildlife trade in wildlife and its products are also regulated in Malta by a comprehensive set of domestic and regional international legislation. National legislation is mainly implemented through the Environment Protection Act (Cap. 549) and its subsidiary legislation, namely the aforecited Trade in Species of Fauna and Flora Regulations (S.L. 549.38); the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (SL 549.44) and the Control of Invasive Alien Species of European Union Concern Regulations (SL 549.119), of which the Environment & Resources Authority is the competent authority. These implement further Council Regulation (EC) 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein and ancillary EU wildlife trade regulations; the EU Nature Directives; Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species; and various multilateral environmental agreements, including the Bern Convention, CMS, CBD and CITES. Collectively these regulations regulate several aspects of domestic trade; trade and movement of goods within the EU; and international trade of alien, protected and/or endangered species. Stricter domestic measures are also in place in the case of the Trade in Species of Fauna and Flora Regulations (S.L. 549.38) which prohibits not only the trade in all those species regulated by the EU wildlife trade regulations but also the importation of species that are protected by nature conservation legislation in their country of origin.

The Crimes Against the Environment Act (Cap. 522) is also relevant in relation to selected aspects linked with the EU Birds Directive. This Act addresses provisions pertinent to Directive 2008/99/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of the environment through criminal law, which also includes issues pertaining to trading in specimens of protected wild fauna or flora species or parts or derivatives thereof.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Wild Birds Regulation Unit, the Environment & Resources Authority and the Malta Police Force.

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Wild Birds Regulation Unit – Compliance team within the enforcement section.

Environment & Resources Authority – Compliance and Enforcement Directorate, particularly in relation to alien species, trade in endangered species and CITES.

Malta Police Force – mainly the Environment Protection Unit (EPU) but enforcement is also carried out by other police officers.

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The control mechanisms and related enforcement processes are put in place through regulation and compliance monitoring, mainly the Conservation of Wild Birds Regulations SL549.42 and other Framework regulations covering derogations, such as: the Framework for Allowing a Derogation Opening a Spring Hunting Season for Turtle Dove and Quail Regulations SL 549.57, the Framework for Allowing a Derogation Opening an Autumn Live-Capturing Season for Song Thrush and Golden Plover Regulations SL 549.74, and the Conservation of Wild Birds (Framework for Allowing a Research Derogation to Determine Malta's Reference Population of Seven Finch Species) Regulations SL 549.137.

ERA is the competent authority to enforce legislation which regulates trade in wildlife including birds, namely the Trade in Species of Fauna and Flora Regulations (S.L. 549.38) and the Control of Invasive Alien Species of European Union Concern Regulations (SL 549.119). These implement further Council Regulation (EC) 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein and ancillary EU wildlife trade regulations and Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species; and various multilateral environmental agreements, including the Bern Convention, CMS, CBD and CITES. In order to enforce the above-mentioned legislation ERA has adopted proactive and reactive enforcement strategies, such as: a priori checks of documentation pertaining to the trade in wild birds in order to ascertain whether specimens intended to be trade were acquired in accordance with the conservation regulations at the country of origin; compliance checks at the border in order to ascertain that only those specimens for which trade is authorised are allowed to be imported; marking of specimens at the border to ensure the traceability of imported specimens; compliance checks at holdings in order to determine the legal status of the species being held and whether they were legally acquired; and providing expert technical support to other law enforcement agencies during investigations of suspected wildlife crime.

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Benefits linked to implementation of national priorities include:

- the correct implementation of the Birds Directive;
- acting as a deterrent against all forms of IKB;
- safeguarding populations of wild birds breeding and wintering in Malta, including those on passage;
- ensuring that the hunting during autumn season is carried out in line with national legislation;
- ensuring that hunting and live-capturing seasons subject to derogation are strictly supervised;
- ensure prompt action against IKB to secure legal action against perpetrators.

Challenges include:

- shortages of experienced staff and/or skills shortages;
- delays in recruitment and/or difficulties attracting suitably qualified candidates for enforcement;

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Malta reports all information requested by Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive including information on pressures and threats as well as bag data of game birds.

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Wild Birds Regulation Unit coordinates with EPU so that enforcement data collected during spring and autumn hunting seasons and autumn live-capturing seasons is compiled, published and reported. These reports are available on WBRU's website: https://mgoz.gov.mt/en/Pages/WBRU/Reports-and-Statistics.aspx . Enforcement reports also contain a section detailing some of the court sentences meted out by the law courts during the reporting year.

All court sentences are published on the online portal of the Court Services Agency which may be accessed from the following link: https://ecourts.gov.mt/onlineservices/Judgements.

A general database of all prosecuted cases is held by EPU and categorized according to the crime.

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Wildlife crime is categorized according to the nature of the offence, e.g., hunting and taking during closed season, illegal possession of birds etc.

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Wild Birds Regulation Unit actively provides technical assistance to the Police and other enforcement entities on matters related to prevention, detection and prosecution of bird-related crime. The Unit is also involved in inspections pertaining to investigations of bird-related crime, during which members of the Unit together with ERA officials, provide technical assistance to the police. Representatives of the Unit are also involved in court cases, during which they act as witnesses and as national experts to support the prosecution.
The Environment and Resources Authority is the formally designated enforcement authority in accordance with Council Regulation 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein. Essentially, this means that the institution is also the focal point with regards the implementation of the aforementioned legislation and performs operations pertinent to such a task including providing expert identification of specimens, determination of the legal

status of specimens, providing technical assistance during investigations and providing expert testimony during court proceedings in order to ensure successful prosecutions.

