

Strasbourg, 18 November 2016  
[MiscE.docx]

**T-PVS (2016) Misc**

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

**Standing Committee**

36<sup>th</sup> meeting

Strasbourg, 15-18 November 2016  
Palais de l'Europe, Room 5

---

**LIST OF DECISIONS  
AND ADOPTED TEXTS**

*Memorandum of the Secretariat  
established by  
the Directorate of Democratic Governance*

## CONTENT

<b>List of decisions.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Recommendation No. 185 (2016) on the eradication of the ruddy duck ( <i>Oxyura jamaicensis</i> ) in the Western Palearctic by 2020 ..... [document T-PVS (2016) 3]	20
Recommendation No. 186 (2016) on the conservation and recovery of the osprey ( <i>Pandion haliaetus</i> ) in Europe ..... [document T-PVS (2016) 8]	24
Recommendation No. 187 (2016) on communicating on climate change and biodiversity ..... [document T-PVS (2016) 19]	26
Recommendation No. 188 (2016) on the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and Invasive Alien Species ..... [document T-PVS (2016) 23]	28
Recommendation No. 189 (2016) on the control of the American mink ( <i>Neovison vison</i> ) in Europe..... [document T-PVS (2016) 13]	35
Recommendation No. 190 (2016) on the conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, specially birds, in afforestation of lowland in Iceland..... [document T-PVS/Files (2016) 42]	37
Recommendation No. 191 (2016) on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula and the sea turtle nesting beaches of Chrysochou Bay (Cyprus) ..... [document T-PVS/Files (2016) 44]	40
Appendix I - Proposed amendment to Article 9 of the revised regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas.....	43
Appendix II - Updated list of officially nominated candidate Emerald sites.....	45
Appendix III – Updated list of officially adopted Emerald sites .....	46
Appendix IV - Programme of activities and budget of the Bern convention for the year 2017.....	47

## **PART I – OPENING**

### **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 1 - Draft agenda  
T-PVS (2016) 24 - Annotated draft agenda

The Chair, Mr Øystein Størkersen, opened the 36<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2016 at 9:30 am. The draft agenda was adopted with two small amendments to the order of discussion of the agenda items.

### **2. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE DELEGATIONS AND FROM THE SECRETARIAT**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 10 and 21 - Reports of the Bureau meetings in March and September 2016  
T-PVS (2015) 30 – Report of the 35<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee meeting

The Committee took note of the communications from the Secretariat and the Chair and welcomed the good results achieved in the implementation of the Programme of Work of the Convention in 2016. The Committee thanked the Parties which have contributed financially to the annual budget of the Convention.

The delegate of the Russian Federation expressed satisfaction to see the Emerald Network high on the agenda of the Committee. The country has been engaged in the work on the setting-up of the Network in the past 7 years and this has given them a very good insight of the work of the Convention. As a result, they are currently considering the different possibilities for moving even further with their cooperation with the Bern Convention in the future.

The EU and its Member States thanked the Chairman and the Secretariat for the reports and their work during 2016 and stressed an importance of the Bern Convention for the EU and its Member States.

## **PART II – MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGAL ASPECTS**

### **3. MONITORING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE CONVENTION**

#### **3.1 Biennial reports 2011-2012, 2013-2014 concerning exceptions made to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 and quadrennial reports 2009 - 2012<sup>1</sup>**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Inf (2016) 7 – Summary tables of reporting under the Bern Convention  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 14 – Table reporting: Contracting Parties Access to the ORS System

The Committee took note of the biennial reports submitted by Parties on exceptions made to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8, as foreseen by Article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention. In 2016, all newly submitted reports by Parties have been sent through the Bern Convention on-line system (ORS).

According to the data extracted from the ORS, 19 Parties haven't yet registered in the system and 13 of these are EU member states and the EU itself. This issue might be linked to the question of the possibility for Parties which are also EU member states to deliver their derogation reports through the EU Habides System.

---

<sup>1</sup> For information only, unless otherwise requested

The Secretariat recalled that the current regulations do not prevent the EU from submitting the reports on behalf of its member States, or the EU member States from reporting on the Bern Convention using the Habides reporting system or any other reporting tool, when the reports comply with the conditions set under Article 9 of the Convention.

In 2015, the Committee concluded that the preparation by the EU of an analysis comparing the information requested by the Bern Convention and the reporting requirements under relevant EU instruments is however a preliminary condition for the future use of Habides as a valid reporting tool under Article 9 of the Convention by those EU member states which so wish.

In 2016, the EU submitted summary reports for the period 2011-2012 and 2013-2014, using extracted and rearranged information already made public on the nature website of the DG Environment of the EC and submitted by its Member states. The European Union has also provided the User's manual for the IT tools used for the collection of the data (Habides 2.10 and Habides +) which shows to some extent the type of information gathered through these tools and how it fits the requirements of the Convention. The Committee concluded that a few bilateral consultations between the Secretariat of the Convention and the European Union will help find a final solution to the issue in the very near future.

## **PART III – MONITORING OF SPECIES AND HABITATS**

### **4. MONITORING OF SPECIES AND HABITATS**

#### **4.1 Conservation of Birds**

##### ***4.1.1 Eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds***

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 15 – Report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Special Focal Points on IKB  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 3 – Questionnaire for Parties for the purposes of the Mid Term Review of implementation by Parties of the Tunis Action Plan 2020  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 4 – Compilation of Parties' replies on progress in the Implementation of the Tunis Action Plan 2020  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 8 – Mid-Term Review of the Implementation by Parties of the Tunis Action Plan 2020

##### **a. Report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Special Focal Points for illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds**

The Committee took note of the report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Special Focal Points for illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds, held in Tirana (Albania) on 14-15 April 2016, and thanked the Albanian authorities for their hospitality and the excellent organisation of the meeting.

The Committee strongly supported the idea for the organisation of a back-to-back meeting of the Bern Convention Group of Experts on the conservation of birds, the Network of Special Focal Points on Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds and the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force to address illegal killing of birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT) in 2017.

The Committee welcomed the increased coordination efforts shown in the past year by different organisations, Conventions and stakeholders, aimed to increase synergies in the work of their respective platforms and initiatives, as these efforts support the implementation of the Tunis Action Plan.

##### **b. Mid-Term Review of the Implementation by Parties of the Tunis Action Plan 2020**

The Committee took note of the mid-term review of progress in the implementation of the Tunis Action Plan 2020 for the eradication of illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds. It welcomed the results achieved by Contracting Parties in the implementation of the Plan and encouraged them to speed up their efforts in particular in areas where their action has been assessed as insufficient by the mid-term review.

The Committee warmly thanked the expert for the assessment made and took note of the statement by Birdlife International hoping that the Bern Convention will continue to play a leading role, alongside other partner organisations and Conventions, in dealing with the issue in Europe. The EU and its Member States requested that the Mid-Term Review be amended to incorporate the answers of all Contracting Parties especially those of the EU and its Member States to the question no 1.

#### **4.1.2 Select Group of Experts on the European Action Plan for the Osprey**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 18 – Report of the meeting of the Select Group of Experts on the European Action Plan for the Osprey  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 12 – Plan for the conservation and recovery of the osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe and the Mediterranean Region  
T-PVS (2016) 8 – Draft Recommendation on the implementation of a Plan for the conservation and recovery of the osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe and the Mediterranean Region

##### **a. Conclusions of the meeting of the Select Group of Experts on the European Action Plan for the Osprey**

The Committee took note of the report of the Select Group of Experts on the recovery and re-introduction of the Osprey held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 in Paris and the Plan for the Conservation and Recovery of the Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe and the Mediterranean. It further noted that the main purpose of the plan is to provide guidance to governments for the development of a solid and viable metapopulation of breeding osprey in the whole of Europe and in the Mediterranean Region. For areas with good populations the priority was improving and maintaining good habitat to promote natural recolonisation and to support it with some artificial nesting, if necessary. For those areas where the species had disappeared it was recommended to consider trying the recovery of lost breeding populations by re-introductions.

The Committee agreed to make some changes to the Plan as proposed by the European Union and its Member States.

##### **b. Draft Recommendation on the conservation and recovery of the osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe**

The delegate of Switzerland wished the recommendation to address as a priority the good maintenance of appropriate habitats to favour natural recolonisation and made proposal to change the recommendation, while noting that for some countries this species may not be a priority.

The Standing Committee examined and adopted, after introducing modifications in the draft, the following Recommendation:

- Recommendation No. 186 (2016) on the implementation of a Plan for the Conservation and Recovery of the Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe and the Mediterranean.

## **4.2 Biodiversity and Climate Change**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 17 – Report of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 9 – Compilation of National Reports on Biodiversity and Climate Change  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 11 – Manual on Communicating Climate Change and Biodiversity to policy makers T-PVS (2016) 19 – Draft Recommendation on communicating on climate change and biodiversity

##### **a. Report of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change**

The Committee took note of the report of the meeting which was held in Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) on 31 May-1 June 2016 and warmly thanked the conservation authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Croatian Membership of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the excellent hosting of the meeting.

The Committee welcomed the areas the Group of Experts identified for priority action in the implementation of the Programme of Work of the Convention on Climate Change and Biodiversity conservation as endorsed by the Standing Committee in 2015. It agreed that allowing the full government-designated Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change and a smaller Select Group of Experts to meet in alternate years is a sensible way forward for reaching faster progress on some of the priority issues identified by the Group itself.

The Committee further welcomed the idea of the Secretariat to look into the opportunity to organise a “Nature for Climate” campaign in 2020 as a follow-up and a renewal of the Council of Europe 1970 and 1995 “European Years on Nature Conservation”. The Committee charged the Secretariat with the task to prepare a concept note on the feasibility and scope of such a Campaign and to present it to the Standing Committee at its upcoming meeting in 2017.

#### **b. Draft Recommendation on communicating on climate change and biodiversity**

The Committee welcomed the Manual on Communicating Climate Change and Biodiversity presented by the consultant and recognised that it is a very good and useful tool for supporting communication efforts by national authorities in raising awareness of both policy makers and the large public on the issue. The Committee agreed that the manual is not only useful for enhancing communication on the issue of climate change but on environmental issues in general.

The Committee further agreed that climate change provides the opportunity to raise awareness about how much humans depend on ecosystem services and that nature based-solutions are particularly important for both climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The Committee examined and adopted the following draft Recommendation with minor changes proposed by the EU and its Member States who also encouraged the Contracting Parties to actively participate in the group of experts on biodiversity and climate change.

- Recommendation No. 187 (2016) on communicating on climate change and biodiversity

### **4.3 Invasive Alien Species**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 12 – Report of the meeting of the Select Group of Experts on IAS  
 T-PVS (2016) 13 – Draft Recommendation on the control of the American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Europe  
 T-PVS (2016) 22 – Draft Recommendation on the European Code of Conduct on Planted Forest and Invasive Alien Trees  
 T-PVS/Inf (2016) 15 - Code of Conduct for Planted Forest and Invasive Alien Trees  
 T-PVS (2016) 23 – Draft Recommendation on the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and IAS  
 T-PVS/Inf (2016) 13 – Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and IAS  
 T-PVS/Inf (2016) 10 – Guidance for governments concerning IAS pathways action plans  
 T-PVS/Inf (2016) 1 – Report of the expert meeting on the implementation of the Action Plan for the eradication of the Ruddy Duck in Europe  
 T-PVS (2016) 3 –Draft Recommendation on the eradication of the Ruddy Duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) in the Western Palaearctic by 2020

#### **a. Report of the meeting on the Select Group of Experts on IAS**

The Committee took note of the report of the Select Group of experts presented by the Secretariat, acknowledging both the substantial work of the Group on risk assessment of some species and on management of pathways for IAS. The Committee welcomed the plan of work of the Group for 2016 and 2017, which included identification of IAS for priority risk assessments (i.e. squirrels), publicising existing and future Codes of Conduct, use of postal regulations to help the entry of new IAS and a new Code of Conduct on International travel and IAS.

**b. Draft Recommendation on the control of the American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Europe**

The Committee examined the draft recommendation on the control of the American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Europe and recognised that the feral American mink could have negative impact on native fauna. The Committee took note of the comments made by the European Union and its Member States and of the amendments proposed to the text of the draft recommendation.

