

2000



COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 25 July 2000
[tpvs2000\tpvs35e_2000]

T-PVS (2000) 35

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

20th meeting
Strasbourg, 27 November – 1 December 2000

**Description of the “Specific sites”
case-file system
under the Bern Convention**

by
*Benjamin ROSOUX, Trainee
Directorate of Sustainable Development*

Contents

Introduction	3
I. Administrative and political levels involved in the case-file system	4
1. Administrative bodies	4
2. Groups of experts/Seminars.....	4
3. Contracting Parties	5
4. Complainants	5
II. Development of the procedure	6
1. First files.....	6
2. First written procedure	6
3. Adoption of the revised procedure for “specific sites” case-files	6
III. Application and results	6
1. General remarks	6
2. Follow-up and legal measures	8
Conclusion	9
Appendices	
Table 1 – Overview.....	10
Table 2 – Follow-up of case-files	12

Introduction

There are many international conventions relating to the environment, some of which are more effective than others. How effective a particular convention is very often depends on the monitoring mechanism set up, and this in turn has a significant impact on its value in practice.

The Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats – better known as the “Bern Convention” – was adopted in September 1979 in Bern (Switzerland) and entered into force on 1 June 1982. There are 43 Contracting Parties, including 37 member states of the Council of Europe, and the European Union.

Whereas many international texts remain a dead letter as they lack a monitoring system, the Bern Convention stands out because of its effective implementation and monitoring machinery.

Even though there are no strictly legal remedies in the event of infringements, other than Article 18 – settlement of disputes – the convention’s Standing Committee has developed various relatively effective ways of monitoring the failure to honour the undertakings entered into by Contracting Parties. Rather than as a legally binding system such as the European Union directives, the Bern Convention and its deliberating body, the Standing Committee, were conceived as forums for transnational co-operation, where the Contracting Parties assist each other in problems relating to the conservation of wildlife (fauna and flora) and the natural environment (habitats).

Generally speaking, the Standing Committee’s decisions are taken on the basis of consensus, and it is only very rarely that a majority vote is required, a measure taken as a last resort.

Among the monitoring procedures developed by the Standing Committee is the system of specific sites case-files, which makes it possible to verify application of the convention’s provisions as defined at international level (Council of Europe) in the very local context of habitats and endangered species in a given geographical area. The system ensures that global guidelines can be linked to local action strategies.

Initially, this system was developed in a relatively informal way, and subsequently became more formalised in pursuance of Articles 14 and 18 of the Convention. It has proved to be the most appropriate means of verifying application of the terms of the convention and of providing for individual or collective (NGO) appeals against states which have failed to honour their commitments.

This paper and the appended tables are intended to provide an overview of how the case-file system has developed in practice and been placed on an official footing through written procedure. An assessment will also be made of the various legal effects of the system and of how effective it has been by analysing some of the 76 case-files presented to the Committee since 1982.

I. Administrative and political levels involved in the case-file system

1. Administrative bodies (Council of Europe)

a. Standing Committee

The convention derives much of its legal force from the work of its Standing Committee, an assembly of Parties which discusses and takes the decisions necessary for its application. Each Contracting Party to the convention is entitled to one or more representatives on the Committee, with each Party being given one vote. International or national non-governmental organisations may sit on the committee as observers (in accordance with Article 13 of the convention) and are encouraged to take an active part in discussing the case-files on the agenda. The same is true of international governmental organisations.

The Standing Committee has general responsibility for overall monitoring of the convention. It is required to do all it can to facilitate and improve the monitoring procedures; accordingly, it developed the “specific sites” files system in a quasi-jurisprudential way. As a political decision-making assembly of the convention, the Standing Committee gives practical effect to the actions undertaken, primarily with regard to the files, approving recommendations, declarations and decisions, and providing guidelines for compliance with the commitments entered into.

b. Bureau of the Standing Committee

With a view to improved monitoring of the activities carried out under the convention, the Standing Committee decided it needed a bureau (set up in January 1991). The bureau is able to react more effectively by providing political support which can be quickly mobilised for urgent cases which the Secretariat has to deal with. It is responsible for taking the necessary administrative and organisational decisions between sessions of the Standing Committee.

