



Strasbourg, 29 July 2022

T-PVS/PA(2022)08

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

**Standing Committee**

42<sup>nd</sup> meeting

Strasbourg, 29 November - 2 December 2022

**First Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting**

15<sup>th</sup> June 2022, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm (CEST)

---

**-MEETING REPORT-**

*Document prepared by  
the Secretariat of the Bern Convention*

---

**The meeting of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting was held virtually on 15 June 2022.**

The Standing Committee is invited to:

- Take note of the report of the meeting of the Ad hoc Working Group;
- Take note of the outcomes of the discussion regarding the purpose of the reporting;
- Welcome the ongoing work on the Reference Lists for the Emerald Network and acknowledge that they constitute a basis for the creation of Checklists for the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012);
- Welcome the national summary dashboards created for the first reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for the period 2013 – 2018.

### **1. Opening of the meeting and welcome to the participants by the Secretariat**

The Secretariat of the Bern Convention opened the meeting, welcomed the participants and recalled the salient points of the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting adopted by the 41<sup>st</sup> Standing Committee (document [T-PVS/PA\(2021\)06](#)).

### **2. Election of the Chair of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting**

Mr James Williams (United Kingdom) was elected as Chair of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting.

### **3. Purpose of the Reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012)**

The Secretariat introduced the agenda item by recalling the content of the background papers, namely:

- a 2017 legal study on reporting requirements (document [T-PVS/Inf \(2017\)11](#)),
- a survey carried out among 17 non-EU Contracting Parties on their experience from the past reporting and their expectations for the future reporting (document [T-PVS/PA\(2021\)04](#)), and
- a reflection on the purpose of the reporting (document [T-PVS/PA\(2022\)05](#))

In the subsequent discussion, a number of participants representing Contracting Parties acknowledged that the reporting was too complex and cumbersome and that an easier way should be identified to measure whether conservation measures are effective in the future. Concerns were also expressed around aligning with reporting that countries already undertake, and making sure that the reporting under Resolution 8 is relevant for Contracting Parties to use for their own purposes. While recognising the substantial resources involved for Contracting Parties to complete the reporting, the representative of the European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity stated that no other means existed to look at the state of nature and that data deriving from it facilitated discussing policy across sectors and provided evidence of conservation gaps, as well as pressures and threats to enable policy making for change.

The representatives of Norway and Switzerland recognised that more relevant national monitoring tools and measures were available. The representative of Norway further commented that not all the features of the Resolutions No. 4 (1996) and No. 6 (1998) were important, and that national Red Lists are more considered in his country.

The representative of the UK, focused on species and habitats identified by the Bern Convention and how reporting on those would be helpful. Given difficulties of translation of habitat features between Annex I of the Habitats Directive and Resolution No. 4 (1996), it was noted that it would not be possible to add data together for many habitat features on a 1:1 basis. The reporting under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive had been a lot more expensive than that under Article 12 of the Birds Directive. The perception was that the reporting had increased in complexity, and the UK expressed the wish for simplification. The results of the reporting have not been used very much in national processes.

An NGO representative stated that the reporting was useful to discover weak links in the data. A level of reporting that every Contracting Party can contribute to was necessary.

The representative of Slovakia noted the increase in cost and complexity in moving from expert judgements to collection of data on individual species and habitats.

#### **4. Reference list of species and habitats**

Marc Roekaerts introduced the Draft Reference Lists for species and habitats for the development of the Emerald Network and suggestions for the creation of the Checklist for species and habitats under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for non-EU Contracting Parties (document [T-PVS/PA\(2022\)04](#)).

He stressed the difference between Emerald Network Reference Lists which list which species (Resolution No. 6 (1998)) and which habitats (Resolution No. 4 (1996)) occur in which country and biogeographical region, and are subject of site-based conservation measures and Checklists for the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) which could also include all features of potential conservation concern in a territory (such as vagrants, irregular visitors, etc.)