The Committee examined, amended, and adopted the following Recommendation:

- Recommendation No. 189 (2016) on the control of American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Europe.

**c. Code of Conduct on Planted Forest and Invasive Alien Trees**

The Committee took note of the presentation of the consultant, Mr Giuseppe Brundu, who explained the changes introduced in the Code after the last circulation of the document to Parties. A number of delegations, including the European Union and its Member States, expressed views on different points which for them needed further clarification and eventual modification of the draft text of the Code.

The Committee agreed to invite Contracting Parties to send their additional comments to both the consultant and the Secretariat of the Convention by 24<sup>th</sup> December 2016 and instructed the Secretariat, in coordination with the consultant, to produce a new text (3<sup>rd</sup> revised version) by the end of January 2017. The new text will be sent again for possible comment to Parties and, if necessary, it will be tabled for discussion at the upcoming meeting of the Group of Experts, which is asked to prepare a final text with a view of a possible endorsement at the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

The Committee warmly thanked the expert for his dedication and hard work on the Code and his readiness to cooperate with Parties and help finalise the text.

The Committee took note that no Party or Observer had comments on the draft recommendation, only on the text of the Code.

**d. European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and Invasive Alien Species**

The Committee took note of the presentation of the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and Invasive Alien Species made by the consultant Ms Emma Barton, valuing favourably the initiative and warmly thanking the expert for her excellent job.

The Committee examined and adopted the following Recommendation:

- Recommendation No. 188 (2016) on the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and Invasive Alien Species.

**e. Expert meeting on the implementation of the Action Plan for the eradication of the ruddy duck in Europe**

The Committee took note of the report of the Expert meeting on the implementation of the Action Plan for the eradication of the ruddy duck in Europe, which took place in Nantes, France, on 14-15 December 2015 and warmly thanked the French conservation authorities for the excellent organisation of the meeting.

It took note of the progress in the implementation of the Action Plan for the eradication of the ruddy duck in the Western Palearctic endorsed in its Recommendation No. 149 (2010) and recognised the efforts by all concerned Parties. The Committee further welcomed the progress in the culling of ruddy duck in most of Europe but noted that some populations still existed in the wild in France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

The Committee expressed its hopes that the draft recommendation proposing concrete actions for concrete States can help achieve a full eradication of the ruddy duck in the wild in the Western Palearctic in the coming years and tackle the issue of ruddy ducks in captivity. The Committee took note of the comments made by the European Union and its Member States and of the amendments proposed to the text of the draft recommendation.

The Committee examined and adopted, with some amendments, the following Recommendation:

- Recommendation No. 185 (2016) on the eradication of the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) in the Western Palearctic by 2020.

**f. Guidance for governments concerning invasive alien species pathways action plans**

The Committee took note with interest of the presentation by the consultant, Mr Riccardo Scalera, on the Guidance for Governments concerning Invasive Alien Species pathways action plans.

The Committee welcomed the document and considered it offers useful guidance for action at national level and invited parties and observers to examine it attentively.

## **4.4 Conservation of other threatened Species**

**a. LCIE Conference**

The Secretariat informed on the 2016 meeting of the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe (LCIE) held from 31<sup>st</sup> October to 2<sup>nd</sup> November in Porto. Concerning the assessment of large carnivore populations in Europe, the experts noted a progress in most species in Europe in the last 5 years. The Iberian lynx was less threatened and most wolf, Eurasian lynx and bear population were progressing, with some worrying exceptions, including lynx in the Balkans, in the Dinaric area, in the Alps and the Bohemian-Bavarian population. Poaching of large carnivore in Austria and – for lynx – in the Bohemian-Bavarian population is perceived as a threat to the recolonisation of large carnivore in parts of the Alps. Bear populations in the Alps and the Pyrenees are still fragile and far from reaching a favorable conservation status.

LCIE is going to work in the next two years in a number of issues, including “integration of large carnivores into forest policies”, surveying and monitoring large carnivore and addressing conflicts (perception by people, management to reduce conflict, large carnivore threat to humans, management of non-shy wolves, hunting and large carnivores, etc.).

The Secretariat proposed to keep the good connection with LCIE so this group may alert the Committee on status of populations and possible lack of implementation of Bern Convention obligations.

The Swiss delegate informed on an ENCA meeting on large carnivores held in her State. Among others, the meeting discussed the issue of border fences preventing their movement and harming large carnivores and other fauna. These fences are contrary to the objectives of the Bern Convention. Switzerland proposed the organisation of an exchange on the issue with the European Commission and the Bonn Convention.

The Czech delegate informed on a recent international conference organised in his State within the framework of the Carpathian Convention to promote large carnivores in this region through, among others, education and awareness, monitoring and appropriate management and protection.

The Committee took note of the information presented by the Secretariat and encouraged LCIE to continue providing information on the status of large carnivores in Europe and appropriate information to the Committee on large carnivore issues.



## 4.5 Habitats

### 4.5.1 *Protected Areas and Ecological Networks*

Relevant documents: T-PVS/PA (2016) 9 – Report of the meeting of the ad-hoc Restricted Group of Experts  
T-PVS/PA(2016)10 –Three dimensional Road Mapfor achieving a fully operational Emerald Network in 7 countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus  
T-PVS/PA (2016) 11 - Updated list of officially nominated candidate Emerald sites  
T-PVS/PA (2016 12 - Updated list of officially adopted Emerald sites

#### **a. Report of the Ad Hoc Restricted Group of Experts on reporting on the Emerald Network**

The Committee took note of the conclusions of the meeting of the Restricted Group and its future programme of activities and confirmed how important it was for the format for reporting on the implementation of the Emerald Network for the period from 2013 to 2018 to be finalised by the end of 2017.

The Committee noted Switzerland's reservations concerning the approval in principle of the reporting format as presented during the Restricted Group meeting and proposed that discussions on this subject should continue at future Group meetings and include the matter of the limitation on the number of species and habitats to be covered by the first reporting cycle.

The Committee also noted and approved the Restricted Group's decision to set a deadline for the annual updates of the Contracting Parties' national Emerald Network databases and to set the deadline at 28 February of each calendar year. The Committee invited all the Contracting Parties concerned by the implementation of the Emerald Network to respect this deadline and to submit annually updated databases.

#### **b. Conference “Reaching concerted site conservation at pan-European level: progress, challenges and future of the Emerald Network”**

The Committee welcomed the outcomes of the Conference “Reaching concerted site conservation at pan-European level: progress, challenges and future of the Emerald Network”, which took place in Minsk, on 4-5 October 2016. It further acknowledged the importance of the actions foreseen in the “3-dimensional Road Map for achieving a fully operational Emerald Network in 7 countries from Eastern Europe and the South-Caucasus”, particularly because they were jointly planned by national authorities and relevant stakeholders in a concerted way.

The Committee endorsed the Road Map and warmly thanked the European Union for its continuous support to the setting-up of the Emerald Network in the past 7 years and expressed its hopes that this generous contribution will continue in the future.

#### **c. Emerald biogeographical evaluations in 2016 and consolidated evaluation conclusions' database**

The Committee took note of the progress achieved in the setting-up of the Emerald Network and expressed its satisfaction of its steady growth accomplished over the last years thanks to the joint efforts of the Secretariat of the Convention and the Parties concerned. The EU and its Member States stressed that both Emerald and Natura 2000 play a crucial role for nature and landscape protection as well as for ecosystem services that they provide.

The Committee particularly welcomed the newly developed visibility tools, namely the Emerald Network Web-Ap and public viewer, and thanked the European Environment Agency and its European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity for the critical help in their development. The Committee acknowledged that these tools clearly show that together the Emerald and Natura 2000 Networks form the biggest and most ambitious network of protected sites built on the same criteria in the world.

#### **d. Draft updated lists of candidate sites and Emerald sites**

The Committee congratulated Belarus and Ukraine for their decision to propose for official adoption their already nominated candidate Emerald sites, as well as all their newly proposed sites in 2016. The Committee noted with satisfaction that this decision will significantly increase the number of sites officially adopted before the Convention.

The Committee further noted the request by Georgia for a slight change in the list of sites proposed for official nomination as candidate Emerald sites for the country and thanked the other countries which made additional proposals for the updated list of officially nominated candidate Emerald sites.

The Committee further welcomed the information provided by the delegate of Iceland on the plans to submit their national list of possible Emerald sites before the end of 2017.

The Committee examined and adopted the following documents with minor corrections:

- Updated list of officially nominated candidate Emerald sites;
- Updated list of officially adopted Emerald sites.

#### **4.5.2 European Diploma for Protected Areas**

##### **a. Report of the meeting of the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma for Protected Areas, follow-up of decisions**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/DE (2016) 4 – Report of the meeting of the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma for Protected Areas  
 T-PVS/DE (2016) 9 - Progress report on the fulfilment of the Resolution of the Committee of Ministers (2012)19 on the European Diploma to the Poloniny National Park  
 T-PVS/DE (2016) 5 – Report of the visit of the independent expert to Bialowieza National Park  
 T-PVS/DE (2016) 11 – Draft proposed amendment to Article 9, para.7, of the revised Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas (CM/ResDip (2008)1)

The Committee examined the report of the meeting of the Group of Specialists, as presented by its Chair, Mr Jan-Willem Sneep, and thanked the Chair and the Group members for their work and dedication.

The Committee noted, in particular, that the Group had decided to postpone its decision on the possible withdrawal of the Diploma awarded to the Poloniny National Park (Slovak Republic) and welcomed the announcement by the Slovak authorities of the much anticipated adoption of a management plan for the Park.

The Committee also took note of the decision by the Group not to propose the renewal of the Diploma awarded to the Bialowieza National Park (Poland) as the government's new forest management plan was likely to have an adverse effect on the areas adjoining the National Park.

##### **b. Draft proposed amendments to the revised Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas (CM/ResDip (2008)1)**

The Committee examined the amendments to the Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas proposed by the Group of Specialists.

The Committee took note of Switzerland's proposal to add a new paragraph 7 to Article 9, stipulating that the renewal of the Diploma would be based on a review by the Group of Specialists of the annual reports submitted by the area authorities.

The Committee also noted the proposal by the NGO, Pro Natura – Friends of the Earth Europe, supported by Albania, to add a clause to paragraph 3 of Article 9 stipulating that all contributions by the stakeholders should be taken into account when drawing up the independent expert's terms of reference.

The Committee decided to propose the amendments to the Regulations for the EDPA for official adoption by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (see text in Appendix I).

## PART IV – MONITORING OF SPECIFIC SITES AND POPULATIONS

### 5. SPECIFIC SITES AND POPULATIONS

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 25 – Summary of case files and complaints  
T-PVS/Inf (2016) 2 – Register of Bern Convention's case-files

***(Note: a detailed summary of each case-file is available in document T-PVS (2016) 25 – Summary of Case files)***

#### 5.1 Files opened

##### ➤ 1995/6: Cyprus: Akamas peninsula

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 18 – Government report + Appendix  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 43 – NGO report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 44 – Report of the on-the-spot appraisal by the independent expert  
T-PVS (2016) 26 - Draft Recommendation on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula and the sea turtle nesting beaches East of Polis (Cyprus)

In the absence of the expert, Dr Paolo Casale, the Secretariat presented the report of the on-the-spot-appraisal carried out on 10 and 11 October to the Akamas Peninsula and the beach of Limni, which included meetings in Nicosia and meetings with local authorities in Polis. The main findings from the expert were that, given the remarkable importance of the area for marine turtle nesting, conservation logic should be largely preferred to a development one, even if there were mitigation measures of the golf project planned very close to the Limni beach, which is part of the Natura 2000 area Periochi Polis-Gialia. Given the great size of the development (circa 800 villas) sky glow could not be excluded, therefore the development represents a high risk for the future of marine turtles and it needed to be reconsidered. A wide buffer zone of 475 meters might perhaps mitigate a little the threat but most likely human pressure on the beach was incompatible with marine turtle nesting.

The Secretariat presented a draft recommendation on the topic following largely the precautionary approach recommended by the expert.

The Committee took note of the report presented by the delegate of Cyprus, ensuring that all necessary measures are being taken to protect the nesting habitat of marine turtles and explaining in detail the assessment done by the government to ensure that the golf project will not affect marine turtle nesting. The delegate gave a number of details on the management plans for the area.