Above and beyond these technical responsibilities, the Bureau has also been prompted to play a bigger role in processing case-files. This involves advising and guiding the Secretariat in the action to be taken in respect of the Contracting Parties concerned¹.

c. The Secretariat of the Convention

The convention’s monitoring activities are carried out by a secretariat provided by the Council of Europe. It is part of the key mechanisms set up by the Convention in practice, although there is no official reference to it in the text. The Secretariat is the keystone to the monitoring procedure which goes to make the Convention the effective instrument it is². It is a body which services the Standing Committee and follows the guidelines which the latter lays down.

In the context of the “specific sites” case-files, the Secretariat registers all the complaints and claims submitted by NGOs or individuals. It then provides the liaison with the Bureau of the Standing Committee so that a decision can be taken on whether a case-file should be opened or not. Once the case-file has been opened, the Secretariat also provides monitoring continuity by requesting information and regular reports and maintaining ongoing contact with the parties concerned.

2. Groups of experts

The Bern Convention Standing Committee may, in pursuance of Article 14, ask for groups of experts to be set up to look at particular topics. They can meet on a regular or ad hoc basis, depending on requirements.

Their meetings are open to interested NGOs, thereby representing open forums making it possible to carry out detailed monitoring of the implementation of the convention from a scientific point of view and to address specific technical problems.

¹ Jen Sandra, “The Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern, 1979): Procedures of Application in practice”; in *Journal of International Wildlife Law and Policy* vol. 2:2, 1999, p 230.

² Jen Sandra, *ibid.*, p. 231

The groups of experts have proved to be most valuable in dealing with particular cases by preparing “specific” draft recommendations, particularly with regard to protection measures for certain species. As regards the “case-files” strictly speaking, the groups of experts are able to steer the Standing Committee’s action by proposing the texts of recommendations. This was what happened with the file on the species *Vipera ursini rakosiensis* in Hungary (Standing Committee, January 1991: REC23 – cf table 2, file no. 33). Such an arrangement is relatively rare since it presupposes that a group of experts on the topic in question meet during the period when the case-file is opened.

3. Contracting Parties

At present, in the year 2000, the Bern Convention has 43 Contracting Parties (countries which have both signed and ratified), including 37 Council of Europe member states, plus Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Senegal, Tunisia, Monaco and the European Community. The Contracting Parties play different roles in the case-file system. Clearly, each delegation acts in line with its political priorities and diplomatic considerations which have a clear influence on particular attitudes to the opening and monitoring of a case-file until recommendations are adopted. In such cases, when it is a question of finding that there have been infringements of the convention, the Standing Committee’s supervisory procedure is highly political. States accused of infringements are subject to international judgement of their management of sites or species classified by the convention. The effective influence of the Standing Committee’s decisions is difficult to assess in terms of practical results. Nonetheless, it would appear that the pressure exerted by Contracting Parties jointly through nature conservation NGOs and the Standing Committee’s opinion is often enough to bring about a speedy institutional response to the problem raised by the opening of the case-file. Certain Contracting Parties can play a more dynamic role; if an NGO wishes to put forward a recommendation, it needs the support of at least one of the Contracting Parties; the latter then adopts a critical position of the country in question.

4. Complainants

a. Non-governmental organisations

Non-governmental organisations, “technically qualified in the protection, conservation or management of wild fauna and flora and their habitats”, may attend meetings of the Standing Committee as observers. Pursuant to Article 13.3, they may obtain observer status on request from the Secretary General at least three months prior to the Committee’s meeting. For international organisations, such requests are granted unless at least one third of Contracting Parties raise an objection within this time. However, in the case of a national organisation, the request may be granted only if it is accepted in the country of the organisation concerned.

