



Strasbourg, 8 August 2022

T-PVS/Inf(2022)41

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

42nd meeting
29 November - 2 December 2022

**ANALYSIS OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON RELEVANT
LEGISLATION OF BERN CONVENTION NON-EU
CONTRACTING PARTIES ON WILDLIFE PATHOGENS SPREAD
BY ALIEN SPECIES AND ON ALIEN SPECIES AFFECTING
WILDLIFE BY ACTING AS PATHOGENS.**

**-REPORT ON ALIEN PATHOGENS AND PATHOGENS SPREAD BY
INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES IN EUROPE**

T-PVS/Inf(2022)40-

*Report prepared by
Mr Riccardo Scalera*

To widen the policy and legislation analysis of the document “*Report on Alien pathogens and pathogens spread by Invasive Alien Species in Europe*”, the Group of Experts on Invasive Alien Species (IAS) suggested to circulate a dedicated questionnaire to Bern Convention Contracting Parties which are not members of the EU. The purpose was to compare experiences so far documented in the EU with those from other countries, with the objective to identify any lesson to be learned and/or confirm the policy/legislation gaps discussed in the document. The replies were expected to be combined and added as annex to the document, to be used as a basis for further analysis to be made by relevant experts, as foreseen in the document itself as a follow up action (see section #7.6).

The questionnaire was launched by the Secretariat on 4 November 2021 with the request to be sent back duly filled in by the Contracting Parties by 10 December 2021. Given the low response rate (only four Contracting Parties replied within the deadline), a second request was sent on 11 February 2022 by the Secretariat to the Contracting Parties that are not EU Member States. On this occasion, an additional wrap up question was added to the questionnaire (#11), which was requested to be delivered duly filled in by 4 March 2022.

As of 4 March 2022, a total of eight Contracting Parties sent their replies to the questionnaire:

1. Armenia
2. Georgia
3. Lichtenstein
4. Moldova
5. Norway
6. Serbia
7. Switzerland
8. United Kingdom

All Contracting Parties provided the formal consent to share their replies, with the only exception of Lichtenstein which did not give any explicit feedback on this point, but informed the Secretariat that the legislation concerning Invasive Alien Species and Emerging Infectious Diseases (EIDs) is the same as in Switzerland.

The replies received cannot be considered representative of the full set of Contracting Parties which the questionnaire was addressed to. However, a few points that can be of general interest are presented/discussed below.

In total, according to the replies received, six Contracting Parties out of eight (75%) have some kind of tools/legislation to deal with alien species and pathogens, while two Parties – namely Armenia and Moldova - have no legislation on the topic. In general, all legal tools mentioned by respondents are currently adopted, implemented, and all are legally binding (with the only exception of a draft law in Georgia expected to be approved in 2022, and another law reportedly not implemented in the UK). The number of legal tools available to the single Contracting Parties ranges from three (as in the case of Serbia) to fourteen (in the UK), for a total of thirty-two pieces of legislation listed (those in common for Switzerland and Liechtenstein are considered only once in this analysis). Nevertheless, while Contracting Parties expressed their availability for sharing further information via mail beyond those provided in the questionnaires, only a part (69%) of the tools listed in the replies were also described in the dedicated sections of the questionnaire.

Particularly relevant is the topic that the policy/legislation reported by Contracting Parties is primarily aimed at (taking into account that the focus of the questionnaire was on current policy and legislation available to deal with **wildlife pathogens spread by alien species and on alien species affecting wildlife by acting as pathogens themselves**). The replies have shown that all Contracting Parties reported one or more tools aimed primarily at Invasive Alien Species (this concerns the totality of tools listed by Georgia and Serbia, the tools described by Norway and Switzerland in their questionnaires, and five out of eleven tools described by the UK in their questionnaire) while only three Contracting Parties have reported tools aimed primarily at Emerging Infectious Diseases (namely the tool described by Switzerland in their questionnaire, four out of six tools described by Georgia, and eight out of eleven tools described by the UK). Similarly, all Contracting Parties have reported some legislation aimed primarily at nature protection, and all (with the exception of Norway) at wildlife management. Also, all Contracting Parties have reported some legislation aimed primarily at animal health and plant health (although the questionnaire compiled by Norway provided no descriptions for this kind