The Committee further took note of the report presented by the representative of Terra Cypria saying that the Akamas management plan was not being implemented and alerted the Committee on the irreversibility of the destruction of the nesting habitat for *Caretta caretta* at the beach of Limni if the golf project was to be approved. The mitigation proposed was not sufficient: buffer zones had to be much larger than now and the road perpendicular to the beach had to be deleted from the plan.

The delegate of the European Union made a statement, noting the initiation by the European Commission of an infringement procedure for possible breach of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive in this case.

After the meeting of a contact group which redrafted the text of the draft Recommendation, the Committee examined, amended and adopted:

- Recommendation No. 191 (2016) on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula and the sea turtle nesting beaches of Chrysochou Bay (Cyprus)

The file remains open.

➤ **2004/1: Ukraine: Proposed navigable waterway in the Bystroe Estuary (Danube delta)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 3 – Romanian Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 37 – Ukrainian Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 39 – Republic of Moldova Government report

This case concerns the excavation of a shipping canal in Bystroe estuary of the Danube delta in Ukraine, which is likely to affect adversely both the Ukrainian Danube Biosphere Reserve and the whole Danube delta dynamics. It is on the Standing Committee's agenda since 2004, when the Committee adopted Recommendation No.111 (2004) on the proposed navigable waterway through the Bystroe estuary (Danube Delta).

The Committee took note of the oral reports presented by the delegates of Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova and welcomed the efforts of the three Parties concerned to ensure the Joint Trilateral Commission meets at least once per year in order to monitor the implementation of Recommendation No.111 (2004).

The Committee reminded that the Joint Commission was set up to provide a framework for a true and constructive cooperation and thanked the Parties for their commitment to the process.

Taking into account the constant, fruitful and promising cooperation in the frame of the Joint Commission, the Committee decided to proceed and close the case-file and to invite the Parties to report every two years to the Standing Committee on the progress achieved in solving the remaining issues.

➤ **2004/2: Bulgaria: Wind farms in Balchik and Kaliakra –Via Pontica**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 12 – Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 13 – NGOs report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 23 – Report by the EU

On 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 the Court of Justice of the European Union ruled against Bulgaria over its failure to protect unique habitats and important species in the Kaliakra special protection area at the Black Sea coast. In July 2016, the European Union informed that the European Commission is currently in dialogue with the Bulgarian national authorities on the implementation of the court judgement.

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Bulgarian authorities on the current progress in the implementation of the European Court judgement, notably the development of an Integrated Management Plan (IMP) for three Natura 2000 zones in the area. The authorities further informed on their expectations that more developments can be expected next year and proposed to dully inform the Standing Committee on progress at its upcoming meeting in 2017.

The Committee further took note of the report of the NGOs warning of an increase in the operational wind farms in the region, of an important amount of newly approved wind farms that can be built, including the windfarm of Smin as the Supreme Administrative Court of Bulgaria rescinded the decision of the Ministry of Environment. The NGO iterated that the only way for Bulgaria to apply the decision of the European Court of Justice is the dismantlement of the concerned wind farms.

The Committee agreed that taking into account the pending implementation of the ECJ's ruling it is important that the Committee awaits to see tangible progress in terms of action and mitigation measures implemented by the authorities. Therefore, the Committee decided to keep the case-file open, invited the Bulgarian authorities to keep the Convention and its institutions updated on progress through detailed reports, to ensure all procedures taking place at national level are transparent and inclusive to all stakeholders and to have strict control over the additional developments in the region.

➤ **2007/1: Italy: Eradication and trade of the American grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*)**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 38 – Government report

The Committee took note of the report of the Italian government informing of substantial progress in the management of alien squirrels through a LIFE project and other action, the result being a drastic reduction in the number of grey squirrels and the full eradication in some areas. Local authorities are providing additional resources. Controls are progressing in some priority areas of intervention, including in the Lambro valley. Through the implementation of the new EU regulation the trade of the invasive species is now illegal.

The delegates of France and Switzerland welcomed the news and reminded that it is very important that the grey squirrel does not reach the Alps.

The Committee took note with satisfaction of the progress in the control of the alien species, decided to close the file and welcomed the proposal of Italy to report to the Bureau of the Convention in spring 2018.

➤ **2010/5: Greece: threats to marine turtles in Thines Kyparissia**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 36 – Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 34 – Complainant report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 41 – NGO report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 23 – Report by the EU

The delegate of Greece informed the Committee that her government was examining carefully the European Court of Justice Decision that Greece had failed to fulfil its obligation to protect sea turtles in the bay of Kyparissia. The authorities are going to duly take it into account this decision to guide new action in the matter. The government will issue a new Presidential decree. The matter had considerable legal complexity.

The representative of MEDASSET expressed concern by the impact of the existing houses, than had already having a negative impact. She denounced that over 150 nests had been vandalised and that the government was failing to protect marine turtle as some of the beaches had illegal roads, beach furniture and bars, particularly in Kalonero beach. Fishing activities were also continuing, with negative impact on marine turtles.

The Committee took note of the information presented, encouraged Greece to fully implement its Recommendation No. 174 (2014) on the conservation of the loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) and of sand dunes and other coastal habitats in Southern Kyparissia bay (NATURA 2000 – GR 2550005 “Thines Kyparissias”, Peloponnesos, Greece) and to take due note of the decision of the European Court of Justice and its recommendation when deciding on the future of the area.

The file remains open.

➤ **2012/9: Turkey: Presumed degradation of nesting beaches in Fethiye and Patara SPAs**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 25 – Government report on Fethiye  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 28 – Government report on Patara  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 35 – NGOs report

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Turkish delegate and thanked the country for the timely and detailed reports sent during the 2016 year. It further welcomed the commitment of Turkey shown by the different actions implemented throughout the year in response to the recommendations of the Convention.

The Committee also noted the exhaustive report submitted by the complainant NGO and their concern with the lack of improvement of the conservation and management of the areas. The NGO reported further habitat damage, beach furniture in the nesting zone, light pollution, uncontrolled vehicle access, lack of guarding and zoning, nearshore fishing, etc. The NGO further stressed that the few measures presented by the Government are only short-term and that the majority of the recommendations of the Committee have not been implemented so far.

The Committee agreed that the case-file should remain open and urged the Turkish authorities to step up their current efforts and ensure the Bern Convention recommendations are fully implemented in 2017. The Committee invited the authorities to report back on the actions planned for next year and their implementation to the Bureau and the upcoming 37<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee meeting.

➤ **2013/1: “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”: Hydro power development within the territory of the Mavrovo National Park**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 5 – Complainant report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 32 – Government report

The Committee took note of the report of the authorities of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” informing that the adoption of the law on the re-proclamation of the National park is expected, in spring 2017, after the constitution of the new Government, and that only then the SEA on the management plan for the park can be initiated. In the meantime the authorities have stopped all government projects in the park until the SEA is implemented.

The Committee also took note of the NGO warnings that the scope of the SEA should cover the cumulative impact of all planned development activities and their regional long term effects. The NGO expressed a concern about 17 other HPP projects which have not yet been suspended. The complainant further reminded the importance of Resolution 026 recently adopted by IUCN at their world Congress in Hawaii in September 2016, calling for prohibition of environmentally damaging infrastructure projects in protected areas.

The delegate of Albania welcomed the progress made so far but regretted the fact that the SEA is still pending and reminded that given the trans boundary effect on the shared water resources, the neighbouring countries should also be consulted in the development of the SEA.

The delegate of the European Union recalled that “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” is a candidate to the EU. In this context, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has committed itself to progressively establishing the conditions for implementation of the EU acquis, and has promised to send written clarifications to the European Commission, by the end of this year, concerning how environmental legislation, in particular EIA, SEA, WFD and nature directives are applied when developing the plans for hydropower plants in the country.

After a long discussion the Committee agreed that the case-file should remain open and that the authorities should speed up the process of development of the SEA. The process of SEA should be realised according to national legislation and international standards/European SEA Directive with which “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” indicates that its legislation already complies, comprising inclusion of all stakeholders.

## **5.2 Possible files**

➤ **2011/4: Turkey: threat to the Mediterranean monk seal (*Monachus monachus*)**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 47 – Government report

The Committee took note of the report by the delegate of Turkey and welcomed the encouraging information regarding the various measures put in place by the authorities to mitigate the impact of the marine terminal on the threatened species. The Committee welcomed the implementation by the country of the Action Plan and its active cooperation with the Complainant on the implementation of some of its measures.

The Committee decided to dismiss the case-file and asked the national authorities of Turkey to report back on the follow-up conservation measures put in place at the 38<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee meeting in 2018.

➤ **2001/4: Bulgaria: Motorway through the Kresna Gorge**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 11 – Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 10 – NGOs report + Annex I and Annex II  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 40 – Other stakeholders report

The Committee took note of the report of the Bulgarian authorities explaining the process leading to the new EIA procedure initiated in 2014 and of their assurance that all alternatives are taken into account and studied. The authorities further confirmed that no decision has been taken yet, no land acquisitions or construction are being carried out and that the final EIA results are expected at the beginning of 2017.

The Committee further noted the concerns expressed by the NGOs regarding the scope of the current EIA and the fact that the so-called NGO alternatives and the long-tunnel alternative are not considered in the study. The NGO highlighted the outstanding ecological importance of Kresna Gorge and asked the Committee to open the case-file and request the Bulgarian authorities to respect Recommendation No. 98 (2002) and implement the agreed long-tunnel option.

After a long discussion, the Committee decided that the case-file should remain as a possible file and invited the Bulgarian authorities to report in details to the Convention as soon as the EIA results are available. The Committee further invited the authorities to ensure all alternatives are considered on an equal footing in the present assessment. The Committee will study the file again at its upcoming 37<sup>th</sup> meeting.

➤ **2012/3: Poland: Possible spread of the American mink (*Neovison vison*)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2016) 14 – Government report  
T-PVS (2016) 13 – Draft recommendation on the control of the American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Europe

The Committee took note of the report by the representative of Poland and the newly introduced amendments in the specific legislation aiming at strengthening the conditions for keeping minks, including new protection standards. Also, the country currently carries out legislation amendments concerning projects likely to have a significant impact on the environment. The amendment foresees lowering the threshold which is used for qualification of a mink farm to the group of projects that are potentially likely to have a significant impact on the environment. As a result of the above mentioned amendment, the decision on the environmental conditions will be mandatory for all the mink farms that will reach the size set in the draft regulation.

The Committee expressed its satisfaction with the information presented and decided to dismiss the file, in particular taking into account the adoption during this meeting, of a Recommendation concerning the control of the American mink.

## 5.3 On-the-spot appraisal

➤ **Recommendation No. 96 (2002) on conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, especially birds, in afforestation of lowland in Iceland**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 42 – Report of the on-the-spot appraisal by the independent experts  
T-PVS (2016) 28 – Draft Recommendation on the conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, especially birds, in afforestation of lowland in Iceland

This Recommendation was adopted by the Standing Committee in 2002, as a follow-up to a complaint lodged by BirdLife. The monitoring of the implementation by Iceland of this recommendation was decided with the agreement of the country. In 2014, the Standing Committee took note of the report of the authorities of Iceland, as well as of the statements made by BirdLife International and the representative of the AEWA. The Committee congratulated Iceland for accepting to undergo an AEWA

Implementation Review Process (IRP), and confirmed the readiness of the Bern Convention for joining and contributing to the IRP visit. At its 35<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Standing Committee took note of the delays in the organisation of a joint AEWA / Bern Convention mission to Iceland in relation with the afforestation policy of the country, and invited the Icelandic authorities to facilitate the organisation of such a visit during the first semester of 2016.

The Committee took note of the report and findings of the Joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission which took place in the period 23-27 May 2016 as presented by the independent expert in charge of the mission, Mr Colin Galbraith. The Committee welcomed the general satisfaction of the Government of Iceland with the report and their agreement that the draft Recommendation proposed supersedes and replaces the current Recommendation No. 96 (2002). The Committee further took note of the specific comments expressed by the Government of Iceland on the different operational parts of the proposed draft Recommendation.