Observers’ rights and restrictions are laid down in Article 9 of the Rules of Procedure. They are also entitled to make oral or written declarations with the authorisation of a delegation or the chair of the session. Moreover, as has already been pointed out, they can make a proposal for a vote provided they obtain the support of at least one delegation.

The role of NGOs in the case-files system is often decisive. Frequently, it is often only via these organisations that it is possible to gauge how provisions of the convention are being applied in specific cases and indeed, the majority of cases which have led to the opening of files have been notified by national or international NGOs. Such organisations, carrying out their own on-the-spot investigations are a key source of information for processing files. They also often play a major role in informing public opinion (awareness-raising campaigns) which in many cases has led to a de facto resolution to the problem, and ensured that the Standing Committee’s recommendations are applied through constant pressure on the competent authorities.

In certain cases, these organisations offer advice on improving procedures. For example, in 1992 the WWF, the RSPB and the SHE presented a proposal concerning the application of recommendations and the opening and closing of case-files on specific sites³. This proposal prompted work on formalising these procedures.

³ Déjeant-Pons Maguelonne, «La Diversité Biologique et les Droits de l’Homme: La contribution de la Convention de Berne Relative à la Conservation de la Vie Sauvage et du Milieu Naturel de l’Europe» (Biological Diversity and Human Rights: the contribution of the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats), *Les Droits de l’Homme au seuil du troisième Millénaire (Human rights at the threshold of the third millennium)*, Bruyant Publications, Brussels, 2000, pp 292-293.

b. Individuals and groups of individuals

It is not only the Secretariat or NGOs who give notification of breaches leading to the opening of files. Under Article 1a of the procedure adopted in 1993⁴, the Secretariat also looks at claims from individuals and groups of individuals.

II. Development of the procedure

1. First case-files

The Bern Convention case-file system existed in practice before there was any legal trace of it in the convention or any other reference document. Back in 1982, two “case-files” were opened and placed on the agenda of the first Standing Committee meeting: “Gran Sasso” and “valle Furlana”. Both cases immediately led to the two first recommendations of the Standing Committee, and were not included on the agenda of the following meetings. Strictly speaking, they did not establish a procedure, as at that stage no monitoring procedure had been envisaged, it was merely a question of specific sites requiring explicit recommendations.

2. First written procedure

With the advent of a systematic approach to notification of infringements at specific sites, a large part of the agenda was taken up with considering and discussing such cases. With effect from its third meeting in 1984, the Standing Committee formally accepted the principle of case-file system and laid down guidelines for the processing of complaints received by the Secretariat (T-PVS (84) 20; Appendix III, point I.6.). However, no official procedure was adopted. It was just a text stipulating the necessary conditions to ensure the seriousness of cases brought before the Committee, without prejudging any steps which might be taken.

3. Adoption of the revised procedure for “specific sites” case-files

At the request of observer NGOs (Cf. I-4-a), work began on rationalising the monitoring procedure leading to a vote on “recommendations to parties”. This work resulted in a number of proposals. The proposal accepted and amended by the Committee was properly formatted and “provisionally” adopted in 1995 at the 14th meeting (T-PVS (95) 12). Most of the provisions merely reflect what had become the Committee’s customary practice over the preceding years and incorporate the various approaches followed.

III. Application and results

1. General remarks

The Convention Secretariat, since its inception, has received what has been estimated at more than 400 complaints of infringements of the Convention by Contracting Parties. At the 18 Standing Committee meetings since 1982, 76 of these complaints have resulted in the opening of case-files. The number of cases looked at by the Committee’s meetings rose very quickly: from two and then one in 1982 and 1983 to 18 in 1991. Over the whole period covered, there has been a sharp rise in this trend: while for the first nine meetings (1982 to 1991) there was an average of 8.1 “special sites” case-files on the agenda, the average for the following nine meetings was 15.4 files per session.