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

In view of Malta's limited geographical area, exchange of information and coordination of actions on a national level are carried out through email and through tele-communication.

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Malta does not have designated web portals for the exchange of information and resources for professionals involved in fighting IKB; data is shared between the relevant enforcement entities via formal channels also in view of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) considerations.

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

5. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Field data is collected by Police through inspections, spot checks, road checks and patrols. Through these enforcement measures, data on areas prone to illegal activities is collected and then translated into increased enforcement effort during specific periods, example peak migration. Information received from the general public, NGOs and also hunters' federations is collected and analyzed.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

As reported in previous reports, in 2016 Malta implemented a major reform of hunting licensing processes which included the implementation of a mandatory and legally binding game reporting requirement utilising a state-of the-art telephonic game reporting system. This system enables instant collection of real-time hunting bag data during all hunting seasons, which allows the precise real time monitoring of the uptake of any quotas and other parameters pertaining to hunting and live capturing. Under this system, all hunters are legally bound to report their catch, including the time, species caught and the relevant quantity, as well as the geographical location where the species were hunted. The system also enables law enforcement authority to instantly verify hunters' compliance with the reporting requirements whilst in the field, as well as retrieve all necessary information concerning licensing and other related parameters. Administrative penalties apply to those failing to use the reporting system.

In spring 2021, the telephonic game reporting system was further improved through the introduction of a game reporting mobile application. This app is linked to a central database which hosts details of licensees and reported game caught. Users login to this app through the GOV eID system which allows the app to identify the person and relay their respective licenses.

Through the app, authorized users can report any game caught in order to fulfill their legal obligations. Users are also able to view their past reports in order to present proof of reporting during field inspections.

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

Data on cases disclosed in Malta pertaining to illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region is maintained by the Environment and Resources Authority. Such data provides an insight on the scale of such an activity, the *modus operandi* of offenders and the drivers prompting such trade.

6. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In 2019, the Wild Birds Regulation Unit re-launched the Conservation of Wild Birds Fund. This funding scheme offers financial support in the form of grants to registered non-governmental organisations (NGOs) which are active within the domain of conservation of wild birds. This fund emerged from commitment made by Malta during a high level conference on wildlife crime held in March 2017 in the Hague.

Financial support under this Fund was available for projects that directly contribute to the conservation of wild birds, in accordance with the priorities of this funding scheme such as

activities that help to contribute towards initiatives related to sustainable hunting, species reintroduction programmes, species and habitats conservation, training for personnel involved in the sector, scientific research, innovation, awareness raising and educational initiatives. The fund provides up to 80% of eligible project value which was capped at a maximum of €20,000 per project.

Early in 2020, the Fund awarded a total of €94,060.80 in grants to three NGOs for projects that promote conservation of wild birds, namely the Federation for Hunting and Conservation (FKNK), Saint Hubert Hunters (KSU) and BirdLife Malta in relation to projects links to the reintroduction of species and implementation of bird-related Natura 2000 Management Plans.

In addition, regular awareness raising activities targeting the public are carried out throughout the years. These activities are aimed at informing all members of society about the various aspects of local legislation concerning conservation and sustainable use of bird species together with information regarding conservation measures adopted to safeguard bird species. Information was delivered through the publication of various press releases and press articles, the participation in educational programs, the dissemination of web-information including guidance documents and the participation in informational courses.

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Wild Birds Regulation Unit condemns IKB through press releases on its online platforms, including its website and Facebook page which is followed by the public.

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

7. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Knowledge amongst national experts is shared through direct communication and through official governmental channels. There is also collaboration between the various law enforcement agencies, namely WBRU, the Environment and Resources Authority, which is the national CITES Enforcement Authority, and Police in the field of information sharing, joint inspections and investigations and harmonised prosecutions of offences. The Wild Birds Regulation Unit is also supported by the Policy Development and Programme Implementation Directorate within the Ministry for Gozo, which assists the Unit to coordinate and communicate with other relevant Ministries through official government channels.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

EPU collaborates very well with INTERPOL both local National Office and also with foreign colleagues. Valuable information is exchanged.

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

So far these cases are investigated and prosecuted by the same officer who already has the necessary information on relative cases.

Cooperation between law enforcement and judiciary remains the same.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Malta actively participates in meetings concerning IKB initiatives including meetings organised by the CMS, Bern Convention, CITES, ENPE, UNEP, CITES, IMPEL, EU fora and various other related nature-related MEA meetings.

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

EPU is an active member of EnviCrimeNet, OPFA Waste (together with ERA), EU-TWIX. The Environment and Resources Authority also utilizes EU-Twix primarily as a means of acquiring information on illegal commodities being traded, trade routes and modus operandi of smugglers. The Environment and Resources Authority, as the designated CITES Enforcement Authority, is a member of the EU Wildlife Trade Enforcement Group. Additional partnerships, affiliations and memberships are included in the following link: https://era.org.mt/affiliates/.

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Malta ensures that inter-sector cooperation between the Environment and Resources Authority within the Ministry for Environment and Climate Change, the Wild Birds Regulation Unit within the Ministry for Gozo and the Environmental Protection Unit of the Malta Police Force within the Ministry for Home Affairs, National Security and Law Enforcement, is maintained throughout the year. This cooperation ensures the sharing expert knowledge on IKB which is essential to improve effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms. Exchanges of information and joint inspections on cases of IKB are carried out on a regular basis throughout the year.