The Committee warmly thanked the members of the mission team for the successful work achieved and the Government of Iceland for the excellent hosting and facilitating of the visit.

The Committee examined and adopted, with minor changes proposed and agreed by the AEWA Secretariat and the delegate of Iceland, the following draft Recommendation:

- Recommendation No. 190 (2016) on the conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, especially birds, in afforestation of lowland in Iceland.

The Committee further decided that the follow-up of the implementation by the Government of Iceland of the newly adopted Recommendation will be done taking into account the deadlines recommended in the joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission report.

Eventually, the delegate of France congratulated the Secretariats of the AEWA and the Bern Convention for the excellent synergy in the handling of the case which is of interest for both instruments.

## 5.4 Follow-up of previous complaints and Recommendations

- **Recommendation No. 175 (2015) on the monitoring of the agreement concluded in the frame of complaint n° 2013/5 (Lithuania)**

Relevant documents : T-PVS/Files (2016) 27 - Government report + Appendix  
T-PVS/Files (2016) 26 - Complainant report

The Committee took note of the report of the national authorities on the measures put in place to implement Recommendation No. 175 (2015) and in particular on the monitoring of the Bern Convention species present in the area. The authorities expressed their readiness to report back on progress in the launching of the monitoring programme at the upcoming Standing Committee meeting in 2017.

The Committee noted the PPT presentation sent by the representative of the complainant association.

The Committee welcomed the efforts of the authorities to implement the Bern Convention Recommendations and invited the country to report back at the appropriate meeting of the Bureau.

- **Recommendation No. 169 (2013) on the Rhone streber (Zingel asper) in the Doubs (France) and in the canton of Jura (Switzerland)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files(2016) 22 - Swiss Government report  
T-PVS/Files(2016) 33 - French Government report  
T-PVS/Files(2016) 31- Complainant report

The Committee took note of the detailed reports presented by the national authorities of France and Switzerland and welcomed their efforts both in tackling the complex issues linked to the conservation of the fish species and in ensuring good transboundary cooperation.



The Committee further noted the concerns expressed by both the Swiss and French NGOs on the lack of real impact of the many measures implemented by the authorities on the species concerned by the case, but also on many other fish species.

The NGOs however welcomed the efforts implemented by both authorities and expressed their hopes that the driving force of the Bern Convention Recommendation will continue to operate in the future as additional action is needed to ensure the measures foreseen finally have a tangible impact on the ground.

The Committee, with the agreement of all parties concerned, agreed that the case-file should be kept on stand-by. Finally, it invited the national authorities of both countries to present progress on the implementation of the Recommendation to the Standing Committee every 2 years, starting in 2018.

➤ **Recommendation No. 144 (2009) on the wind park in Smøla (Norway) and other wind farm developments in Norway**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 46 – Government report

The Committee took note of the written Government report available in document T-PVS/Files (2016) 46 and agreed to adopt a flexible approach in the future follow-up of Recommendation No. 144 (2009) by inviting the Party concerned to inform the Committee as soon as any substantial and important information on the case is available.

➤ **Recommendation No. 110 (2004) on minimising adverse effects of above-ground electricity transmission facilities (power lines) on birds**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 20 – Reports by the Parties

➤ **Recommendation No. 176 (2015) on the prevention and control of the *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* chytrid fungus**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Files (2016) 30 – Reports by the Parties

The Committee took note of the reports submitted by Contracting parties on the follow-up of Recommendations No. 176 (2015) on the prevention and control of the *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* chytrid fungus and No. 110 (2004) on minimising adverse effects of above-ground electricity transmission facilities (power lines) on birds.

The Committee noted that only a dozen (and same) Parties have replied to the reporting request of the Secretariat on the above mentioned recommendations. The Committee urged all Contracting Parties to reply to the reporting requests.

The Committee charged the Bureau of the Convention with the selection of previous Recommendations to be followed-up during 2017.

## **PART V – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONVENTION**

### **6. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONVENTION**

#### **6.1 International coordination with other MEAs and organisations**

The Secretariat informed the Committee on progress in the international coordination with other MEAs and organisations, stressing in particular the excellent cooperation with the AEWA, but also the EU, the CMS, IUCN, the LCIE and WCMC.

**a. Revision of the Memorandum of Co-operation with the EEA**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2016) 27 – Draft revised Memorandum of Co-operation between the Council of Europe and the EEA

The Committee welcomed the excellent results of the strengthened co-operation of the Convention with the EEA, in particular in relation to the establishment of the Emerald network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest.

The Committee endorsed the proposed amendments to the Memorandum of Co-operation between the Council of Europe and the European Environment Agency and congratulated the two organisations on the occasion of the 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the signature of their 1<sup>st</sup> Memorandum of Co-operation.

**6.2 Implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan for biodiversity: the contribution of the Bern Convention**

The Secretariat informed the Committee that in accordance with its decision from 2015, a Side Event on the Emerald network will be organised by the Convention during the COP 13 of the CBD in Cancun. The event takes place on 9 December 2016 at 13:15, Universal Building, main floor.

**6.3 Awareness and visibility**

The Secretariat informed on the activities carried out to promote knowledge and understanding of the Bern Convention's action for biodiversity conservation, in particular the Emerald Network and IAS.

**6.4 Draft Programme of Activities and budget for 2017**

Relevant document: T-PVS (2016) 20 – Draft Programme of Activities for 2017

The Committee examined and adopted its Programme of Activities for 2017, prepared on the basis of the biennial Programme and Budget pre-validated in 2015 and amended to include some additional activities requested by the different Groups of Experts in 2015. It also thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of the Programme.

**6.5 States to be invited as observers to the 37<sup>th</sup> meeting**

The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following States to attend its 37<sup>th</sup> meeting: the Russian Federation, San Marino, Algeria, Holy See, Jordan.

**PART VI - OTHER ITEMS****7. ELECTION OF CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR AND BUREAU MEMBERS**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Inf (2013) 6 – Rules of Procedure: Standing Committee, on-the-spot enquiries, mediation

In accordance with Article 18(e) of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee elected:

- Mr Øystein Størkersen (Norway) as Chair
- Mr Igor Ivanenko (Ukraine) as Vice-Chair
- Ms Sandrine Liegeois (Belgium) and Ms Jana Durkosova (Slovak Republic) as Bureau members.

According to Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee acknowledged the automatic election of the previous Chair, Mr Jan Plesník (Czech Republic), as a Bureau member.

**8. DATE AND PLACE OF THE 37TH MEETING**

The Committee agreed to hold its next meeting on 5-8 December 2017, in Strasbourg.

**9. ADOPTION OF THE MAIN DECISIONS OF THE MEETING**

The Committee adopted document T-PVS (2015) Misc.

**10. OTHER BUSINESS (ITEMS FOR INFORMATION ONLY)**

No other business.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 185 (2016) of the Standing Committee, examined on 18 November 2016, on the eradication of the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) in the Western Palaearctic by 2020**

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

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and its natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 11, paragraph *b*, of the Convention requires parties to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

Recalling that Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention requires Contracting Parties to give particular emphasis to the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species;

Noting that the species *Oxyura leucocephala*, listed in Appendix II of the Convention, is still endangered;

Recognising the efforts of Contracting Parties in preserving the populations of this species;

Noting, however, that the main threat to the long-term survival of the species is its hybridisation with American ruddy ducks (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) introduced in Europe;

Noting that the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) has been recognised as an invasive alien species of Union concern under Article 4 of the EU Regulation 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species;

Conscious of the need to arrest the expansion of the ruddy duck in Europe and Northern Africa;

Recalling Recommendation No. 48 of the Standing Committee, adopted on 26 January 1996, on the conservation of European globally threatened birds;

Recalling the International Single Species Action Plan for the conservation of the white-headed duck, prepared by BirdLife International, Wetlands International and the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust and adopted by CMS, AEWa and the European Union;

Recalling Recommendation No. 61 (1997) on the conservation of the white-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*) which asked Contracting Parties to develop and implement without further delay national control programmes which could include the eradication of the ruddy duck from all the countries in the Western Palaearctic;

Recalling the Bern Convention Action plan for eradication of the ruddy duck (1999-2002) drafted by the Wildfowl & Wetland Trust [document T-PVS/Birds (99) 9];

Recalling recommendation No. 149 (2010) of the Standing Committee, on the eradication of the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) in the Western Palaearctic and noting its implementation has contributed to lower the numbers of ruddy ducks in most European States, in particular in the United Kingdom where effective controls have reduced ruddy ducks in the wild to a few tens of individuals;

Noting that the Bern Convention Action Plan for the eradication of the ruddy duck is an integral part of the International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the white-headed duck;

Regretting, however, that delayed, insufficient action or operative difficulties in some states following the Bern Convention's eradication plan, has allowed the establishment of populations in mainland Europe and thereby made eradication more costly and difficult;

Noting that very little action has been taken to address the issue of ruddy ducks in captive collections;

Welcoming the entry into force and implementation by the EU and its member states of Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species and noting with satisfaction that the ruddy duck has been included in the list of invasive alien species of European Union concern;

Referring to the document "*Eradication of the Ruddy Duck (Oxyura jamaicensis) in the Western Palaearctic: a review of Progress and revised Action Plan 2011-2015*" by the Wildfowl & Wetland Trust [document T-PVS/Inf (2016) 16];

Conscious that, following present culling efforts, and increasing them in Belgium, France and the Netherlands it is realistic to achieve a full eradication of the ruddy duck in the wild in the Western Palaearctic in the coming years;

Noting, however, that this commendable goal will only be reached if all states concerned collaborate in a common action plan for eradication of the species;

Noting that failure to act effectively and immediately will increase the threat to the white-headed duck and increase the complexity and financial cost of eradication;

Recalling also Resolution 4.5 of AEWa, which, amongst others, strongly urges all countries with ruddy duck populations to establish or step up complementary eradication measures in order to prevent the spread of the species in Europe and towards its complete eradication in the AEWa area,

Recommends that:

*All Contracting Parties:*

1. Implement without delays the actions specified in the "Action Plan for the Eradication of the Ruddy Duck in the Western Palaearctic, 2016-2020" enclosed as appendix to this recommendation;

*Priority States:*

- *Belgium*
- 2. continue its current policy to eradicate every single ruddy duck or hybrid detected in its territory, outline and implement a rapid response protocol to improve reaction time;
- *France*
- 3. finalise and implement the national action plan for the eradication of Ruddy Duck; intensify winter controls - especially in Lac de Grand Lieu - and provide the necessary human and financial means to intensify birds culling, increasing also monitoring of breeding and moulting birds in Loire-Atlantique and neighbouring departments;

- *The Netherlands*

4. continue the present efforts to eradicate the remaining ruddy ducks;

- *Spain*

5. continue its current policy to eradicate every single ruddy duck or hybrid detected in its territory;

- *United Kingdom*

6. continue present efforts to eradicate the remaining populations of ruddy duck;

*All priority states listed above*

7. engage joint projects aimed to facilitating the eradication of ruddy ducks in their territories and fulfilling their obligations under the Convention, including through implementation of Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species concerning this alien species of Union concern;

*Other States:*

8. Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland: monitor and eliminate systematically all ruddy ducks appearing on their territories particularly in the breeding season and inform regularly the Standing Committee on actions taken;

9. Morocco: control systematically ruddy ducks and hybrids on its territory and inform regularly the Standing Committee on actions taken;

10. Tunisia monitor white-headed duck and eliminate systematically ruddy ducks and hybrids on its territory and inform regularly the Standing Committee on actions taken;

Invites Algeria to monitor white-headed duck and eliminate systematically ruddy ducks and hybrids on its territory and inform regularly the Standing Committee on action taken;

Invites BirdLife International and all concerned BirdLife partners organisations in Europe, the Wildfowl & Wetland Trust, as well as other relevant NGOs, to support the implementation of the eradication action plan as a way to promote the long-term conservation of the native white-headed duck, helping with observations of ruddy ducks or hybrids in the wild and explaining to their members the rationale and conservation benefits of the eradication.