⁴ T-PVS (95) 12 “Opening and closing of files – and follow-up to recommendations” (completed version)

- Reason for the opening of case-files in percentages:

Habitats	30%	(3% for wetlands)
Birds	22%	
Amphibians and reptiles	21%	(10% for sea turtles alone)
Mammals	16%	
Invertebrates	3%	
Miscellaneous	10%	(multiple species)

- The situation with regard to the average time from the opening of a file until the matter is resolved is as follows (only the years when the Standing Committee met are counted; some years when there were two meetings count for double):

- 47% have been resolved (or no longer discussed) and closed after two years (appearing on the agenda once or twice),
- 37.5% were closed after four years,
- 15.5% were closed after six years

Only two files have remained open and unresolved for longer than this: “Missolonghi Wetlands” (no. 39 in the tables) which is still open after 8 years, and “Laganas Bay, Zakynthos” (no. 16) which was closed after 14 years with no positive result (1999).

- Breakdown of case-files by Contracting Party concerned:

Greece	11
Spain	9
United Kingdom	9
France	8
Turkey	7
Italy	6
Netherlands	6
Cyprus	3
Germany	3
Ireland	3
Austria	2
Hungary	1
Luxembourg	1
Norway	1
Poland	1
Portugal	1
Senegal	1
Sweden	1
Switzerland	1
Several states	1

2. Follow-up and legal measures

a. Recommendations

For specific cases such as those raised by the follow-up files of infringements by Contracting Parties, the Standing Committee is required to vote on “specific recommendations” (as opposed to “general recommendations”). These recommendations are the official expression of the Standing Committee’s decisions on a particular case-file and offer guidance to the party or parties concerned on the measures to be taken so as to comply with the provisions of the convention.

Of the 76 case-files opened, 22 have resulted in a recommendation (see the table for details), representing 27.8% of all recommendations adopted by the Committee.

Following adoption of a recommendation, the party or parties concerned are required to present a report on developments in the situation and the measures taken to apply the terms of the recommendation in question.

b. On-the-spot visits

The rules of procedure stipulate that in the event of difficulty or doubt as to the measures to be taken in a particular case and if further information is required, the Committee may, if it should prove necessary given the presumed gravity of the situation, ask an expert appointed by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe to carry out an on-the-spot appraisal. The expert in question must be accompanied by a member of the Secretariat and a representative of the Party concerned.

Since the first such visit in 1987 to Laganas Bay (Zakynthos, Greece), eleven on-the-spot visits have been made, including - and so far this is the only time this has occurred - a second appraisal in Laganas Bay. (see tables 1 and 2).

c. Declarations and decisions: the “Zakynthos” file

Although the “Laganas Bay, Zakynthos” file, concerning conservation of the nesting beaches for the marine turtle (*Caretta caretta*) on this Greek island has not been satisfactorily resolved, it has nevertheless provided the opportunity to explore, over a 14-year period, the various resources of the convention and the Standing Committee’s means of action.

Not only has this file resulted in two on-the-spot visits, it also prompted a diversification of the Committee’s forms of action. Having led to Recommendation no. 9 in 1987, it resulted in the adoption of two new types of text – a “declaration” and a “decision”.

A “declaration” is an official text adopted by the Standing Committee comprising information for the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. It derives from Article 15 of the Convention which provides for the submission of Standing Committee activity reports to the Committee of Ministers. The first specific declaration resulting from the “Laganas Bay” file dates from 1992 (12th meeting of the Standing Committee), and describes the failure of the Convention to resolve the problem:

“From the Standing Committee’s point of view, it has not been possible to find an acceptable balance between tourism and conservation” (T-PVS (92) 84, Appendix 10)

Pointing out that the Standing Committee had done all in its power, it sought to draw the Committee of Ministers’ attention to this case.