POLAND

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	Poland
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted] - expert
Institution/Organization	General Directorate for Environmental Protection
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	Yes
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	No
Date of completing the form	25.05.2021

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	J. Identification of National Priorities
	K. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	L. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Since wild-bird crime is not a significant threat in Poland, priorities to tackle this issue have not been identified. However, actions to prepare such document may be undertaken in the future, if necessary.

7.1 Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1								
2								
3								

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

The national priorities haven't been established by administrative or legal means.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Doesn't apply (see answer 2.)

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Doesn't apply (see answer 2.)

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Doesn't apply (see answer 2.)

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Doesn't apply (see answer 2.)

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Doesn't apply (see answer 2.)

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Doesn't apply (see answer 2.)

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Act of 16 April 2004 on Nature Conservation requires reporting of dead animal specimens of species that are under species protection, but it doesn't address the issue of the cause of death of the specimen (legal or not).There might be regulations in operation that require the police to collect data on wildlife crime. No details are known.

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Act of 16 April 2004 on Nature Conservation requires reporting of dead animal specimens of species that are under species protection, but it doesn't address the issue of the cause of death of the specimen (legal or not).There might be regulations in operation that require the police to collect data on wildlife crime. No details are known.

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Due to other more urgent responsibilities and limited staff, there is no possibility to tackle the issue. However, it is possible that proper actions will be undertaken in the future.

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

There is no need for a dedicated infrastructure at the moment.

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

The website of the General Directorate for Environmental Protection is a platform that is kept up to date. Should a need occur, it could be used as a platform of communication and sharing information on IKB.

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Due to other more urgent responsibilities, there was no possibility to tackle the issue. However, it is possible that proper actions will be undertaken in the future.

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Due to other more urgent responsibilities, there was no possibility to tackle the issue. However, it is possible that proper actions will be undertaken in the future.

8. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Due to other more urgent responsibilities, there was no possibilityto tackle the issue. However, it is possible that proper actions will be undertaken in the future.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Data is available and annually collected on the base of reports of the use of permits (legal harvest) issued by the General Director for Environmental Protection and regional directors for environmental protection.

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

No estimates of mortality due to illegal killing and trapping are available.

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

According to our knowledge, no research has been conducted and no data collected.

9. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

There is no official study.

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The aforementioned website of the General Directorate for Environmental Protection serves such purpose.

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

An official strategy on this issue hasn't been adopted so far

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

In 2017-2019 the General Directorate for Environmental Protectionhas been implementing the project titled "You have the right to effective protection of nature." The aim of the project is to increase the level of awareness and knowledgeof authorities involved in legal aspects of nature conservation, improve the coordination of their activities and facilitate law enforcement in the field of nature protection. As part of the project implementation, it is planned a series of trainings dedicated to nature conservation services and judicial authorities, a public e-learning course and materials promoting knowledge about legal nature protection. The main target groups of the project are: law enforcement bodies, prosecutors' offices, offices involved in nature protection, judicial authorities and other entities (including ecological organizations).

10. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Should a need occur, the General Directorate for Environmental Protection employee could coordinate the efforts. At the moment no actions are being undertaken though, therefore there was no need to establish procedures or other mechanisms regulating the issue.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

General Directorate for Environmental Protection hasn't cooperated with the INTERPOL yet. It might be possible that the police does, but it isn't possible to provide any details.

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Should a need occur, the General Directorate for Environmental Protection employee could coordinate the efforts. At the moment no actions are being undertaken though, therefore there was no need to establish mechanisms regulating the issue.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Poland hasn't exchanged experiences about the issue with other parties.

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No international networks, platforms has been used.

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No actions are being carried out.

SERBIA

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	Republic of Serbia
Name and position of responsible person	
Institution/Organization	Ministry of Environmental Protection
E-mail	
Bern Convention SFP	Yes
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	Yes
Date of completing the form	1.6.2021.

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	M. Identification of National Priorities
	N. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	O. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

11. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

11.1 Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1								
2								
3								

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Program for Nature Protection of the Republic of Serbia with Action plan for period 2021. to 2023. was established on 20th May 2021.

The Action plan envisages, among others, the following measures:

Measure 1.1.3: Suppression of illegal killing, capture and trafficking in wild species and Measure 1.3.2: Improving international cooperation at the level of the European Union and the Council of Europe - Harmonization of regulations for nature protection with international treaties and party resolutions and recommendations of the Council of Europe which include the acceptance by the Government of Recommendation 205 (2019) of the Bern Convention/CMS Strategic Plan of Rome for the period 2020-2030.

The Government of the Republic of Serbia accepted the Conclusion on Recommendation No 205 (2019) with the Rome Strategic plan for period 2021-2030. on 28th April 2021.

By the Government conclusion, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunications, Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ministry of Finance - Customs Administration are obligated to take measures and activities within the scope of their competencies in order to prevent the illegal killing, capture and trafficking of wild bird species.

Further step will be planned to establish operational framework for the implementation of the Rome Strategic plan on the illegal killing, capture and trafficking of wild species of birds until 2030.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Ministry of Environmental Protection is responsible for monitoring and control of realization of the named measures from the Program for Nature Protection of the Republic of Serbia with Action plan for period 2021. to 2023. in cooperation with Environmental Inspection and Institutes for Nature Conservation.