## APPENDIX

### Action Plan for the Eradication of the Ruddy Duck in the Western Palaearctic, 2016-2020

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Ruddy ducks<sup>2</sup> stop being a threat to the white-headed duck</i>
<i>Target</i>	<i>Long-term eradication of the ruddy duck in the Western Palaearctic and avoidance of new introductions of the species.</i>

#### I. Actions concerning eradication of ruddy ducks in the wild

<i>General target</i>	<i>Eradication of the ruddy duck in the wild in the Western Palaearctic by 2020</i>
Action 1	Eliminate ruddy ducks in the wild mobilising the necessary resources for culling operations
Action 2	Continue monitoring the distribution of ruddy duck in the wild
Action 3	Keep active the existing national working groups guiding the implementation of this eradication strategy, drafting as necessary national eradication strategies
Action 4	Remove legal barriers that may hinder the control of ruddy ducks

#### II. Actions concerning ruddy duck in captivity

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Avoid any new escape of ruddy ducks to the wild in the Western Palaearctic</i>
<i>General target</i>	<i>Phase out all captive populations of ruddy ducks</i>
Action 5	Fully implement legislation which prohibits the trade and release of ruddy ducks kept in captivity, such as Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species
Action 6	Devote supplementary efforts to monitor the status of ruddy ducks in captivity
Action 7	Encourage the sterilisation and/or elimination of ruddy ducks in captivity and consider compensating owners for voluntary elimination, thus avoiding possible accidental scape or release of birds

#### III. Actions concerning public awareness, reporting and international co-ordination

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Improve understanding by the public of the problem thus and create a favourable opinion for eradication</i>
<i>Goal</i>	<i>Follow the progress of the eradication plan and update it as necessary</i>
Action 8	Implement public awareness activities on the need to control ruddy ducks.
Action 9	Report annually to the Bern Convention on national action and collaborate with other States, the Bern Convention, AEWA and other appropriate bodies in the implementation of this updated eradication plan and the Action plan for the conservation of the white-headed duck.

---

<sup>2</sup> In the framework of this action plan the term « ruddy ducks » refers both to ruddy ducks and to the hybrids of ruddy ducks and white-headed ducks.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 186 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on the implementation of a Plan for the conservation and recovery of the osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe and the Mediterranean region in particular**

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

Having regard to the aims of the convention, which are to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that the convention gives particular emphasis to the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species, especially endemic ones, and endangered habitats;

Recalling that Article 4.1 of the convention requires Parties to take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats;

Recalling its Recommendations No. 48 (1996) on the conservation of European globally threatened birds; No. 60 (1997) on the implementation of the actions plans for globally threatened birds in Europe; No. 62 (1997) on the conservation of regionally threatened birds in the Macaronesian and Mediterranean regions; No. 75 (1999) on the implementation of new action plans for globally threatened birds in Europe; No. 88 (2001) on the implementation of five new Action Plans for globally threatened birds in Europe; No. 92 (2002) on sixteen new Action Plans for most threatened birds in the Convention's area; and No. 103 (2003) on five new Action Plans for most threatened birds in the Convention's area; No. 121 (2006) of the Standing Committee on the implementation of six new action plans for most threatened birds in the Convention's area; No. 156 (2011) on the implementation of an Action Plan for the conservation of the white-tailed sea eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*) along the Danube; No. 165 (2013) on the implementation of twenty-one new or revised action plans for most threatened birds in the Convention's area;

Stressing that the osprey is one of Europe's most iconic species, and that the distribution of its breeding population on the continent has been greatly influenced by humans as it was presented, resulting in its extinction in no less than fifteen Contracting Parties;

Aware that the species is classified as Least Concern (LC) by the IUCN, although this relates to the state of the populations in the northern countries;

Referring to the Plan for the conservation and recovery of the osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Europe and the Mediterranean Region presented in document T-PVS/Inf (2016) 12;



Noting that range recovery would be highly beneficial to European ospreys as a larger and more widespread population would reduce the species' vulnerability to future changes in weather, climate, contamination and variations in food supply;

Aware of the need to address the absence or low numbers of breeding ospreys in the central southern half of Europe and to investigate the decline of the species to reverse it where it happens,

Recommends Contracting Parties and invites observer States to the Convention:

1. Draw-up and implement national action plans or other relevant measures, as appropriate, on the osprey, taking into account the plan mentioned above;
2. Promote the natural recolonisation of osprey by conserving and managing good habitat and dealing with threats that affect the species, such as habitat degradation and loss, unfavourable forest practice, accumulation of damaging chemicals, collision with technical installations, electrocution and other mortality factors;
3. Consider reinforcement of populations or re-introduction, as appropriate, in areas where breeding population of osprey are small or the species went extinct;
4. Keep the Standing Committee informed of the implementation of the present Recommendation.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

**Recommendation No. 187 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on communicating on climate change and biodiversity**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and its natural habitats;

Aware that the conservation of natural habitats is a vital component of the protection and conservation of wild flora and fauna;

Recalling that Article 2 of the Convention requires Parties to take requisite measures to maintain the populations of wild flora and fauna at, or adapt it to, a level which corresponds in particular to ecological, scientific and cultural requirements, while taking account of economic and recreational requirements and needs of sub-species, varieties or form at risk locally;

Recalling that Article 3 of the Convention requires Parties to undertake to have regard to the conservation of wild fauna and flora in their planning and development policies, and in their measures against pollution;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention requires Parties to take appropriate measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of wild flora and fauna species as well as of endangered natural habitats; and give particular attention to the protection of areas of importance for migratory species;

Recognising that climate change affects biological diversity in the territory covered by the Convention, including species, habitats and the Areas of Special Conservation Interest of the Emerald Network;

Recognising the need to adapt conservation work to the challenges of climate change so as to minimise its impacts on the species and natural habitats protected under the Convention;

Recognising the need to improve awareness of the strong relationship between climate change and biodiversity and the ecosystem services it underpins;

Recognising that the entry into force of the Paris Climate Change Agreement on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2016 brings an opportunity to make the case for the important role of biodiversity in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction;

Recalling Recommendations of the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention: No. 122 (2006), on the conservation of biological diversity in the context of climate change; No. 135 (2008) and No. 143 (2009) on addressing the impacts of climate change on biodiversity; No. 145 (2010) on guidance for Parties on biodiversity and climate change in mountain regions; No. 146 (2010) on guidance for Parties on biodiversity and climate change in European islands; No. 147 (2010) on guidance for Parties on wildland

fires, biodiversity and climate change; No. 152 (2011) on marine biodiversity and climate change; No. 159 (2012) on the effective implementation of guidance for Parties on biodiversity and climate change; and No. 158 (2012) on Conservation translocations under changing climatic conditions;

Welcoming and bearing in mind the Manual prepared by Scienseed on communicating climate change and biodiversity to policy makers [document T-PVS/Inf (2016) 11];

Concerned by the added urgency climate change is bringing to addressing biodiversity loss and the attendant loss of ecosystem services and costs to society,

Recommends that Contracting Parties:

1. Take the necessary action to communicate the urgent need to enforce action in the field to manage biological diversity in the face of climate change, and in particular to communicate the need to enforce and facilitate the use of climate change adaptive management for protected areas and the monitoring of climate change impact on species and habitats, where possible;
2. Take the Manual on communicating climate change and biodiversity to policy makers mentioned above into account when raising awareness and preparing information campaigns;
3. Keep the Standing Committee informed of measures taken to implement this recommendation;

Invites Observer States to take note of this recommendation and implement it as appropriate.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

**Recommendation No. 188 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and Invasive Alien Species**

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

Having regard to the aim of the Convention which is notably to ensure the conservation of wild flora and fauna, by giving particular attention to species, including migratory species, which are threatened with extinction and vulnerable;

Recalling that under Article 11, paragraph 2.b of the Convention, each Contracting Party undertakes to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 41 (1993) on the conservation of freshwater fish;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 99 (2003) on the European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 150 (2010) on the European Charter on recreational fishing and Biodiversity;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 170 (2014) on the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Fishing and Invasive Alien Species;

Recalling Decision VI/23 of the 6<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, on Alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species, and the definitions used in that text;

Recalling that the 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 with its 20 headline Aichi targets for 2020, in particular Target 9 devoted to invasive alien species (IAS): “By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritised, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment”;

Welcoming the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020, endorsed by the Council of the European Union in June 2011, and in particular its Target 5, calling on Member States to combat IAS so that by 2020 IAS and their pathways are identified and prioritised, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and pathways are managed to prevent the introduction and establishment of new IAS;

Welcoming the Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species;

Noting the need to co-operate with all the actors involved in recreational boating activities in the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of IAS into the territory of the Convention;

Referring to the European Code of conduct on recreational boating and invasive alien species [document T-PVS/Inf (2016) 13],

Recommends that Contracting Parties:

1. Take the European Code of Conduct mentioned above into account while drawing up other relevant codes - or where appropriate - draw up national codes of conduct on recreational boating and IAS,
2. Collaborate as appropriate with the actors involved in recreational boating activities in implementing and helping disseminate good practices and codes of conduct aimed at preventing and managing of introduction, release and spread of invasive alien species,
3. Keep the Standing Committee informed of measures taken to implement this recommendation;

Invites Observer States to take note of this recommendation and implement it as appropriate.

**Appendix I to Recommendation No. 188 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on the European Code of Conduct on Recreational Boating and Invasive Alien Species**

**THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

**Audience and aims**

This code of conduct is voluntary guidance aimed at all those that engage in recreational boating whether individual boaters, clubs or training centres, recreational boating governing bodies or those that are commercially engaged with recreational boating, for example charter boats or marinas. It is applicable to water management authorities and other bodies involved in managing ports or waterways. It is also intended for those Member States and their agencies that may regulate recreational boating activities. However this code is voluntary only and is not a legally binding instrument nor is it the intention that this code be used as the basis for future legislation. Its aim is to be compatible with other national and international initiatives on recreational boating and IAS such as the IMO's 'Guidance for minimizing the transfer of invasive aquatic species as biofouling (hull fouling) for recreational craft' (IMO, 2012 - see Annex 1). It incorporates that advice, particularly on use of antifouling, and then expands the IMO guidelines to cover more detailed advice on smaller craft particularly those which are used predominantly in freshwater.

The code of conduct uses the experience gathered by the Royal Yachting Association (RYA, 2015) and The Green Blue environment programme, a partnership project between the RYA and British Marine (TGB, 2015). This is pulled together with the biosecurity approach taken in the UK using the Check, Clean, Dry protocols (GBNNSS, 2015) developed by the GB Non Native Species Secretariat in collaboration with other UK Government Departments and stakeholders. Much of the guidance in these initiatives are repeated verbatim here or tailored to highlight issues around IAS and recreational boating.

**Awareness, education, training, research and monitoring**

The recreational boating sector should:

- Promote awareness of the code to encourage responsible recreational boating through targeted information, education and training within the sector. Particular emphasis should be placed on biosecurity, promoting and spreading the message, implementing basic biosecurity measures, encouraging everyone to do what they can, in particular to check and clean equipment. Action should not only be limited to locations where aquatic IAS are an issue, measures should be implemented by everyone, everywhere, everytime.
- Promote research into developing effective and practical biosecurity methods and tools for the recreational boating sector. Collaborate with relevant experts in developing awareness, engagement, training and education programmes aimed at informing recreational boating on IAS.
- Ensure that where relevant, government agencies and authorities engage with recreational boaters in programmes to prevent, early detect, eradicate or manage specific IAS on waters used by the sector.
- In collaboration with government agencies and recreational boating associations, monitor the application and implementation of the Code of Conduct and its effects on recreational boating among Member States.
- This Code of Conduct should be reviewed periodically, and as appropriate, taking into account new developments in IAS as it impacts recreational boating. Knowledge is still evolving, and new, practical and effective biosecurity techniques developed in partnership with the recreational boating sector should be supported where possible and included in future revisions.

## Biosecurity for recreational boating

An appropriate anti-fouling coating system and good maintenance are the best way of preventing biofouling accumulation, which therefore minimises the risk of introduction and spread of aquatic IAS. However, this approach may not be appropriate for small trailered craft, particularly those used predominantly in freshwater.