Marc Roekaerts informed the group that there was a need to create a compilation of agreed Reference Lists to clearly identify the features from Resolution No. 4 (1996) and Resolution No. 6 (1998) for which sites are to be selected in the network. Draft Reference Lists based on the existing Emerald Network sufficiency conclusions would exist for 17 Parties after the biogeographical evaluations in Iceland and Liechtenstein. Contracting Parties which did not have an Emerald Network should identify the features from Resolution No. 4 (1996) and Resolution No. 6 (1998) present in their country to elaborate their Reference List. The Emerald Network data for the UK originated from the Natura 2000 database before the UK left the EU. The Reference List for the UK would be based on the Natura 2000 evaluation process.

He further stated that the consolidated Reference Lists for the Emerald Network were a good basis for the creation of the Checklists for the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012).

Discussion centred on the difference between the Reference Lists for the Emerald Network, and Checklists for reporting, in particular whether vagrants should be included in the list of species for reporting; including vagrants would make the lists more comprehensive, but it was likely that there would be little that a Contracting Party could say about them – because they are irregular visitors. The consensus was that the Reference Lists would need to be further discussed once they have been prepared, and that further consideration of the inclusion or exclusion of vagrants in the checklists was needed.

#### **5. National summary dashboards of the first reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012)**

At the request of several Contracting Parties, asking to see further analysis of the outcomes of the reporting on the conservation status of species and habitats carried out in 2019, [national summary dashboard](#) were created.

The dashboards aimed to display a summary of the data reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012) by non-EU Parties, merged with data delivered by EU Parties under Articles 17 and 12 of the EU Habitats and Birds Directives for the same subset of features.

Data were grouped according to the following themes:

- Number of habitats and species per Country
- Conservation status and trends of habitats and species
- Main pressures and threats
- Data completeness and quality

It was acknowledged that the number of features reported was rather limited and not many high-level conclusions could be made with the data, however the tool was considered to be informative. The dashboards should raise awareness of the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) and be used as a tool to foster ideas and plan future reporting rounds. It was noted that the dashboards reflect the content of the reports, and should not be seen as an overview of the status of all biodiversity in a country.

## **6. Next steps**

It was stated that the purpose of the reporting under the Bern Convention required further consideration. A written consultation of members of the Ad-hoc Working Group would be carried out to further clarify what is expected to be achieved through the reporting and by when.

It was considered to hold another meeting in November 2022.

Members of the Ad hoc Working Group agreed to further elaborate the Emerald Network Reference Lists for all non-EU Contracting Parties and to pursue the reflection on the Checklists for the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012).

## **7. Other business**

None.

## **8. Closing of the Meeting**

The chair thanked the participants for their inputs and closed the meeting.

## Appendix 1 - Agenda

### 1. Opening of the meeting and welcome to the participants by the Secretariat

[List of members of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting – T-PVS/PA(2022)01]

[Mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting – [T-PVS/PA\(2021\)06](#)]

### 2. Election of the Chair of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Reporting

### 3. Purpose of the Reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012)

[Opinions about the reporting under the Resolution No. 8 (2012): assessment of the past reporting exercise and pointers for the future – [T-PVS/PA\(2021\)04](#)]

[Purpose of the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) – [T-PVS/PA\(2022\)05](#)] *published on 3 June*

[Emerald Network reporting requirements under the Bern Convention: a legal analysis – [T-PVS/Inf \(2017\)11](#)] *published on 3 June*

### 4. Next steps

### 5. Reference list of species and habitats

[Draft Reference Lists for species and habitats for the development of the Emerald Network And suggestions for the creation of the Checklist for species and habitats under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for non-EU Contracting Parties– [T-PVS/PA\(2022\)04](#)]

### 6. National summary dashboards of the first reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012)

[National summary dashboards \(coe.int\)](#)

- [Number of habitats and species reported per country and per biogeographical region](#)
- [Conservation status and trends of habitats and species](#)
- [Main pressures and threats](#)
- [Data completeness and quality](#)