Ministry of Environmental Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunications, Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ministry of Finance - Customs Administration are responsible for the realization of Conclusion on Recommendation No 205 (2019) with the Rome Strategic plan for period 2021-2030.

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The Republic Inspection of Environmental Protection, Hunting Inspection and other competent inspections, Ministry of Justice-Public Prosecution, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Customs …etc..

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

According to the Law on Nature Protection, Law on Game and Hunting, Criminal Law and other ratificated international agreements and conventions and joint cooperation and action between the relevant authorities and scientific organizations.

Just to mention, for the years, Ministry of Environmental Protection has been paying expenses for sample analysis and diagnostics for determining the cause of death of the killed specimens, or specimens that died otherwise, of strictly protected wild species found within the territory of the Republic of Serbia.

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No applicable

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Not for now

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

12. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

Scoreboard 2018-2020

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

13. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

Scoreboard 2018-2020

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

14. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Scoreboard 2018-2020

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Scoreboard 2018-2020

SPAIN

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	Spain
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted]. Conservation Actions Unit
Institution/Organization	Ministry for the Ecological Transition. General Directorate on Biodiversity, Forests and Desertification
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	No
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	Yes
Date of completing the form	18/05/2021

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	P. Identification of National Priorities
	Q. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	R. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in Spain are not officially appointed by any institution or administration but could be ranked as follows:

- Fight against illegal poisoning
- Control and eradication of illegal trade of wild birds to Spain
- Illegal shooting
- Illegal trapping of songbirds

a. Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1	High	Illegal poisoning	Predators in general, scavengers in particular	High	1. Regional plans against poisoning 2. Examination and traceability of cases in the field 3. Necropsies analyses 4. Judicial and punitive measures 5. Mitigation with canine patrols 6. Regional plans against poisoning	- Reporting regional data to a national database - Improvement of case findings in the field - Improvement of legal procedures Training of prosecutors and judges	1, 2, 3, 5, 6. Autonomous communities, their veterinary services and regional environmental rangers. 2, SEPRONA 4, judicial and court bodies	Autonomous communities at regional level and the Ministry for the Ecological Transition at the national level
2	High	Illegal trade of exotic birds to Spain	Bird species considered as pets, usually native from Central and South America, or Central Africa	High depending on the global conservation status of the affected species	7. Investigation of criminal networks importing wild species 8. Persecution of the crime through controls in borders and internet	- Reinforcement of awareness to reduce the demand of wildlife - Training of enforcement and judiciary bodies Greater investment in controls of	6 and 7 enforcement bodies, especially SEPRONA. 8, national authorities such as Ministries for	National enforcement bodies and Ministry for the Ecological Transition, with the collaboration of

					9. Implementation of a National Plan against illegal trafficking	importations, also at origin countries	the Ecological Transition	Autonomous communities
3	Medium	Illegal shooting	Medium-sized birds (including raptors)	Unknown	10. Persecution of illegal actions during hunting periods. 11. Judicial and punitive measures.	Definitive judicial and punitive measures to offenders	Autonomous communities and regional environmental rangers.	Autonomous communities at regional level and the Ministry for the Ecological Transition at the national level
4	Medium-Low	Illegal trapping	Songbirds (specially insectivorous)	Unknown-low	12. Persecution of illegal actions at "parany" points. 13. Monitoring and control of potential illegal captures 14. Judicial and punitive measures	Judicial and punitive measures to offenders	Autonomous communities and regional environmental rangers, with some collaboration from SEPRONA at national level	Autonomous communities at regional level and the Ministry for the Ecological Transition at the national level

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

No changes since our last report in 2019

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

No changes since our last report in 2019

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

No changes since our last report in 2019

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

No changes since our last report in 2019

2. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

No changes since our last report in 2019

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and

the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

No changes since our last report in 2019

3. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

4. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

No changes since our last report in 2019

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The coordination between the SEPRONA agency in Spain and INTERPOL is excellent in the issue of IKB

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

No changes since our last report in 2019

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of

Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

No changes since our last report in 2019

TUNISIA

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	TUNISIE
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted]
Institution/Organization	Direction Générale des Forêts; Tunisie
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	(Yes/No)
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	(Yes) Member
Date of completing the form	11 avril 2019 / 03 mai 2021

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	S. Identification of National Priorities
	T. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	U. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines
2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.

In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Aucune liste des priorités n'a été élaboré pour l'instant; mais la Tunisie a renforcé ses efforts pour répondre aux objectifs de plan d'action de Tunis 2013-2020 et mieux protéger la biodiversité spécialement les oiseaux migrateurs par :

1- la révision des lois relatives à la chasse
2- la création d'une plate-forme de suivi et de contrôle des oiseaux (INITIATION DE L'AAO/BIRDLIFE TUNISIE ; "www.stop-braconnage.com")
3- la réalisation et la programmation d'une série de formation et de sensibilisation
4- les interventions sur terrain pour la conservation des oiseaux migrateurs.

La Direction Générale des Forêts est l'autorité responsable du contrôle sur le terrain jours et nuits par la loi n° 88-20 du 13 avril 1988, portant refonte du code forestier.

Durant les 5 dernières années 1200 infractions de braconnage et de commerce illégale ont été enregistré.