### Check, Clean, Dry

Following the discovery of the Ponto-Caspian gammarid species, *Dikerogammarus villosus*, at a public water supply reservoir at Grafham Water in England in 2010 the United Kingdom (UK) Government Departments and its Agencies together with environmental Non-Government Organisations and representative bodies from all water users in the UK adopted similar biosecurity practices to those used in New Zealand. This campaign has been effective in containing *Dikerogammarus villosus* to a limited number of sites. This report therefore recommends that this good practice should become the norm, where practical, for biosecurity control for recreational boating and other water users in Europe. This is consistent with the recent Code of Conduct for Recreational Fishing and IAS (Owen, 2013). In some places in Europe this will be a new concept, building on the practices in Australia, New Zealand and most recently in the United Kingdom following the recent discovery of this Ponto-Caspian species in that country.

The overriding principle is that prevention is better than cure and the key to success in this approach is the awareness, education and training principles noted previously and recognises that recreational boaters contact with water via equipment or clothing can result in their inadvertently becoming a vector for the transfer of aquatic IAS. Equipment includes boats, anchors, trailers, buoys and engines. Further information on 'Check Clean Dry' for anglers (including those fishing from recreational vessels) is available in the Code of Conduct on Recreational Fishing and IAS (Owen, 2013). The campaign consisted of a public initiative for all water users, launched in 2011, to promote the adoption of the principles of 'Check, Clean, Dry' (Anderson, 2015). This protocol relies on public participation, education, awareness raising and training to ensure that these procedures are followed, which are as follows:

#### **Check**

Check boats, equipment and clothing for living plants and animals. Pay particular attention to areas that are damp or hard to inspect.

#### **Clean**

Clean and wash all equipment, thoroughly with freshwater and anti-foul boats annually. Remove visible fouling and put in the bin, not back in the water.

#### **Dry**

When recovering a boat, trailer, dinghy, personal watercraft or RIB, drain water from every part and all equipment that can hold water, including any water that collects in bilges, before leaving the site. Clothing and equipment should be thoroughly dried for as long as possible before it is used elsewhere.

Use of hot water can provide a simple, rapid and effective method to clean equipment (Anderson, 2015). Submerging equipment for about 15 minutes at around 45°C can effectively kill a number of significant aquatic IAS. This technique is useful for participants who may be cleaning equipment such as wetsuits when they return home, however it is not practical for cleaning large equipment such as boats. If hot water is available on site, hot pressure washers can also be effective for cleaning boat hulls. Use of chemicals is not recommended as not all species are susceptible to each product.

Adequate signage or guidance should be in place in boating hotspots and particularly with site specific measures in areas known to already contain aquatic IAS, making all boaters aware of the risk and providing advice on how and why to prevent any spread. By demonstrating that aquatic IAS can damage boating equipment, affect navigation, increase maintenance costs, block water treatment systems, harm native habitats and impact on recreational access to waterbodies, participants may be more likely to take action. Where practical, access and egress points for boats arriving on site and recovery from the waters should be limited, preferably to a single spot or point to enable biosecurity equipment to be readily provided and regularly used. Ideally, all cleaning and inspection operations should be supervised by a volunteer or member of staff.

More detailed tailored Check, Clean, Dry advice specific for recreational boating, particularly small trailered craft such as dinghies and RIBs is as follows:

#### ***On the water***

- ✓ Avoid sailing or motoring through water plants and weed if possible. This can chop up plants and can spread them further. If caught up on the hull or propeller, invasive alien species can be transferred to another area.
- ✓ If the boat is on the water but not in use and stationary for a period of time, if possible, raise propellers out of the water to minimise the risk of invasive alien species entering the engine. Use your boat regularly to prevent biofouling of the hull and engine.
- ✓ If an anchor has been used, wash off both the anchor and chain before stowing.
- ✓ Any structures or equipment such as pontoons, piles and buoys which have been submerged in water for a time also pose a higher risk of spreading invasive alien species and so extra care should be taken when moving or working with them.

#### ***After use***

- ✓ Once the boat is on shore, remove all visible plant and animal material and put in the bin.
- ✓ Use freshwater to wash down all parts of the boat that have been in contact with the water (including outboard, trailer and trolley/vehicle tyres). Pay attention to any crevices. Flush outboard engines with clean fresh water before leaving the site using appropriate equipment, flush muffs or in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations.
- ✓ Drain all water from the boat, including bilges. Allow the water to drain completely from engines by placing them in a vertical down position.
- ✓ Wash and dry all equipment, clothing and footwear. Drying for as long as possible is important because some invasive alien species can survive for over two weeks in damp conditions.
- ✓ If freshwater washing facilities are not available on site, ensure that the boat is washed down, drained and dried prior to arrival at another waterbody.
- ✓ Ensure that any wash water run-off or water emptied from boats after use does not drain into another waterbody.

#### ***Boat storage on land***

- ✓ Store boats and outboard engines in a location where any run-off does not drain into a waterbody (e.g. drains, gullies or rivers).
- ✓ Return any engines to their vertical down position to drain.
- ✓ Use the general waste bin to dispose of any plant or animal material found in prop bags or other equipment.



### ***Antifouling and in-water cleaning***

If boats, such as yachts and motor cruisers, are normally kept in the water for long periods of time the Check, Clean, Dry approach may not be a practical method of preventing the spread of aquatic IAS. Although biofouling may not necessarily always contain IAS, it follows that reducing biofouling minimises the risk of spread.

An appropriate antifouling coating system and good maintenance are the best way of preventing biofouling accumulation for boats kept on the water. Lifting out, cleaning and antifouling annually keeps boat hulls clean, and has environmental benefits including both preventing the spread of invasive alien species and also improving fuel efficiency.

Different anti-fouling coating systems suit different operating profiles. An appropriate antifouling coating should be chosen by seeking expert advice and considering the time period between coatings, the use, location and type of the vessel and any legal requirements in the country of use. It is important to note that antifoul may not be effective against all species in all areas, for example, some types of antifoul are thought to be ineffective against biofouling by zebra mussels (Weissert, 2013). Therefore, appropriate antifouling should be combined good maintenance, in-water cleaning and the Check, Clean, Dry approach where possible. The more a boat is used the less likely species will accumulate and the more effective any antifouling will be. By using the boat regularly over summer/growing season, the level of fouling can be reduced.

Antifouling is, by its nature, toxic to aquatic life. Since the banning of Tributyltin (TBT), most antifouls are now copper or zinc based. Available biocides are regulated by European and national regulations; however, during evaluation of these products, their toxicity should be balanced with their efficacy against biofouling, particularly by aquatic IAS.

Some of the compounds found in these antifouls can enter the environment through leaching or during removal of the paint, accumulating in organisms, forming concentrated deposits in the sediments and finding their way into wildlife further up the food chain. Boat owners can play a vital role in preventing concentrated scrapings from entering the water by following the following best practice advice.

#### *When removing antifoul:*

- ✓ Select a marina, club or boatyard which has a wash-down facility which collects residues and captures run off from wash down, or prevent antifoul scrapings from entering the water by collecting in a tarpaulin;
- ✓ Use a dustless vacuum sander or wet abraision to reduce dust toxic dust and to protect the users health;
- ✓ If using scrubbing piles, only scrub off the fouling and not the underlying paint – be careful not to let old or new paint enter the water;

#### *When applying antifoul:*

- ✓ Select the right type of antifouling for the area and boat usage, choosing the lowest levels of biocides and copper suitable for your needs – take advice from the local chandlery. Use water-based paints where possible, or paints low in Volatile Organic Compounds or look into using less damaging bottom paints, such as vinyl, silicone or Teflon, which are suitable for in-water hull cleaning systems;
- ✓ Apply the right amount of antifouling required and do not spill it – when applying use a sheet to collect drips;

- ✓ Dispose of used brushes, rollers and trays and empty cans of antifoul as hazardous waste.

It is always preferable to clean boats out of the water where waste can be effectively captured for proper disposal. However, in-water cleaning can be effective as an interim measure.

In-water cleaning can be suitable for removing light fouling, predominantly if the boat has been in the water for less than a year but has not been frequently used and therefore may have accumulated bio-fouling.

Particular consideration should be given to in-water cleaning prior to long distance trips, if cleaning out of the water is not possible. This will help prevent invasive alien species from being transferred long distances, for example from one country to another. Remove any potential invasive alien species in situ at a home harbour before transferring them somewhere else.

Before undertaking any in-water cleaning, check with the local authorities for any regulations regarding the in-water cleaning of boat hulls and / or the discharge of chemicals into the water column. In water cleaning systems are available in some marinas, or the process can be carried out by hand:

- ✓ Use gentle techniques to minimize both the release of toxic substances from any anti-fouling coating and the degradation of the anti-fouling coating system;
- ✓ Take care not to deplete the anti-fouling coating system which would then rapidly re-foul: in-water should not be used in order to delay haul-out beyond the specified service life of a coating. Many inland water recreational boats (narrow boats, motor cruisers and barges) do not have any anti-fouling coating - thus there is a reduced risk of toxicity for aquatic life from cleaning the hull in these cases;
- ✓ From a tender, a sponge can be used to clean as much material off as possible. Alternatively, use a long handled brush from the pontoon or the boat to clean off the material;
- ✓ Collect the material into a bucket or bag for disposal on land where practical.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

**Recommendation No. 189 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on the control of the American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Europe**

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

Recalling that under Article 11, paragraph 2.b of the Convention, each Contracting Party undertakes to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

Recalling Recommendation No. 31 (1991) of the Standing Committee on the protection of the European mink (*Mustela lutreola*);

Recalling Recommendation No. 99 (2003) of the Standing Committee on the European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (IAS);

Aware that the spread of feral populations of American mink is a serious threat to the survival of the European mink (*Mustela lutreola*), a species with critically endangered (CR) status in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and listed in Appendix II of Bern Convention;

Worried by the impact on other protected biodiversity (birds, small mammals, amphibians, reptiles) of the predation by American mink;

Aware that mink farms, if not properly managed, and criminal release of animals from mink farms are the main course of release of American mink in nature;

Noting that introduction of American mink in islands with high densities of breeding populations of birds has resulted in severe predation, particularly of marine birds,

Recommends that Contracting Parties and invites Observer States to:

*Feral population:*

1. Carry out national campaigns aimed to eradicate, where feasible, reduce or contain American mink populations in the wild;
2. Draft national action plans for control or eradication, with special focus on eradication of American mink in small islands important for nesting birds, range of endangered or endemic species negatively affected by American mink (as the Pyrenean desman *Galemys pyrenaicus*) or in the European mink home range;

*Pets:*

3. Discourage the use of American minks as pets and consider the prohibition of its sale in pet trade;

*Farms:*

*[N.B The following recommendations do not apply to those Contracting Parties and Observers with legislation prohibiting or requiring the phasing out of American mink farming]:*

- 4.. Require mink farms to establish effective measures to prevent escapes of the animals, establish an early alert system for escapes and an efficient recapture system (contingency plans) and implement a system to inspect existing mink farms to verify that they have efficient systems to avoid accidental escape of animals
5. Avoid the establishment of new mink farms in areas with the occurrence of European mink as well as in countries where feral population of American mink are not yet established;
6. Request environmental impact assessment for new mink farms in cases where they can possibly have a significant negative impact on protected species listed in Appendix II of Bern Convention, Natura 2000 sites, Emerald network sites or other international protected areas;
7. Recommend that permits for new mink farms be approved by authorities responsible for conservation issues;
8. Establish and communicate clear national guidelines to avoid escapes from mink farms and ensure that new mink farms comply with those guidelines;
10. Require that mink farms keep and transmit to the authorities records of animals escaped;
11. In cases where the above measures are not successful and escapes from mink farms persist, consider additional measures;

*All captive American mink*

12. Prohibit the deliberate release of American mink in nature.

*Awareness*

13. Promote public awareness on threats posed by deliberately released individuals of American mink.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 190 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on the conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, specially birds, in afforestation of lowland in Iceland**

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

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 3 of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take steps to promote national policies for the conservation of the habitats of wild flora, wild fauna and natural habitats, with particular attention to endangered and vulnerable species, especially endemic ones, and endangered habitats;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 96 (2002) on conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, specially birds, in afforestation of lowland in Iceland;

Noting the joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission held in Iceland on 23-27 May 2016 which had six specific objectives agreed by all concerned parties prior to the mission;

Noting that one of the objectives of the joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission was to review the progress made so far by the Government of Iceland in response to Recommendation No. 96 (2002) and to assess its contribution to addressing the points of concern as indicated in that Recommendation;