The second declaration was adopted at the following meeting, in 1993, and merely noted that Greece was still failing to comply with its commitments, and called for a special meeting to discuss possible solutions to the case (T-PVS (93) 48 / 6.1).

As no acceptable solution could be found during subsequent meetings, the Standing Committee adopted two decisions in 1995 and 1999. The first was in the form of a solemn warning to Greece, “urging” the government to implement the conservation provisions contained in Recommendation no. 9, failing which it would be accused of a serious and repeated infringement of the Bern Convention. The second decision, in 1999, closed the file on a final note of failure, and handed over the case to the Court of Justice of the European Communities.

Conclusion

Many cases placed on the Standing Committee's agenda never lead to the official opening of a case-file or, therefore, to a recommendation. Often the mere initiation of the procedure by the Secretariat (official request for information to Contracting Parties) is enough to prompt an appropriate response from parties and the case-file is never opened (23 "case-files" have never proceeded further than a discussion in the Standing Committee – cf tables 1 and 2 in the appendix).

Such a situation can often be explained by the work of the NGOs which, in referring the problem to an international instrument such as the Bern Convention, call on the international community to exert more political pressure on governments. More often than not, the countries concerned are eager to respond in order to avoid a case-file being opened.

Lastly, although one might criticise the Bern Convention for its lack of binding legal remedies, which could make for greater effectiveness in the enforcement of recommendations on specific cases, it is nevertheless relatively effective given that it is an international convention of a diplomatic nature. The co-operational and inter-state nature of the Bern Convention, as with all the Council of Europe conventions, requires there to be considerable procedural flexibility, leaving room for more informal political mechanisms, which have very often proved most successful.