Party	Law/tool	Key topic(s) which the legal tools aim primarily at									International policies and agreements which the legal tools are in line with					
		Invasive alien species	Emerging infectious diseases	Wildlife management	Nature protection	Animal health	Plant health	Human health	'One Health' initiative	Other (specify)	CBD	Bern	CITES	EU Biodiv. Strategy	OIE	EU IAS Regulation 1143/2014
UK	The Aquatic Animal Health (England and Wales) Regulations 2019	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N					X		
UK	Regulation (EC) No 1251/2008 (as retained) implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards conditions and certification requirements for the placing on the market and the import into the Community of aquaculture animals and products thereof and laying down a list of vector species	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N					X		
UK	Regulation (EC) No 708/2007 (as retained) concerning use of alien and locally absent species in aquaculture (Retained by the UK after EU Exit, currently as EU, no divergence, so not detailed below)															
UK	The Alien and Locally Absent Species in Aquaculture (England and Wales) Regulations 2011	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	X					
UK	Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 (as retained) on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species (Retained by the UK after EU Exit, currently as EU, no divergence, so not detailed below)															
UK	The Prohibition of Keeping or Release of Live Fish (Specified Species) (England) Order 2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X					
UK	The Prohibition of Keeping of Live Fish (Crayfish) Order 1996	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X					
UK	The Keeping and Introduction of Fish (England and River Esk Catchment Area) Regulations 2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N						
UK	Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/320 (as retained) on certain animal health protection measures for intra-Union trade in salamanders and the introduction into the Union of such animals in relation to the fungus Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans (Retained by the UK after EU Exit, currently as EU, no divergence, so not detailed below)															
UK	The retained EU Regulation 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species and related implementing legislation: Invasive Alien Species (Enforcement and Permitting) Order 2019 (England and Wales). In Scotland, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Keeping and Release and Notification Requirements) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2019 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Prohibition on Sale etc. of Invasive Animal and Plant Species) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2019 came into force in April 2019. The Invasive Alien Species (Enforcement and Permitting) Order (Northern Ireland) 2019	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N					X	X	
UK	Animal Health Act (1981)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N						
UK	Zoonoses Order (1975) and as amended inc 2021	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N						
UK	The Zoonoses Monitoring Regulations (2007)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N						
UK	Specified Diseases (Notification) Order 1996 and as amended	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N						

The key information excerpted from the feedback of each single Party summarized above, is also complemented with the information outlined in the table below, with the objective to contribute as much as possible to present an accurate state of the art of the current policy and legislation regarding alien pathogens and pathogens spread by invasive alien species in Bern Convention Contracting Parties which are not EU Member States.

As mentioned above, considering the number of replies received, the analysis cannot be considered representative of the full set of non-EU Contracting Parties to the Bern Convention, therefore it does not allow to draw any conclusion. However, it is interesting to note what Contracting Parties declaring to lack relevant policy/legislation perceive about the existing challenges, restrictions or limitations in relation to tackling the

risks of alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS affecting wildlife. For example, Moldova offered interesting points of reflection of existing gaps (some of which may be common to other Contracting Parties, and may be worth addressing in the near future):

- *not sufficient scientific data on invasion of alien pathogens and their risks to the wildlife;*
- *poor institutional capacities and skills to monitoring the invasions of pathogens;*
- *insufficient capacities to risk assessment and management of pathogenic invasions and their impact to wildlife;*
- *no responsible governmental body in duty with the management and prevention of pathogenic invasions.*

Additionally, among the main constraints and barriers, Moldova noted the following:

- *Poor understanding and insufficient skills and knowledge of personnel to manage the pathogenic alien invasions, spread by IAS;*
- *Insufficient financing of biodiversity issues;*
- *Invasive pathogen issues not yet identified as a priority in the biodiversity policy;*
- *Changes of the government make difficult to ensure continuity of the specific topics in biodiversity.*

It is also worth to note that while another Contracting Party with no legislation – Armenia – mentioned the intention to explore the European approach, to be used in national legislation and policies as much as possible (hence suggesting that some guidance may be useful for this purpose), another Party –the UK – reported how “*Legislation dealing with pathogens is often separate from legislation seeking to control IAS which can leave gaps and grey areas*”. Although no further detail was provided by the Contracting Party on this regard, this comment seems deserving a particular attention in the light of the fact that most of the UK legislation is line with the EU, hence it should be worth to verify whether this is perceived as a challenge by other Contracting Parties which are also EU Member States. The UK also noted that “*ensuring compliance with the variety of legal/policy tools at our disposal is more of a challenge than introducing new legal tools/policy. Improving compliance with the existing suite of tools/powers will likely be more impactful than introducing new powers*”.