Referring to the joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission report prepared by Mr Colin A Galbraith and Mr Dave Pritchard and available in document T-PVS/Files (2016) 42;

Noting that although certain progress has been achieved in the implementation of Recommendation No. 96 (2002), substantial parts have not been fully implemented so far;

Noting the conclusion of the joint mission that currently there is a significant opportunity for a rapid and effective implementation of the actions foreseen in Recommendation No. 96 (2002) and acknowledging the proposals made on the way to complete them;

Agreeing that the current Recommendation supersedes and replaces Recommendation No. 96 (2002),

Recommends that the Government of Iceland:

1. Develop a schedule and clear programme of work to implement the recommendations in this report. This should include details (for each one) of the lead person responsible, along with the timetable (with key milestones where applicable), while taking into account the deadlines recommended in the joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission report, and the means by which progress will be monitored and evidenced. These should be submitted to the respective Standing Committees through the AEWA and Bern Convention Secretariats by 30 April 2017;

2. Finalise and activate as soon as possible the proposed contract between the Environment Ministry and IINH for a project supporting the implementation of AEWA; share details of the contract as soon as possible with the Secretariats of the Agreement and the Convention; consider the scope for involving external facilitation; and include details of an appropriate scheme for monitoring, evaluating and communicating the project's outcomes;
3. Accelerate significantly Iceland's work towards its contribution to the international Emerald Network of sites so this can be completed as soon as possible. Full application of legal protection measures at the national level may need to follow later in some cases, but all other methods should be used to safeguard the nominated sites against the negative impacts of afforestation in the meantime;
4. Implement urgently the provisions in the 2006 legislation for Strategic Environmental Assessment of regional afforestation programmes, and of those Municipal plans that cover areas of importance for waterbirds. Undertake the SEA of national forestry policy as originally recommended under the Bern Convention in 2002;
5. Develop a national indicative forestry strategy in the short term, for full implementation over the longer term, which will:
  - (i) have the aim of meeting current afforestation targets while minimising negative effects on species or habitats of conservation importance (including both intact and modified wetlands),
  - (ii) use the most recent IINH maps and other data, including waterbird and wetland distribution data and the identified ASCIs, to identify zones of different degrees of presumption for and against planting,
  - (iii) be linked to the tiered system of decision-making set out in Iceland's Environmental Impact Assessment legislation, and
  - (iv) be guided by the conservation priorities and good practice standards referred to in the present report;
6. As part of the IINH work, support the implementation of AEWA in Iceland (see point 2), develop and launch with effect from 2017 an appropriately-resourced country-wide scheme for long-term monitoring of waterbirds and their habitats, to:
  - (i) be capable inter alia of detecting changes caused by forestry, and
  - (ii) be used inter alia to help inform judgements about forestry development, by reference to the national and international context relating for example to bird distribution, habitat use and the status and trends of populations;
7. Continue to give priority to the screening of afforestation proposals to determine the need for Environmental Impact Assessment according to case-specific judgements concerning the risk of effects on significant ecological values, rather than according to an arbitrary size threshold. Support these decisions with guidelines on factors likely to contribute to such effects (including those that may contribute indirectly, cumulatively and synergistically), and take a precautionary approach where there is uncertainty. Undertake "Class A" assessments under the EIA legislation wherever the circumstances warrant it;
8. Make full use of the opportunity provided by the negotiation of individual planting agreements with landowners to provide advice and attach appropriate conditions to any grant aid, in order to safeguard (and where applicable enhance) important ecological values. Develop effective collaboration between IINH and the Forestry Service, to provide an evidence based approach to support locational guidance for forest planting in future; and to build up relevant knowledge and capacities across government;
9. Undertake a review of existing formalised systems for liaison, consultation and equitable input to decision-making in planning and management of forestry across the various departments and agencies responsible for forestry, planning, environmental protection and climate change policy; and define specific steps for improving coordination and the coherence of action. Address explicitly as part of this review the supportive role of NGOs, academic experts and civil society;

10. Update Iceland's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, incorporating provisions relating to forestry policy and migratory waterbirds that reflect the recommendations made in the joint AEWA/Bern Convention mission report, and setting out a timeline for the future implementation of actions, accompanied by the necessary resourcing commitments;

11. Give priority in future environmental research projects and programmes to gathering better Iceland-specific evidence on the ecological mechanisms by which afforestation may impact upon birds and other biodiversity. This should give particular attention to effects that may be secondary, cumulative, synergistic, indirect or "edge"-related, as well as any complicating factors associated with climate change. Make the findings available to all concerned, and use the resulting knowledge fully in EIA screening processes, good practice guidance and advice on e.g. buffer distances, mitigation measures and options for habitat restoration;

12. Update and expand existing guidance on good environmental practice in afforestation, to include (for example):

- (i) the Bern Convention's draft Code of Conduct on plantation forestry and invasive alien trees, when adopted,
- (ii) more advice (especially to help municipalities) on EIA and planning decisions,
- (iii) updated information on the location of sensitive habitats and important sites,
- (iv) avoidance of sites that support important bird populations (irrespective of habitat quality), and
- (v) setting back plantation boundaries to provide buffer zones for reducing "edge effects" on wetlands;

13. Given the need, as part of wider ecosystem management, to maintain and restore wetland values and services, as articulated in the Terms of Reference for the Mission; then explore the scope and possibilities for introducing State-funded "positive" financial incentives for land management in favour of nature conservation. This should be informed by research on trends in uptake of existing forms of support and on landowner perspectives concerning the future;

14. Keep the Standing Committee regularly informed about the progress in the implementation of this Recommendation.



Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 191 (2016) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 18 November 2016, on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula and the sea turtle nesting beaches of Chrysochou Bay (Cyprus)**

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

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 3 of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take steps to promote national policies for the conservation of the habitats of wild flora, wild fauna and natural habitats, with particular attention to endangered and vulnerable species, especially endemic ones, and endangered habitats;

Recalling that Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild fauna species, especially those listed in Appendix II to the Convention;

Recalling that Article 6 of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the special protection of the wild fauna species listed in Appendix II to the Convention, particularly by prohibiting damage to or destruction of breeding sites;

Noting that *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas* are strictly protected species listed in Appendix II to the Convention;

Recognising the high natural value of the Akamas peninsula, both in its terrestrial and marine parts, especially as a largely undisturbed coastal area, a well-preserved forest and an extraordinary nesting area for the marine turtles *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas*;

Noting that the future of *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas* populations in the Mediterranean are largely dependent on the maintenance of conservation activities, including those in Akamas Peninsula and Chrysochou Bay;

Noting that the beach of Limni and the rest of the Natura 2000 area “Periochi Polis-Gialia” have also an exceptional value for nesting of *Caretta caretta*;

Recognising the study carried out by the World Bank in 1995 and its important outcomes and underlining the need to take into consideration further developments concerning the management of the area of Akamas peninsula;



Recalling its Recommendation No. 63 (1997) on the conservation of the Akamas Peninsula, Cyprus, and in particular of the nesting beaches of *Caretta Caretta* and *Chelonia mydas* and noting that parts of that recommendation are still appropriate and pertinent;

Noting with satisfaction that, the Government of the Republic of Cyprus has not yet authorised any development in the vicinity of the beaches of Lara and Toxeftra, and has *de facto* followed, the last nineteen years, much of the guidance offered by the World Bank study and has taken positive steps towards the sustainable development of the villages of Akamas;

Concerned that a golf project and a large development in the immediate vicinity of the Natura 2000 site “Periochi Polis-Gialia”, including a hotel and 792 villas, may negatively affect the value of Limni beach for marine turtle nesting;

Referring to the report by Dr Paolo Casale on the visit to Akamas [document T-PVS/Files (2016) 44],

Recommends that the Government of the Republic of Cyprus:

1. Declare the whole of the Akamas peninsula a national park, a biosphere reserve or a protected area with comparable international protected status, including in the protected area the Natura 2000 area. “Periochi Polis-Gialia” (CY 4000001), aiming to facilitate a coordinated management of sea-turtle nesting beaches in NW Cyprus, and to ensure that the Akamas Peninsula, as a whole, including a terrestrial and a marine part, be managed in a sustainable, integrated way;
2. Achieve the objective above by protecting adequately the area without undermining the existing good conservation status of the habitats and species of the designated Natura 2000 area “Chersonisos Akamas” and by ensuring a harmonious coexistence with the neighbouring communities;
3. Establish an entity, with scientific staff and wardens, which would be responsible for the sustainable management of the protected area and the neighbouring communities, facilitating an effective implementation of protection measures;
4. Ensure that the protected area, through appropriate management measures, remains one of the most significant marine turtles nesting sites in Cyprus and continues to show positive trends;
5. Maintain and, where appropriate, improve the nature protection-oriented provisions of the existing and future development plans, especially in the areas adjacent to Lara and Toxeftra beaches where building is to be avoided, so as to prevent negative impacts on nesting sites from tourist and/or housing developments;
6. Promptly commence the implementation of the protection measures of the newly formulated management plan through appropriate and adequate funding, as to preserve the good conservation status of the habitats and species of the Natura 2000 area, as well as to maintain the strict protection provided, so far, in the areas of Lara and Toxeftra;
7. Continue to manage access of people and vehicles to the beaches of Lara and Toxeftra, avoiding in particular the disturbance caused by tourism;
8. Continue and strengthen the integrated and coordinated management of the nesting sites, though the Turtle Conservation Project which is implemented in the areas of the Republic of Cyprus under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, and especially in the areas of Akamas Peninsula and “Periochi Polis-Gialia”, so as to maintain positive trends;
9. Close down illegal restaurants in the neighbourhood of the beaches of Lara and Toxeftra (including Aspros river restaurant);
10. Continue to offer protection to the seagrass communities in the Akamas and Limni areas on which *Chelonia mydas* feeds;

*On the golf course and associated housing development in Limni:*

11. Ensure, by an appropriate assessment that the golf project will not affect the Natura 2000 site “Periochi Polis-Gialia” and especially the exceptional nesting beach of Limni; in this context, avoid housing and establish a zero-lighting zone in an area of at least 200 meters south of the boundaries of the Natura 2000 site;
12. Take appropriate measures to avoid light pollution impacts on the beach from the planned road that will be connecting the golf development with the existing coastal road and protect the beaches from light pollution in the entire coastal length of the Natura 2000 site;
13. Revisit the local development plan of the Polis Gialia so as to ensure, through Strategic Environmental Assessment, that it will not affect the integrity of the nesting habitats of marine turtles;
14. Keep the Standing Committee regularly informed about the progress in the implementation of this Recommendation.

## APPENDIX I

# DRAFT PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 9 OF THE REVISED REGULATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN DIPLOMA FOR PROTECTED AREAS

## CM Documents

CM(2016)

---

...Meeting, ....2016  
Sustainable Development

Standing Committee to the Bern Convention  
Group of Specialists on the European Diploma for Protected Areas  
(T-PVS/DE)

---

**Draft Resolution CM/ResDip(2016) ...  
on the proposed amendment to Article 9, para.7, of the revised Regulations for the European  
Diploma for Protected Areas (CM/ResDip (2008)1)**

*(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on ... 2016 at the ... meeting of the Ministers' Deputies)*

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.a of the Statute of the Council of Europe,

Having regard to Resolution (65) 6 instituting the European Diploma, as amended by Resolution (98) 29 on the Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas and Resolution **CM/ResDip(2008)1** on the revised Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas;

Taking into consideration the proposal of the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma for Protected Areas at its meeting on 7 March 2016 to amend Article 9, para.7, of the revised Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas providing for an automatic renewal of the award after its first renewal, which seems to contradict the standards of high quality required by the European Diploma;

Taking into consideration the decision of the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention to endorse the proposed amendment and to transmit it further to the Committee of Ministers;

Amends Article 9, para.7, of the revised Regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas (Resolution (2008) 1) as follows:

Present text of Article 9:

*Article 9 — Extension of the period of validity of the Diploma*

1. During the fifth year, unless the state concerned decides otherwise, the Committee or its Bureau shall consider extending the validity of the Diploma for a further ten-year period in the light, in particular, of the annual reports.
2. To this end, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall appoint an independent expert to carry out a fresh appraisal, particular attention being paid to information provided every year in the annual

reports. The new appraisal is aimed at taking stock of the state and development of the area, having regard to the conditions and/or recommendations formulated previously, and proposing, as appropriate, new measures for the coming period. The working conditions for this expert shall be the same as those laid down for the expert who carried out the appraisal for the award of the Diploma. The expert will be accompanied by a member of the Secretariat if renewal raises any particular problems; otherwise the visit shall be made by the expert alone.