Appendix

Table 1 – Overview

Rec = recommendation – OSA = On-the-spot appraisal – Dec = Decision

	Case files/ Dossiers	Country/ Etat	Object	Cause	First discussion	Notified by	follow-up actions	Final settlement
1	<i>Gran Sasso</i>	Italy	habitat	wintersports centre	Sept-82		rec1 (82)	no file open
2	<i>Valle Furlana</i>	Italy	habitat	Hunting	Sept-82	CCSEVAP	rec2 (82)	no file open
3	<i>Wadden Sea</i>	Netherlands	birds	protected area	Nov-83			closed in 84
4	<i>Hainburg alluvial forest</i>	Austria	habitat	dam/barrage	Dec-84			provisionally closed in 89
5	<i>Inch Level, Donegal</i>	Ireland	birds	Drainage	Dec-84			file not opened
6	<i>Halvergate Marshes</i>	UK	birds		Dec-84			file not opened
7	<i>Benone Wetlands</i>	UK	birds		Dec-84			file not opened
8	<i>Wetlands in Ravenna</i>	Italy	Wetlands + birds		Dec-84	WWF Italian section		file not opened
9	<i>Spring shooting</i>	Greece	birds	Hunting	Dec-84		rec5 (86)	file not opened
10	<i>Hunting of Migratory Birds</i>	Cyprus	birds	Hunting	Dec-84	NSPB	rec5 (86)	file closed in 86
11	<i>St Pietersberg Limestone</i>	Netherlands	mammal (bats)	Tunnel building	Dec-85			file not opened
12	<i>Duich Peat moss</i>	UK	habitat	Drainage+ Plant (distillery)	Dec-85	RSPB		closed in 88
13	<i>Markemeer</i>	Netherlands	Wetlands + birds	?	Dec-85	NSPB		closed in 86
14	<i>Lake Akrotiri</i>	Cyprus	birds	sewage plant	Dec-86	ICBP		file not opened
15	<i>Dalyan Beach</i>	Turkey	turtle		Dec-86	Netherlands delegation	rec8 (87)	closed in 91
16	<i>Laganas Bay, Zakynthos</i>	Greece	turtle	Tourist development	Dec-86	MEDASSET/ STPS	rec9 +OSA (87); measures proposed; OSA (89);decl 92/93; visit.	evicted in 99
17	<i>Grencher Witi</i>	Switzerland	habitat	Motorway	Dec-87	Secretariat		closed in Dec-91
18	<i>Alluvial Forest of Rastatt</i>	F.R.Germany	habitat	plant building	Dec-87	WWF(-RFA)		closed in 89
19	<i>Hares Down and Knowston Moors</i>	UK	habitat	Road	Dec-87	DTNC		not opened
20	<i>Vikos-Aoos Nat. Park</i>	Greece	habitat	Road	Dec-87			not opened
21	<i>Sorgenti del fiume Pescara</i>	Italy	birds	Motorway	Dec-87		OSA ; rec32 (91)	closed in Dec91
22	<i>Clafarinas Islands</i>	Spain	birds	military operations	Dec-87	Secretariat		closed in 87
23	<i>Santona Marshes</i>	Spain	habitat	urban expansion	Dec-87	Secretariat		closed in Dec91
24	<i>Cabrespine Cave</i>	France	mammals (bats)	cave visitors	Dec-87			closed in Jan 91
25	<i>Hopa</i>	Turkey	reptile	Capture	Dec-88			not opened
26	<i>Moray Firth (Scotland)</i>	UK	Mammals (dolphins)	sewage sea-outfall	Dec-89			closed in Jan 91
27	<i>poisoned baits</i>	Greece	several	use of poisoned baits	Dec-89	Secretariat		closed in Jan 91
28	<i>Dam of Vidrieros</i>	Spain	Bear + an.II species	Dam	Dec-89	Secretariat	OSA (91); rec37(92)	closed in Dec 92
29	<i>Castlegregory</i>	Ireland	amphibian	golf course	Dec-89		rec33 (Dec91)	closed in Dec 92
30	<i>Dry heath in Dorset</i>	UK	habitat	planning permission	Dec-89	WWF/S.E.H	OSA (91) (98) rec67	closed in Dec 98
31	<i>Podarcis muralis</i>	Netherlands	reptile	site protection	Dec-89	S.E.H		closed in Jan-91
32	<i>Gulf of Orosei</i>	Italy	amphibian	economic/tourist development	Dec-89	S.E.H	OSA (91) rec42(93)	closed in Jan-91
33	<i>Vipera ursini rakosiensis</i>	Hungary	reptile		Jan-91	dealt with by a group of experts	rec23 (Jan91)	closed in Jan-91
34	<i>La Loire</i>	France	habitat	various problems	Jan-91	Secretariat		closed in Dec91
35	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Sweden	amphibian		Jan-91	S.E.H		closed Dec.91
36	<i>Bufo calamita</i>	Austria	amphibian		Jan-91	S.E.H		closed Dec-92
37	<i>Bufo viridis</i>	Germany	amphibian		Jan-91	S.E.H		closed in 93
38	<i>Vipera wagneri</i>	Turkey + several destination countries	reptile	trade/commerce	Dec-91	S.E.H		closed in Dec 91
39	<i>Missolonghi Wetlands</i>	Greece	birds	dam+irrigation	Dec-92	RSPB + others through Mr L. Rose	rec38(92)	file open in 99
40	<i>Vipera lebetina schweizeri in Milos</i>	Greece	reptile	mining sites	Dec-92	Secretariat		file open in 99
41	<i>Caretta caretta in Patara</i>	Turkey	turtle	building projects	Dec-92	MEDASSET	OSA(95); rec54	file open in 99
42	<i>Testudo hermanni in Maures</i>	France	reptile	wheel tires' trial road	Dec-93	SEH/ SNPN		closed in 97
43	<i>Iruena (Salamanca province)</i>	Spain	habitat	Dam	Dec-93	The Greens	OSA(95); rec46	closed in Dec 96
44	<i>Ursus arcto in the Pyrenees</i>	France	mammal	Tunnel+motorway	Dec-93	MEPs		closed in 97
45	<i>Totes Moors (Saxony)</i>	Germany	reptile	peat extraction	Dec-93			closed in 97
46	<i>Wind Farm in Tarifa</i>	Spain	birds	Windmills	Mar-95	Birdlife International/ SEO		
47	<i>Itoiz (Navarra)</i>	Spain	habitat + birds	Dam	Mar-95			closed in Dec 96
48	<i>Grunwald forest</i>	Luxemburg	habitat	Road	Jan-96	Secretariat	OSA (96)	closed in 98