En 2017; Et par initiative de l'Association des Amis des Oiseaux et en coopération avec la Direction Générale des Forêts, une plate-forme de suivi; de contrôle et de réclamation des infractions enregistrées sur les oiseaux, était lancé ("www.stop-braconnage.com")

En 2018; la Commission Consultative de la Chasse et de la Conservation du Gibier a fixé le nombre de pièces de gibier qu'un chasseur peut abattre au cours d'une journée de chasse; par un Arrêté Ministériel relatif à l'organisation saisonnière de la chasse.

En 2020 ; la Commission Consultative de la Chasse et de la Conservation du Gibier a réduit la période de chasse des oiseaux gibiers.

En 2020 ; la Commission Consultative de la Chasse et de la Conservation du Gibier a démuni le nombre de jour de chasse des oiseaux gibiers par semaine à 04 jours.

14.1 Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1	la révision des lois relatives à la chasse	- fixé le nombre de pièces de gibier qu'un chasseur peut abattre au cours d'une journée de chasse. - diminution de la période de chasse des oiseaux gibiers. - diminution de nombre de jour de chasse des oiseaux gibiers par semaine.	- Toutes espèces des oiseaux sauvages autorisées à la chasse. - Toutes espèces des oiseaux sauvages autorisées à la chasse. - Toutes espèces des oiseaux sauvages autorisées à la chasse.	_	Des quotas de prélèvement sont fixés. - 04 jours de chasse au lieu de 07 jours.	_	Les agents de la Direction Générale des Forêts - Les agents de la Direction Générale des Forêts. - Les agents de la Direction Générale des Forêts.	Les agents de la Direction Générale des Forêts et les Associations. - Les agents de la Direction Générale des Forêts et les Associations. - Les agents de la Direction Générale des Forêts et les Associations.

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

Par un Arrêté Ministériel relatif à l'organisation saisonnière de la chasse le nombre de pièces des oiseaux gibiers qu'un chasseur peut abattre au cours d'une journée de chasse est fixé.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Les Parties prenantes qui ont été impliqués dans le processus de definition des priorités sont :

- La Direction Générale des Forêts
- Le Ministère de la Justice
- Les Membres de la Commission Consultative de la Chasse et de la Conservation du Gibier

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Généralement les infractions en matière de la chasse feront l'objet de constatations et d'enquêtes par les ingénieurs et techniciens des Forêts et tous les officiers de police judiciaire, les gardes nationaux, les officiers et préposés des douanes et les agents de police.

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Pas des mécanismes spécifiques, mais on compte sur les actions de contrôle faites sur terrain et par les réclamations inscrites sur la plate-forme mentionnée ci-dessus (en A1) et sur la sensibilisation.

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Les avantages de cette action sont tout d'abord de garantir la durabilité de l'existence des oiseaux sauvages et d'assurer une bonne gestion des oiseaux gibiers.

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

La Direction Générale des Forêts et l'Association des Amis des Oiseaux ont lancé une Plate-forme de suivi et de contrôle des infractions sur les oiseaux et des délits de chasse. Cette Plate-forme permet d'éditer des bilans statistiques selon la demande et de localiser les zones noires de point de vue infractions.

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Voir réponse B 1.a

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Pas également, mais la Direction Générale des Forêts à une liste des Brigadiers Régionaux avec une Brigade Nationale pour lutter contre les infractions liées à la chasse et aux faunes sauvages. Aussi, un Point Focal CITES est désigné et qui est en contact régulier avec les Brigadiers.

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Voir réponse B 1.a

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Oui, La Direction Générale des Forêts et l'Association Tunisienne des Amis des Oiseaux ont lancé une Plate-forme de suivi et de contrôle pour lutter contre l'abattage illégal des oiseaux et des délits de chasse.

"www.stop-braconnage.com"

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Les peines sont fixées par la loi n° 88-20 du 13 avril 1988, portant refonte du code forestier.

Les pénalités ainsi définies par les articles de dit code comme suit :

- de 16 jours à 6 mois d'emprisonnement et d'une amende de 500 dinars à 5000 dinars; pour les infractions liées à la chasse illégal et au commerce illégale des espèces gibiers.
- Ces peines sont portées au double et l'autorisation de chasse est retirée pour cinq ans dans le cas où les crimes graves vises par le présent code sont commis.

- de 16 jours à 6 mois d'emprisonnement et d'une amende de 1000 dinars à 5000 dinars; pour les infractions liées à l'abattage illégal et au commerce illégale des Espèces protégées.

15. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

La Direction Générale des Forêts et l'Association des Amis des Oiseaux ont lancé une Plate-forme de suivi et de contrôle des infractions sur les oiseaux et des délits de chasse.

Cette Plate-forme permet d'éditer des bilans statistiques selon la demande et de localiser les zones noires de point de vue infractions.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Chaque année on a au niveau de rapport annuel de la chasse une estimation des espèces gibiers chassées notamment les oiseaux migrateurs.

Les données des rapports nous permettent d'avoir un aperçu sur l'évolution des prélèvements effectués par saison de chasse.

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

Avant le lancement de la plate-forme on n'a pas des données exactes ; néanmoins que durant la période de révolution le braconnage s'est beaucoup accentuée avec une diminution de contrôle.

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

Jusqu'à nos jours pas de recherches menées ou des données collectées concernant ce sujet.

16. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

Malheureusement, aucune étude officielle n'a été faite sur les principaux facteurs et avantages des crimes contre les oiseaux sauvages.

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Oui, la Direction Générale des Forêts et l'Association des Amis des Oiseaux ont lancé une Plate-forme de suivi et de contrôle des infractions sur les oiseaux et des délits de chasse.

Cette Plate-forme présente les espèces protégées non chassable ; aussi elle présente les espèces gibiers avec les périodes de chasse et le nombre des pièces autorisées.

De plus, on trouve au niveau de la Plate-forme l'Arrêté annuel relatif à l'organisation de la chasse.

La sensibilisation du grand public aux conséquences et à l'impact biologique de l'abattage illégal d'oiseaux est assurée par les ONGs comme l'Association des Amis des Oiseaux et l'Association de Sauvegarde des Zones Humides du Sud Tunisien.

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Non il n'existe pas une stratégie dans ce sens ;

Mais, le grand effort des brigadiers concernant les actions de lutte contre le braconnage et le commerce illégal d'espèces est portée à la connaissance des Associations et des médias.

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Non; Pas encore.

17. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Oui ; la partage des connaissances est garantie, vu que le point focal de la Tunisie sur l'abattage illégal des oiseaux (Membre de Task-force) travail à l'organe de gestion CITES de la Tunisie et aussi membre de groupe de travail de la Plate-forme de suivi et de contrôle des infractions sur les oiseaux et des délits de chasse.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Sans Objet.

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

Non, pas des mécanismes exacts.

Parce que la Tunisie manque des Juges spécialisés en environnement.

Mais en travail en coopération étroite avec les procureurs ce qui nous permet de garantir l'exécution des peines aux infractions.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or

MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Non,

La Tunisie n'a pas fait des échanges des expériences avec d'autres parties.

Mais on essaie de participer aux différentes réunions organisées dans le cadre de la conservation de la biodiversité.

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Sans Objet

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Généralement tous les ministères concernés travaillent en collaboration pour la protection de la biodiversité ; et spécialement la Direction Générale des Forêts pour la conservation de la flore et de la faune sauvage.

Les actions de sensibilisations du public sont faites par les agents des Forêts et les Associations spécialisées en la protection de la biodiversité.

UNITED KINGDOM

Reporting period 2019-2020

Country	United Kingdom
Name and position of responsible person	[redacted], Policy officer
Institution/Organization	Defra
E-mail	[redacted]
Bern Convention SFP	No
CMS MIKT Member/Observer	No
Date of completing the form	26/05/21

Definition and Reference Documents

"Illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds" is defined for the purpose of this questionnaire as: Activities which are illegal under national, regional or international law committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens of wild birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts and derivatives.

- Recommendation No. 164 (2013) and the "Tunis Action Plan 2013-2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds"
- Recommendation No. 171 (2014) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 5 December 2014, on the setting-up of national policing/investigation priorities to tackle illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds
- Programme of Work 2016 – 2020 for the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT).
- UNEP/CMS Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP 13): The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- Compilation of National Reports for Rome 2019 meeting.

INDEX

1.	ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS
	V. Identification of National Priorities
	W. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution
	X. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

2.	BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS
3.	AWARENESS ASPECTS
4.	COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL ASPECTS

A. **Identification of National Priorities**

1. Please provide the list of policing/investigation priorities identified to tackle wild-bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) where applicable], as well as the bodies in charge of their enforcement and monitoring.
In case the list of priorities is not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

There are seven UK wildlife crime priorities; badger persecution, bat persecution, the illegal trade in CITES species, freshwater pearl mussels, poaching, raptor persecution and cyber-enabled wildlife crime. Each wildlife crime priority has a delivery group to consider what action should be taken and develop a plan on prevention, intelligence and enforcement.

The priority delivery groups bring together police, NGOs and government. The Raptor Persecution Priority Delivery Group focuses on 'hotspot' areas of the country rather than specific species although there are five species of particular concern: the hen harrier, golden eagle, goshawk, peregrine and white-tailed eagle. Despite instances of poisoning and killing of birds of prey, populations of many species, such as the peregrine falcon, red kite and buzzard have increased. Red kites were previously identified as a key species at risk, but is no longer a priority species, given the significant population recovery.

Priority delivery group plans focusing on specific species, such as hen harriers, aim to help species recover a self-sustaining and well dispersed breeding population in England across a range of habitats. However, as noted above enforcement is targeted over crime and incident 'hotspots', rather than by species, as individual species are not necessarily specifically targeted in a particular local environment.

The enforcement of all offences, including wildlife offences, is an operational matter for the police. It is for senior police officers to set their local investigative priorities; local forces are accountable to elected police and crime commissioners who ensure that operational prioritization reflects the concerns of local people. The Government takes steps to ensure that the enforcement of wildlife protection legislation is achieving the best possible outcomes for

wildlife through the National Wildlife Crime Unit and involvement with the National Police Chiefs Council.

a. Complementary information where appropriate, please see table below (OPTIONAL)

Rank	Priority	Type of offence / Crime targeted	Species affected	Level of threat on the species	Ongoing actions	Actions to be put in place	Body(ies) in charge of enforcement	Body(ies) in charge of monitoring
1								
2								
3								

2. By which administrative or legal means have the national priorities been established in your country? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019*.