ANNEX I

REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON POLICY AND LEGISLATION MEASURES ADOPTED BY BERN CONVENTION NON-EU CONTRACTING PARTIES TO DEAL WITH WILDLIFE PATHOGENS SPREAD BY ALIEN SPECIES AND ON ALIEN SPECIES AFFECTING WILDLIFE BY ACTING AS PATHOGENS.

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
<p>1. Please indicate if your country has any specific legal tool, such as laws or regulations (or any other text, including conventions, plans, strategies, codes, laws or acts, ordinances, decrees, orders, statutory orders, circulars, decisions, bills, etc.) at any level (from local to national) that aim to tackle alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS that affect wildlife.</p> <p>You should report the names of the official documents on relevant policy and legislation in full (e.g. name, number and date).</p>	<p>Armenia: no legal tools are listed</p> <p>Georgia: 6 legal tools are listed (2 laws and a draft law, a regulation, a code, and an action plan)</p> <p>Moldova: no legal tools are listed</p> <p>Norway: 4 legal tools are listed</p> <p>Serbia: 3 legal tools are listed (a Nature Protection Programme, a Law on Nature Protection and a Law on Protection and Sustainable Use of the Fish Stocks)</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: 5 legal tools are listed (2 federal acts and 3 ordinances)</p> <p>UK: 14 legal tools are listed</p>	<p>Georgia: all listed legal tools are clearly indicated</p> <p>Norway: one tool - Regulations on measures against diseases and zoonotic agents in animals (Animal Health Regulations) - is not clearly identified (i.e. number and date missing).</p> <p>Lichtenstein: the legislation concerning invasive alien species (IAS) and emerging infectious diseases (EIDs) is the same as in Switzerland. These laws were either adopted by Switzerland into the national legislation of Liechtenstein or the Swiss laws are even directly applicable in Liechtenstein via the customs treaty with Switzerland. Therefore, the answers given by Switzerland are also valid for Liechtenstein</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: there are other legal tools quoted in the reply to Question #3, but they are not described in detail</p> <p>UK: a disclaimer on legislation peculiarities in England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland is included</p>
<p>2. Name of legal tool</p>	<p>Armenia: no tools are described</p> <p>Georgia: the names of the legal tools are provided, along with their English translation, the relevant articles and a link to the webpage</p> <p>Moldova: no tools are described</p> <p>Norway: The information (name of the legal tool is provided, along with the English translation, the relevant articles and a link to the webpage) is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species)</p>	<p>UK: Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/320, Regulation (EC) No 708/2007 and Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 are not described, because they are part of the EU legislation retained after the EU exit.</p>

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	<p>Serbia: the names of the legal tools are provided, along with their English translation, the relevant articles and a link to the webpage</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: The information (name of the legal tool is provided, along with the English translation, the relevant articles and a link to the webpage) is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Ordinance on the Handling of Organisms in the Environment)</p> <p>UK: the names of the legal tools are provided, along with the concerned articles and a link to the relevant webpage (English translation not needed)</p>	
<p>3. Please specify whether the legal tool mentioned in question n.2 is adopted or in the process of development, if provisions are legally binding and/or implemented, and provide details on geographic scope which the text applies (local to national), and key authorities responsible for implementation and enforcement (e.g. ministries and agencies).</p>	<p>Armenia: no tools are being adopted or in the process of adoption/development, legally binding or implemented</p> <p>Georgia: all tools are adopted and implemented (except for a draft law which is expected to be approved in 2022), and all are legally binding. Their scope is national and the responsible authority is the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture</p> <p>Moldova: no information provided</p> <p>Norway: The information is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species), which is adopted, legally binding and implemented at the national scale by the Ministry for Environment.</p> <p>Serbia: all tools are adopted and implemented, and all are legally binding. Their scope is national and the responsible authority is the Ministry of Environment</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: the only described tool (Ordinance on the Handling of Organisms in the Environment) is adopted and implemented, and is legally binding. Its scope is national and the responsible authority is the Ministry of Environment</p>	<p>Georgia: the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Georgia 2014 – 2020 and the Law on aquaculture are indicated as both “Adopted” and “In the process of development/adoption” (but from the rest of the information is assumed to be actually adopted/implemented).</p>