	Case files/ Dossiers	Country/ Etat	Object	Cause	First discussion	Notified by	follow-up actions	Final settlement
49	<i>Phoca vitulina</i> in Baie de Somme	France	mammal	destruction of explosives	Jan-96	C.Baie de Somme Picardie Nature		closed 97
50	<i>Galloccanta marshes</i>	Spain	birds	Agriculture	Jan-96			closed in Dec 96
51	<i>Akamas peninsula</i>	Cyprus	habitat	tourist development	Dec-96	SEH/MEDASSET	OSA (97); rec 63	file open in 99
52	<i>Biltzheim forest</i>	France	habitat	motor-racing circuit	Dec-96	SNPN	rec 55 (Dec 96)	file not opened
53	<i>Caretta caretta</i> in Kamimia	Greece	turtle	tourist resort project	Dec-96	MEDASSET	rec 64 (97)	file open in 99
54	<i>Porto (Island of Tinos)</i>	Greece	habitat	building work	Dec-96			closed in 97
55	<i>Testudo marginata</i>	Greece	reptile	Various	Dec-96			closed in 97
56	<i>Introduction of exotic bees</i>	Portugal	insects	threatening of local bees	Dec-96			file not opened
57	<i>Trade in Caretta caretta</i>	Senegal	turtle	trade/commerce	Dec-96			file not opened
58	<i>Trionyx triunguis</i>	Turkey	turtle	various water-course exploitation	Dec-96			file not opened
59	<i>Rana holtzi</i>	Turkey	amphibian	lack of legal protection	Dec-96	S.E.H		file not opened
60	<i>Burdur Lake</i>	Turkey	birds	industrial complex	Dec-96	Birdlife International		file not opened
61	<i>Orton Brick pits</i>	UK	amphibian	urbanisation	Dec-96	SEH / WWF-int.	rec 70	closed in 98
62	<i>Lacerta agilis</i>	Netherlands	reptile		Dec-96			closed in 97
63	<i>Rhine-Rhone Grand Canal project</i>	France		canal building	Dec-97	Secretariat		file not opened
64	<i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	UK	birds	Invasive specie	Dec-97	SEO-Birdlife	rec 61	file closed in 99
65	<i>Bialowiesia Forest</i>	Poland	habitat	non-sustainable logging	Dec-98	Birdlife International		file not opened
66	<i>Cricetus cricetus</i> in Alsace	France	mammal	Agriculture	Dec-98	various local NGOs	rec 68	file closed in 99
67	<i>Lake Vistonis and Lafra-Lafrouda Lagoon</i>	Greece	habitat	anti-floods engineering work	Dec-98	Birdlife International		info required
68	<i>Caretta caretta</i> in Belek	Turkey	turtle	yacht-marina building	Dec-98	WWF-int.+ DHKD		file closed in 99
69	<i>Meles meles</i>	UK	mammal	government trial including killing European badgers	Dec-98	several British / Dutch NGOS (Doom & Bas)	rec 69	closed in 99
70	<i>Donana National Park</i>	Spain	habitat	dam destruction + possible pollution	Dec-98	SEO-Birdlife		file not opened
71	<i>Meles meles</i> in Ireland	Ireland	mammal	trial including badger capture	Dec-99	Mrs Nuala Ahern MEP		'possible new file'
72	<i>Ursus arcto</i>	Greece	mammal	Motorway	Dec-99	ARCTUROS		'possible new file'
73	<i>Canis lupus</i>	Norway	mammal	permission to kill a pair of wolves	Dec-99	Norwegian Carnivore & Raptors Society		'possible new file'
74	<i>Sciurus vulgaris</i>	Italy	mammal	complaints on a grey squirrel eradication campaign	Dec-99	INFS	rec78 (99)	file not opened
75	<i>"El Regajal" Nature Reserve</i>	Spain	invertebrates	Motorway	Dec-99	Mr Viejo (university of Madrid)		file not opened
76	<i>Cricetus cricetus</i>	Netherlands	mammal	hamster conservation plan	Dec-99	Badger to Bear Foundation		file open in 99