Wildlife crime priorities are set by the UK Wildlife Crime Tasking and Co-ordination Group (UKTCG) which is chaired by the Chief Constable Wildlife Crime lead. This group is supported by the Wildlife Crime Conservation Advisory Group (WCCAG), chaired by the Joint National Conservation Committee (JNCC). Government sits on these groups, along with other statutory agencies and relevant non-government organizations. The WCCAG assesses the conservation status of species and habitats and the importance of enforcement intervention.

Priority areas are those which are assessed as posing the greatest current threat to the conservation status of a species or which are calculated to have a high risk score (based on impact and harm, likelihood, and organisational position) and therefore they are assessed as requiring an immediate UK-wide tactical response. UK wildlife crime priorities are reviewed every 2 years by UKTCG.

3. Which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process*? Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Government, police, statutory agencies and relevant non-government organizations

4. What are the bodies in charge of their enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Enforcement of all offences, including wildlife offences, is an operational matter for local and national law enforcement and Border Force for enforcement at the UK border. Within regional police forces, there are over 500 specialist Police Wildlife Crime Officers (PWCO) who investigate a wide range of complex wildlife offences and provide advice and support to police. Police investigations are supported by the National Wildlife Crime Unit.

5. What are the control mechanisms put in place to ensure that the identified priorities are applied as such? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The UKTCG, chaired by the Chief Constable Wildlife Crime lead, decides the UK wildlife crime priority areas and monitors progress. Each priority areas have implementation plans with plan owners and leads identified for the prevention and enforcement of crimes. Progress is monitored by the Chairs of these groups and reported to the UKTCG.

6. What is your evaluation of the benefits and challenges linked to the implementation of national priorities? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The priority areas are beneficial; they focus law enforcement activity on those crimes posing the greatest current threat to either the conservation status of a species or which are calculated to have a high risk score (based on impact and harm, likelihood, and organisational position) and therefore they are assessed as requiring an immediate UK-wide tactical response.

7. Where applicable: To which extent your authorities refer to the national priorities for the reporting obligations of Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The WCCAG (see Q2) assesses the conservation status of species and habitats and the importance of enforcement intervention when making recommendations on wildlife crime prioritization. This is informed by a range of sources, including those that underpin Article 12 reporting. The UK's Article 12 reporting can be accessed here: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/knowledge/rep_birds/index_en.htm

8. Is IKB contemplated by the National Action Plans (NAPs) or have NAPs being developed to address IKB? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Answered as part of the Scoreboard submission.

B. Mechanisms to improve the availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge for investigation, prevention and prosecution

1.a. What are the national mechanisms put in place for recording reports of wildlife cases/prosecution? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

All convictions for illegally killing or taking birds (offences under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981) are recorded by the UK Ministry of Justice and in Scotland by the Scottish government.

Law enforcement agencies will record reports of wildlife crime in their information management systems.

1.b and to what extent these are also used to provide statistical evidence of the areas of offending (e.g. through adding categories of wildlife crime to those crimes already recorded nationally?)

In case such mechanisms are not in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The UKTCG (see Q2) considers a Strategic Assessment prepared by law enforcement during the bi-annual review of wildlife crime priorities. This assessment includes evidence on areas of offending.

2. Has your country appointed national focal points to assist investigators and prosecutors in accessing/locating expert knowledge providers, or at least established a compilation of a

national contact list of expert providers (including scientists, specialist law firms, expert witnesses, and independent specialists)?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Within regional police forces, there are over 500 specialist Police Wildlife Crime Officers (PWCO) who investigate a wide range of complex wildlife offences and provide advice and support to police. Police investigations are supported by the National Wildlife Crime Unit. The Unit contains Investigative Support Officers who support active cases across the UK. This means that all investigation leads can call upon specially trained officers for support and advice.

The National Wildlife Crime Unit hosts an annual UK Wildlife Crime Enforcers Conference for law enforcers, statutory agencies and NGOs to share best practice in combatting wildlife crime.

Police officers also have access to POLKA (Police Online Knowledge Area) where information can be exchanged.

In Scotland, every Division in Police Scotland has a Wildlife Crime Liaison Officer and there are also a network of Wildlife Crime Officers across the force.

3. Are there any dedicated infrastructures enabling for the national exchange of information and coordination of actions at identified black-spots of illegal activities?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect,

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

UK police intelligence structures and systems are well developed. Their use is an independent operational matter.

4. Are there any national platforms, for instance in the form of web portals, to provide information and resources for the professionals involved in fighting against illegal killing of birds?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

As above.

C. Identification and standardisation of gravity factors and sentencing guidelines

1. Have authorities promoted or included gravity factors and sentencing guidelines to be integrated in the legal framework? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Answered as part of the Scoreboard submission.

2. Where applicable: By which mean have your authorities brought the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee through Recommendation N° 177 (2015) to the attention of the judiciary? And what feedback – if any- was received authorities?

If the sentencing guidelines and gravity factors have not yet been forwarded to the judiciary, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

The UK's legislation (primarily the Wildlife & Countryside Act, 1981) pre-dates the publication of the 2015 Bern Convention Tunis Action Plan. The Act contains provisions that broadly align with many of the gravity factors, including (but not limited to):

- Reflection of the conservation status of species, as outlined in the EU Nature Directive.
- The UK's legal obligations to protect under international legislation.
- Consideration of the methods used to commit an offence.
- Scale of offending (Where an offence was committed in respect of more than one bird, nest or egg, the maximum fine is determined as if the person convicted had been convicted of a separate offence in respect of each bird, nest or egg).

2. BIOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. What are the mechanisms in place for analysing existing data on illegal activities affecting birds? Is there any standardised protocol for data collection, namely to identify black-spots for illegal killing of birds?

If no mechanism or protocol is in place, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect.

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

The Raptor Persecution Priority Delivery Group considers data and expert opinion on raptor persecution. This informs the group's activity. The Chair reports to the UKTCG.

Raptor persecution maps for England and Wales have been published (and made available to the public via the government's gov.uk website) to enable the police to clearly see where the highest incidents are taking place and focus enforcement efforts in the areas that need it most.

The maps present the number of shootings, trappings, poisonings and nest destructions that took place across England & Wales between 2011 and 2015 and consideration is being given to how they can be most suitably updated, providing an invaluable intelligence tool to help fight crimes again birds of prey.

In Scotland, bird of prey poisoning hotspot maps have been published from 2005, and bird of prey all crimes maps from 2009. These are published annually and are available to the public on the Scottish Government website.

Statutory bodies and NGOs collaborated in the publication of satellite tracking research into hen harrier disappearances. This was recently published in Nature Communications.

2. Has your country established statistics on mortality within bird populations due to legal harvest? If yes, through which mechanism? If not, please explain why. *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Legal, licensed control of bird populations is a separate matter from the illegal killing of birds. The two should not be conflated.

3. What are the estimates of mortality due to illegal killing trapping and trade and illegal activities in your country (according to the definition given by the Bern Convention Recommendations or/and the CMS resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP13))? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard**

Answered as part of the Scoreboard submission.

4. Has research been conducted, or data collected, regarding scale, modus operandi, socio-economic drivers, national and international legal and illegal trade in wild birds in the European and Mediterranean region? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

There are over 300 separate wildlife crime offences on the statute book in the UK. These cover a wide range of different, specific criminal activities, from the trade in protected species to the killing or injuring of wild birds. Offenders will be motivated by different factors depending on the crime they are committing; this could be profit (for those trading in illegal wildlife, poaching or organising fights between animals) economic pressure (for gamekeepers illegally killing birds of prey), expediency (for those using non-approved methods to protect their property from damage from wild birds) or other, diffuse, reasons (for those who, for example, illegally take birds' eggs for their collections). Police, policy makers and NGOs have a good understanding of the drivers for each of these offences.

The UK has invited the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to apply the ICCWC toolkits, one of which focusses on the drivers that underpin wildlife offences and the preventative techniques that could be deployed to effectively counter them. This ICCWC assessment is currently ongoing in the UK and a report is due in August 2021.

3. AWARENESS ASPECTS

1. Is there any official study on the key drivers and benefits of wild-bird crimes in your country? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.**

Answered as part of the Scoreboard submission.

2. Is there any operational platform put in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

The purpose of the UK's Priority Delivery Groups for Raptor Persecution and CITES crimes is to progress the priority in relation to prevention, intelligence and enforcement, including:

• Awareness raising (across law enforcement agencies, partners, stakeholder communities and the public)
• Raising the profile via media exposure

3. Is there any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Raptor Persecution Priority Delivery Group is developing a shared communication approach between police, government and NGOs to encourage a consistent response to incidents of suspected or confirmed raptor persecution.

4. Has your country implemented any kind of campaign, including school campaigns, to raise awareness on this matter? **You can skip this question if you have completed the Scoreboard.** *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

Answered as part of the Scoreboard submission.

4. COORDINATION, SYNERGIES AND MAINSTREAMING

1. Are there any protocols, procedures or mechanisms to ensure knowledge-sharing between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under the Bern Convention, the MIKT member or observer, the National representative at the EU Ornis Committee and the CITES enforcement officers?

If coordination is not foreseen, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

There is regular policy level contact between the Special Focal Point for Illegal Killing of Birds under Bern, the National rep at the EU Ornis Committee, Cites enforcement officers and UK policy colleagues. UK frequently works with other parties on wildlife crime initiatives.

2. How would you evaluate the cooperation of your main enforcement agency(ies) with the relevant INTERPOL National Central Bureau? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

I am not aware of any issues between UK enforcement agencies and INTERPOL relating to wildlife crime matters.

3. Has your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors? Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level?

If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect

Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.

The UK regularly supports, and provides experts for, projects to strengthen cooperation and build capacity within national judiciaries and law enforcement agencies to combat wildlife crimes.

The UK is committed to global leadership in tackling the illegal wildlife trade, including the trade in birds and products derived from these species. We hosted the ground-breaking London Conference in 2014 that secured ambitious agreements from more than forty governments to take urgent, coordinated action. It was hailed as a turning point in global efforts to tackle these damaging activities. In October 2018 the illegal wildlife trade Conference returned to London.

The UK is investing more than £36 million between 2014 and 2021 to take action to counter the illegal wildlife trade, including work to reduce demand, strengthen enforcement, ensure effective legal frameworks and develop sustainable livelihoods.

4. Has your country exchanged experiences (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

As above.

5. Which existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms has been used to maximize cooperation in law enforcement? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

As above.

6. Overall by which means and with which results is your country addressing the need to enhance inter-sector cooperation involving all relevant Ministries, particularly the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Interior or Home Affairs, Justice and Education? *Please report only any changes/updates since your last report in 2019.*

As above.