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	<p>UK: all tools are adopted and implemented (except for Regulation (EC) No 1251/2008), and all are legally binding. Their scope is usually national (UK or GB) but responses are mostly relevant to England and Wales only (sometime for Scotland too). The responsible authorities are usually the Ministry for Agriculture, Ministry for Environment, and others, like the Fish Health Inspectorate and the Invasive Non-Native Species Inspectorate (both operational on behalf of Defra), Animal and Plant Health Agency; Local Authorities</p>	
<p>4. Please clarify which topic(s) the legal tool mentioned in question n.2 aims primarily at, if appropriate.</p> <p><i>Please specify also whether the focus is on a specific species or group of species (this should include information on whether the focus is on the native species threatened or on the alien species acting as a threat).</i></p>	<p>Armenia: no tools are reported as dealing with any specific topic</p> <p>Georgia: all listed tools deal with IAS and four of them also on Emerging infectious diseases (namely, the Regulation on Ballast Water Management Procedures, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Georgia 2014 – 2020, the Law on aquaculture, as well as the Draft law on Biological Diversity). Also, all tools deal with both animal health and plant health, with the exception of the Law on aquaculture which deals only with animal health. Also, they all deal with both Wildlife management and Nature protection, with the only exception of the Regulation on Ballast Water Management Procedures which does not cover Wildlife management.</p> <p>Moldova: no information provided</p> <p>Norway: The information is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species), which deals with IAS and nature protection</p> <p>Serbia: all listed tools deal with IAS, Wildlife management and Nature protection. The Nature Protection Programme also deal with animal and plant health, and the integration of the principle of preservation of biodiversity in other</p>	<p>Georgia: Human health is indicated as both Yes and No as a key topic in both the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and the Draft law of Georgia on Biological Diversity</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: the additional legislation is listed without any additional description (but with links to relevant text online is provided)</p>

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	<p>policies. The Law on Protection and Sustainable Use of the Fish Stocks also deal with animal health</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: the only described tool deals with all themes, including IAS and EID, with the exception of plant health (but additional legislation on this topic is mentioned). Likewise additional legislation is listed, i.e. on wildlife management, nature protection, animal health, human health, and an initiative on “One Health”, with links to online text.</p> <p>UK: cumulatively, all themes are covered by the 11 legal tools described, with the only exception of the “One Health” initiative</p>	
<p>5. Please indicate whether and how the legal tool mentioned in question n.2 is in line with relevant international policies and agreements.</p>	<p>Armenia: according to the information provided, the Republic of Armenia does not have legal tools mentioned in question n.2 which are in line with relevant international policies and agreements</p> <p>Georgia: Convention on Biological Diversity of the United Nation (CBD) - Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, Target N9</p> <p>Moldova: no information provided</p> <p>Norway: The information is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species), which is in line with the CBD, Bern Convention, etc</p> <p>Serbia: all listed tools are cumulatively in line with the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Bern Convention, the CITES, the Convention on Migratory Species, the EU Strategy on Biodiversity and Green Agenda, and EU Legislation for Nature Protection (plus other national legislation)</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: Convention on Biological Diversity</p> <p>UK: OIE animal health standards, Convention on Biological Diversity, Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014. No</p>	

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	information is provided for 5 legal tools out of 14	
<p>6. Please indicate what legal or administrative procedures/measures are put in place to ensure effective implementation of the legal tool mentioned in question n.2.</p> <p><i>Please describe whether there are future improvements or changes under consideration.</i></p>	<p>Armenia: no information provided (the Republic of Armenia does not have legal tools to describe).</p> <p>Georgia: authorities responsible for control of any illegal activities in frames of this legislation are indicated, along with those for the coordination of the implementation, and to report and keep statistics updated</p> <p>Moldova: no information provided</p> <p>Norway: The information is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species). The articles dealing with Enforcement and sanctions are reported</p> <p>Serbia: the aim of the Nature Protection Programme is described, and the concerned articles of the Law on Nature Protection and the Law on Protection and Sustainable Use of the Fish Stocks are reported.</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: 8 relevant articles are listed, with hyperlinks to relevant text in English</p> <p>UK: information is provided for all described tools.</p>	<p>Serbia: it is not clear which legal or administrative procedures/measures are put in place to ensure effective implementation of the mentioned legal tools</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: the reported articles are not described/discussed</p>
<p>7. Please provide information on any existing good practices or lessons learned regarding key provisions (e.g. monitoring and surveillance at borders) foreseen to tackle alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS affecting wildlife in your country.</p> <p><i>Concrete examples are welcome.</i></p>	<p>Armenia: no information provided</p> <p>Georgia: Information is reported for one legal tool only (National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of Georgia 2014 – 2020), with a focus on <i>Rapana venosa</i> and invasive alien plants.</p> <p>Moldova: no information provided</p> <p>Norway: The information is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species). Two links are provided on Crayfish plague (<i>Aphanomyces astaci</i>) and the pathogenic <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i>.</p> <p>Serbia: no information provided</p>	<p>Georgia: the link with IAS and pathogens is not clear</p> <p>Norway: only the links are provided, with no description of lesson learned</p>