### 7. Other business

## Appendix 2 – List of participants

<b>I. CONTRACTING PARTIES</b>	
<b>Member States</b>	<b>Representative</b>
<b>CZECH REPUBLIC</b>	<p><b>Ms Eliška ROLFOVÁ</b> Bern Convention, Carpathian Convention and Nagoya Protocol NFP Unit of International Conventions Department of Species Protection and Implementation of International Commitments Ministry of the Environment</p> <p><b>Mr Jan PLESNÍK</b> Nature Conservation Agency</p>
<b>HUNGARY</b>	<p><b>Ms Éva FEJES</b> Biodiversity Advisor Ministry of Agriculture Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Department</p>
<b>REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA</b>	<p><b>Ms Veronica JOSU</b> Main Advisory Officer Biodiversity Policies Department Ministry of Environment</p> <p><b>Ms Angela LOZAN</b> Project Manager Environmental Projects Implementation Unit Ministry of Environment</p>
<b>NORWAY</b>	<p><b>Mr Tore OPDAHL</b> Senior Adviser, Protected Areas Section Norwegian Environment Agency</p> <p><b>Mr Endre GRÜNER OFSTAD</b> Threatened Biodiversity Section Norwegian Environment Agency</p>
<b>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</b>	<p><b>Mr Jan CERNECKY</b> State Nature Conservancy</p> <p><b>Mr Andrea LESOVA</b> State Nature Conservancy</p>
<b>SWITZERLAND</b>	<p><b>Mme Danielle HOFMANN</b> Point focal pour la Suisse Office fédéral de l'environnement OFEV Division Biodiversité et paysage Section Faune sauvage et conservation des espèces</p>
<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b>	<p><b>Mr James WILLIAMS</b> Biodiversity Indicators Manager International Advice Team Joint Nature Conservation Committee</p> <p><b>Ms Willow OUTHWAITE</b> Senior International Biodiversity Advisor International Advice Team Joint Nature Conservation Committee</p> <p><b>Mr Keith BARBER</b> Senior Policy Advisor Species Recovery</p>

	<p>National Biodiversity Defra</p> <p><b>Ms Kerry VITALIS</b> Senior Policy Advisor Habitats National Biodiversity Defra</p>
--	--

## II. OBSERVERS

Observers	Representative
<b>BirdLife</b>	<b>Mr Willem VAN DEN BOSSCHE</b> Senior Flyway Conservation Officer for Europe & Central Asia, Stichting BirdLife Europe, BirdLife International
<b>CBD Convention on Biological Diversity</b>	<b>Ms Sakhile Silitshena KOKETSO</b> Head of Biodiversity Science Policy and Governance Unit  <b>Ms Edjigayehu SEYOUM-EDJIGU</b> Area-based Conservation Consultant
<b>European Environment Agency</b>	<b>Ms Stéphanie HUDIN</b> <b>Deputy Manager</b> Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity  <b>Ms Laura-Patricia GAVILAN IGLESIAS</b> Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity
<b>FACE</b>	<b>Ms Sabrina DIETZ</b> European Federation for Hunting and Conservation Wildlife Policy Officer
<b>Pro Natura – Friends of the Earth Switzerland</b>	<b>Mr Friedrich WULF</b> International Biodiversity Officer

## III. SPEAKERS

<b>Mr Otars OPERMANIS</b>	Expert and Technical Consultant to the Bern Convention for the setting up of the Emerald Network (Latvia)
<b>Mr Marc ROEKAERTS</b>	Scientific and Technical Consultant to the Bern Convention for the setting-up of the Emerald Network (Belgium)

## IV. SECRETARIAT OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Directorate General of Democracy (DGII), Directorate of Democratic Participation Bern Convention	
<b>Ms Ursula STICKER</b>	Secretary of the Bern Convention
<b>Mr Marc HORY</b>	Project Manager
<b>Ms Helena ORSULIC</b>	Secretarial assistant