Table 2 – Follow-up of case files

D = discussed – REC = recommendation – OSA = On-the-spot appraisal – DECL = Declaration – DEC = Decision

	Case files/ Dossiers	Country	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	91	91bis	92	93	95	96	96bis	97	98	99
1	Gran Sasso	Italy	D + REC.1																	
2	Valle Furlana	Italy	D + REC.2																	
3	Wadden Sea	Netherlands		D	D															
4	Hainburg alluvial forest	Austria			D	D	D	D	D	D										
5	Inch Level, Donegal	Ireland			D															
6	Halvergate Marshes	UK			D															
7	Benone Wetlands	UK			D															
8	Wetlands in Ravenna	Italy			D															
9	Spring shooting	Greece			D															
10	Hunting of Migratory Birds	Cyprus			D	D	D + RECS													
11	St Pietersberg Limestone	Netherlands				D														
12	Duich Peat moss	UK				D	D	D	D											
13	Markemeer	Netherlands				D														
14	Lake Akrotiri	Cyprus					D													
15	Dalyan Beach	Turkey					D	D +REC8	D	D	D									
16	Laganas Bay, Zakynthos	Greece					D	D + OSA; REC9	D	D + OSA(2);	D	D	D + DECL.	D + DECL	D		D	D	D	D + DEC.
17	Grencher Witi	Switzerland						D	D	D	D	D								
18	Alluvial Forest of Rastatt	F.R. Germany						D	D	D										
19	Hares Down and Knowston Moors	UK						D												
20	Vikos-Aoos Nat. Park	Greece						D												
21	Sorgenti del fiume Pescara	Italy						D	D	D	D + OSA	D + REC32								
22	Clafarinas Islands	Spain						D												
23	Santona Marshes	Spain						D	D	D	D	D								
24	Cabrespine Cave	France						D	D	D	D									
25	Hopa	Turkey								D						D		D	D +OSA	
26	Moray Firth (Scotland)	UK								D	D									
27	poisoned baits	Greece								D	D									
28	Dam of Vidrieros	Spain								D	D	D	D + OSA; REC.37							
29	Castlegregory	Ireland									D	D + OSA; REC.33	D							
30	Dry heath in Dorset	UK									D	D	D					D	D + REC67	
31	Podarcis muralis	Netherlands									D									
32	Gulf of Orosei	Italy										D	D + OSA	D + REC.42						
33	Vipera ursini rakosiensis	Hungary									D + REC23									
34	La Loire	France									D	D								
35	Hyla arborea	Sweden									D	D								
36	Bufo calamita	Austria									D	D	D							
37	Bufo viridis	Germany									D	D	D	D						
38	Vipera wagneri	Turkey + several destination countries									D	D								
39	Missolonghi Wetlands	Greece										D	D + REC38	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
40	Vipera lebetina schweizeri (Milos)	Greece										D			D	D	D	D	D	D + OSA
41	Caretta caretta in Patara	Turkey										D	D		D		D + RECS4; OSA	D	D	D
42	Testudo hermanni in Maures	France												D	D	D	D	D		
43	Iruena (Salamanca province)	Spain												D		D + REC46; OSA	D			
44	Ursus arcto in the Pyrenees	France												D	D	D	D	D		