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	<p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: no information provided</p> <p>UK: information is provided in relation to all described tools.</p>	
<p>8. If possible, please submit the original text of the legal tool mentioned in question n.2, accompanied by an English translation. It is sufficient to translate only the concerned articles.</p>	<p>Armenia: no information provided</p> <p>Georgia: the provisions of each legal tool are reported in English. They all directly refer to IAS, but only in two cases out of six there is a specific reference to pathogens (Regulation on Ballast Water Management Procedures) and parasites (law on aquaculture)</p> <p>Moldova: no information provided</p> <p>Norway: The link to the relevant legislation (English version) is reported for one legal tool only (i.e. Regulations relating to alien species).</p> <p>Serbia: The Nature Protection Programme is shortly described, and the concerned articles of the Law on Nature Protection and the Law on Protection and Sustainable Use of the Fish Stocks, were translated and reported in previous replies</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: Two links to online text are provided for the following legislation: Federal Act on the Protection of the Environment, and Ordinance on the Handling of Organisms in the Environment.</p> <p>UK: the links to the original text are all reported under Qu. #2</p>	
<p>9. Please provide information on existing challenges, restrictions or limitations in relation to tackling the risks of alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS affecting wildlife, and elaborate on the impact of these impediments.</p> <p><i>Problems of developing and implementing a legislation on IAS and wildlife diseases should be described here regardless of whether a specific legislation is already in place or not in your</i></p>	<p>Armenia: no information provided</p> <p>Georgia: (Gaps) Information on invasive species is scarce which makes it a challenge to find and tackle spreading and terminate invasive species. There is no unified list of invasive species in Georgia (defined by any legal act). The ways of their entry and distribution have not been confirmed. The data on invasive plant and animal species in government agencies, scientific and expert circles are incomplete and fragmented. Legislation on invasive species is incomplete.</p>	

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
<p><i>country. Concrete examples are welcome.</i></p>	<p>(Constraints and barriers) lack of resources to enforce regulations and implement procedures that are designed to safeguard biodiversity</p> <p>Moldova: (Gaps) By present, there are no national legal provisions/acts to tackle the risks of alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS and affecting wildlife. Among existing gaps there are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not sufficient scientific data on invasion of alien pathogens and their risks to the wildlife; • poor institutional capacities and skills to monitoring the invasions of pathogens; • insufficient capacities to risk assessment and management of pathogenic invasions and their impact to wildlife; • no responsible governmental body in duty with the management and prevention of pathogenic invasions. <p>(Constraints and barriers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor understanding and insufficient skills and knowledge of personnel to manage the pathogenic alien invasions, spread by IAS; • Insufficient financing of biodiversity issues; • Invasive pathogen issues not yet identified as a priority in the biodiversity policy; • Changes of the government make difficult to ensure continuity of the specific topics in biodiversity. <p>Norway: no information provided</p> <p>Serbia: no information provided</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: (Gaps) The Release Ordinance covers the handling of organisms in the environment, i.e. any <u>deliberate</u> activity using organisms that takes place outside a contained system, in particular culturing, processing, multiplication, modification, experimental release, marketing, transport, storage or disposal. It does (so far) not cover <u>undeliberate</u> activities. This gap is recognized in the national strategy on IAS and</p>	

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	<p>needs a revision of the Federal Act on the Protection of the Environment. The according process has started recently</p> <p>UK: (Gaps) Certain wildlife diseases, if detected in the wild, would require a fulsome and robust response, up to and including the euthanasia of any host species in the area. If public opinion were to turn against such action it may prove to be politically unpalatable or logistically difficult (if landowners refuse permission to access their land) to pursue eradication.</p> <p>There is a legal duty to report animal diseases that are notifiable to OIE- this could foreseeably mean that a novel, un-notifiable, disease is not reported as quickly as it would be if it was notifiable.</p> <p>Anecdotally, there is a growing school of thought that due to the biodiversity and climate crisis all creatures should be protected and allowed to live- including invasive species. It is not uncommon for Defra to be contacted by the members of the public who think it is cruel not to allow invasive animals that have been taken into rescue centres to be released back into the wild. This sentiment could foreseeably impede any efforts to eradicate IAS or the diseases they carry.</p> <p>We are also seeing an increase in the keeping of once native amphibian species in outdoor enclosures where we fear the risk of escape could be unacceptably high. Similarly, calls to increase the rate of reintroduction of once native species have increased along with reports of the illegal release of such species- members of the public who believe releasing species without proper licenses is beneficial for nature and local ecosystems run the risk of introducing disease into wild populations.</p> <p>(Constraints and barriers) Increasing global trade create new opportunities for IAS to enter new territories bringing pathogens with them.</p>	

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
<p>10. Please include here any comment you would like to make on the issue of policy and legislation regarding alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS affecting wildlife.</p> <p><i>You may include here comments related to difficulties related to collecting information to reply to the questionnaire.</i></p>	<p>Armenia: Explore European experience and to use in national legislation and policies as much as possible</p> <p>Georgia: The information on invasive alien species is fragmented and not monitored on a country level;</p> <p>Moldova: Human resources development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs for capacity building trainings and webinars; • Needs to collect information and scientific data on pathogenic alien invasion and spread by IAS; • Needs to develop a legal policy and mechanisms to manage risks from alien pathogens spread by IAS to wildlife in the country. • Regional transboundary collaboration and monitoring, • Public awareness and information. <p>Norway: no information provided</p> <p>Serbia: no information provided</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: no information provided</p> <p>UK: Legislation dealing with pathogens is often separate from legislation seeking to control IAS which can leave gaps and grey areas.</p> <p>Defra is funding research looking to determine if fertility control of grey squirrel populations is possible. If it is possible, it should suppress the population of grey squirrel which would suppress the spread of pathogens the species plays host to. With regards to IAS, we take the position, informed by the CBD that prevention is better than cure. That it is better to prevent IAS arriving in the first place than it is to try and eradicate/manage them once they've established. This logic also applies to pathogens spread by IAS species- stopping the host species establishing is likely to be cheaper and easier than trying to control</p>	

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	both the host species and the pathogen once established.	
<p>11. Could you please briefly describe whether and how the existing policy and legislation in your country sufficiently covers alien pathogens or pathogens spread by IAS that affect wildlife, with a specific focus on species other than those used as livestock or crops, or affecting human health (i.e. causing zoonosis)?</p> <p><i>(There is no need to reply if there is no relevant policy/legislation in your country)</i></p>	<p>Armenia: no information provided</p> <p>Georgia: Specific agencies are responsible for control invasive alien species in the relevant field; For example, forest invasive species are monitored and controlled by National Forest Agency, where invasive species found in or around protected areas – by the Agency of Protected Areas. This topic is considered in the new NEAP National Environmental Action Program of Georgia 2022-2026, for example identifying main ways of entry of invasive species and developing recommendations, as well as improving national legislation.</p> <p>Moldova: n.a.</p> <p>Norway: no information provided</p> <p>Serbia: n.a.</p> <p>Switzerland/Lichtenstein: n.a.</p> <p>UK: There are various legal tools at our disposal to lessen the impacts of pathogens spread by invasive species. The retained EU IAS regulation places strict restrictions on certain species which will, in turn, restrict any pathogens they are carrying. There are trade rules for species that aim to prevent the import of diseased animal stock and we can also control the release of certain species, and their pathogens, into the wild through the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981 and its licencing regime. It is illegal to release any animal into the wild that is not considered ordinarily resident in GB.</p> <p>Ensuring compliance with the variety of legal/policy tools at our disposal is more of a challenge than introducing new legal tools/policy. Improving compliance with the existing suite of tools/powers will likely be more impactful than introducing new powers. We also have “risk identification groups” such as the Human Animal</p>	

Question	Answer	Comments/notes
	<p>Infections and Risk Surveillance group (HAIRS), veterinary risk group (VRG) and the Plant Health Risk Group (PHRG) where such threats can be discussed. This is relatively new legislative field for the UK to manage domestically following our exit from the EU.</p>	