3. The independent expert's terms of reference shall be drawn up by the Group of Specialists. They shall take account, in particular, of the progress of action taken to comply with the conditions and/or recommendations in the resolution awarding the Diploma or the resolution renewing it on the previous occasion, and of the comments by the Group of Specialists and those set out in the annual reports.

4. The government concerned shall be invited to send a representative, at its own expense, to the meeting of the Group of Specialists, when the discussion on the renewal of the Diploma takes place.

5.a. After examining the expert's report and the findings of the Group of Specialists, the Committee or its Bureau will propose one of the following options to the Committee of Ministers:

- to extend the period of validity of the Diploma;
- not to renew the Diploma before certain conditions are met;
- not to extend the period of validity, which shall be tantamount to withdrawing the Diploma, in which case the Committee of Ministers shall inform the authorities directly responsible for the area concerned of the reasons for its decision, through the government.

5.b. If the Diploma is not renewed or its period of validity extended, the authorities responsible shall be requested to keep the Committee or its Bureau regularly informed of developments in the situation.

6. The decision concerning the renewal of the Diploma shall be taken by the Committee of Ministers by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast and a majority of the representatives entitled to sit on the Committee. It shall be the subject of a resolution.

7. After the first renewal, the Diploma will be automatically renewed every ten years, without any prior appraisal, except where there is an express request from the government of the country concerned or in the case of a recognised threat to the area.

\* \* \*

New text of Article 9, para. 7:

After the first renewal, the Diploma may be renewed by the Committee of Ministers every ten years, on the basis of a review by the Group of Specialists of the annual reports submitted by the area authorities, without any compulsory prior appraisal.

New text of Article 9, para 3:

The independent expert's terms of reference shall be drawn up by the Group of Specialists. They shall take account, in particular, of the progress of action taken to comply with the conditions and/or recommendations in the resolution awarding the Diploma or the resolution renewing it on the previous occasion, and of the comments by the Group of Specialists and those set out in the annual reports. In doing this, they shall take into account any relevant input supplied by stakeholders.

**APPENDIX II**

**UPDATED LIST OF OFFICIALLY NOMINATED CANDIDATE  
EMERALD SITES**

Kindly consult document T-PVS/PA (2016) 11 on the website of the meeting.

### **APPENDIX III**

## **UPDATED LIST OF OFFICIALLY ADOPTED EMERALD SITES**

Kindly consult document T-PVS/PA (2016) 12 on the website of the meeting.

## APPENDIX IV

# PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET OF THE BERN CONVENTION FOR THE YEAR 2017

### 1. Meetings of the statutory bodies (Standing Committee and Bureau)

The Standing Committee to the Bern Convention, whose existence is foreseen in Article 13 of the Convention for enabling parties to meet regularly to develop common and co-ordinated programmes, is the body composed of the representatives of the parties. It has much of the responsibility for the functioning and monitoring of the Convention and meets once a year.

The Bureau of the Standing Committee takes administrative and organisational decisions in between meetings of the Standing Committee. It includes the Chair of the Standing Committee, the Vice-chair, the previous Chair, and two additional Bureau members, and is assisted by the Secretariat.

### 2. Monitoring and assistance to Parties in species conservation

The activities planned under this heading aim at assessing and recording the conservation status of the populations of species listed in the appendices to the Convention, identifying species at risk, devising processes affecting loss of wild biological diversity, setting-up models to monitor change in wildlife outside protected areas. Common management standards may be proposed through action plans. Monitoring of the implementation of Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Convention, as well as of the pertinent recommendations should also be carried out by the relevant Group of Experts.

*These activities may directly contribute to the following CBD Aichi Targets: 1, 9, 12, and 15.*

### 3. Conservation of natural habitats

The activities planned under this heading aim at ensuring the conservation of natural habitats and the implementation of Article 4 of the Convention, as well as of Resolutions Nos (1989) 1, (1996) 3, (1996) 4, (1998) 5, (1998) 6 and Recommendations Nos (1989) 14, (1989) 15 and (1989) 16 of the Standing Committee. The setting-up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest (ASCI) in Europe, and the development of the Pan-European Ecological Network are the two main medium-term objectives of the Convention's work in this field.

*These activities may directly contribute to the following CBD Aichi Targets: 1, 11, and 12.*

### 4. Implementation of Article 3

Article 3 of the Convention sets out the general obligation for each Contracting party to take action individually, with respect to the conservation of wild flora and fauna and all natural habitats in general, by for instance promoting national conservation policies as well as education and information. Through the activity planned under this heading, the Secretariat seeks to provide assistance to parties in building capacities for communicating on the biodiversity advantage.

### 5. Monitoring of sites at risk

The activities to be implemented under this heading concern the monitoring of the implementation of the obligations of the Convention by parties by examination of case-file complaints or in the framework of the mediation procedure. They may also concern emergencies in the eventuality of a grave ecological damage as a result of a catastrophe, an accident or a conflict situation, and include on-the-spot appraisals organised for the European Diploma for Protected Areas.

Bern Convention Budget for 2017					
Expenditure	# Units	Unit cost	Total cost	Total available	Funds needed
			<b>604316</b>	<b>374900</b>	<b>244403</b>
<b>1. Statutory bodies</b>			<b>55505</b>	<b>39700</b>	<b>15805</b>
Meeting of the Standing Committee (4 days)			45504	29699	15805
<i>Subsistence of Chair/Delegates/Experts (average: 24 experts*5 per diem). Chair + Countries: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, BiH, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Portugal, Serbia, Slovak Republic, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Turkey, Ukraine, Morocco, Tunisia, Burkina Faso, Senegal</i>	120	175	21000	10900	10100
<i>Travel expenses of Chair/Delegates/Experts</i>	24	470	11280	5575	5705
<i>Interpretation Services</i>	6	2 204	13224	13224	0
<b>1st Meeting of the Bureau (1 day)</b>			<b>4563</b>	<b>4563</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Subsistence of Bureau Members (5 experts*1,5 per diem)</i>	7,5	175	1313	1313	0
<i>Travel expenses of Bureau Members (5 experts)</i>	5	650	3250	3250	0
<i>Interpretation Services</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2nd Meeting of the Bureau (1,5 days)</b>			<b>5438</b>	<b>5438</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Subsistence of Bureau Members (5 experts*2,5 per diem)</i>	12,5	175	2188	2188	0
<i>Travel expenses of Bureau Members (5 experts)</i>	5	650	3250	3250	0
<i>Interpretation Services</i>	0	0	0	0	0



<b>2. Monitoring and assistance to Parties</b>			<b>83575</b>	<b>33677</b>	<b>64885</b>
Select Group on Illegal killing of birds and GoE birds (2 days)			18425	9950	8475
<i>Travel expenses of Delegates/Experts</i>	15	470	7050	3450	3600
<i>Subsistence of Delegates/Experts (15 experts*3 per diem)</i>	45	175	7875	4000	3875
<i>Consultancy/technical reports</i>	1	3 500	3500	2500	1000

Group of Experts on Invasive Alien Species (2 days)			22925	7407	15518
<i>Travel expenses of Delegates/Experts</i>	15	470	7050	3450	3600
<i>Subsistence of Delegates/Experts (15 experts*3 per diem)</i>	45	175	7875	3957	3918
<i>Consultancy/technical reports</i>	2	4 000	8000	0	8000

Group of Experts on Amphibians and Reptiles (1,5 days)			24225	7820	16405
<i>Travel expenses of Chair/Delegates/Experts</i>	15	470	7050	2820	4230
<i>Subsistence of Chair/Delegates/Experts (15 experts *2,5 per diem)</i>	37,5	175	6563	3000	3563
<i>Consultancy/technical reports</i>	1	4 000	4000	2000	2000
<i>Interpretation Services</i>	3	2 204	6612	0	6612

Select Group of Experts on Climate Change (1 day)			14988	0	14988
<i>Travel expenses of Chair/Delegates/Experts</i>	15	470	7050	0	7050
<i>Subsistence of Chair/Delegates/Experts (15 experts *1,5 per diem)</i>	22,5	175	3938	0	3938
<i>Consultancy/technical reports</i>	1	4 000	4000	0	4000

Technical support on Large Carnivores, Plant conservation (Planta Europa Conference), and the CMS Pan-Mediterranean Task Force			10000	4000	6000
<i>Lumpsum AA</i>	1	0	10000	4000	6000

Capacity building on IAS management [including ruddy duck]			8000	4500	3500
<i>Lumpsum AA</i>	1	0	8000	4500	3500

<b>3. Conservation of Natural Habitats</b>			<b>72645</b>	<b>37923</b>	<b>34722</b>
Group of experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks (1,5 days)			23317	18595	4722
<i>Travel expenses of Chair/Delegates/Experts</i>	14	470	6580	5170	1410
<i>Subsistence of Chair/Delegates/Experts (14 experts*2,5 per diem)</i>	35	175	6125	4813	1312
<i>Consultancy/technical reports</i>	1	4 000	4000	2000	2000
<i>Interpretation Services</i>	3	2 204	6612	6612	0

Emerald Pilot project in Tunisia			0	0	0
<i>Lumpsum</i>	1	pm	0	0	0

2nd Emerald Pilot project in Morocco			20000	0	20000
<i>Lumpsum</i>	1	20 000	20000	0	20000

Emerald Phase II in Turkey			0	0	0
<i>Lumpsum</i>	1	pm	0	0	0

<b>Emerald biogeographic evaluations (2 days)</b>			<b>20000</b>	<b>10000</b>	<b>10000</b>
<i>Consultancy/technical reports</i>	2	10 000	20000	10000	10000
<i>Travel expenses of Delegates/Experts</i>	14	470	6580	6580	0
<i>Subsistence of Delegates/Experts (14 experts*2,5 per diem)</i>	35	175	6125	6125	0

<b>Group of Specialists on the EDPA (1 day)</b>			<b>9328</b>	<b>9328</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Travel expenses of Chair/Delegates/Experts</i>	6	470	2820	2820	0
<i>Subsistence of Chair/Delegates/Experts (6 experts*2)</i>	12	175	2100	2100	0
<i>Interpretation Services</i>	2	2 204	4408	4408	0

<b>4. Implementation of Article 3</b>			<b>17000</b>	<b>6000</b>	<b>11000</b>
Capacity building on the biodiversity advantage, including marine turtles			5000	3000	2000
<i>Lumpsum (training and consultancy)</i>	1	5 000	5000	3000	2000

<b>Awareness and visibility: Communication strategy</b>			<b>12000</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>9000</b>
<i>Lumpsum (communication supports)</i>	1	8 000	8000	3000	5000
<i>Lumpsum (electronic publications)</i>	1	4 000	4000	0	4000

<b>5. Monitoring of and advise on sites at risk</b>			<b>29950</b>	<b>21400</b>	<b>8550</b>
<i>Travels Experts</i>	10	470	4700	3500	1200
<i>Subsistence Experts</i>	30	175	5250	3900	1350
<i>Consultancy/AA</i>	10	2 000	20000	14000	6000

<b>6. Official Journeys of staff</b>			<b>22500</b>	<b>22500</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Travel and subsistence</i>	15	1 500	22500	22500	0

<b>7. Provision for the Chair</b>			<b>5000</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>2000</b>
<i>Travel and subsistence expenses (lumpsum)</i>	1	5 000	5000	3000	2000

<b>8. Overheads</b>			<b>27700</b>	<b>27700</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Printing Internal</i>	110 000	0,03	3300	3300	0
<i>Postage (Lumpsum)</i>	1	400	400	400	0
<i>Prepress (lumpsum)</i>	1	2 500	2500	2500	0
<i>Translation Services</i>	636	33,805	21500	21500	0

<b>9. Staff costs*</b>			<b>290 442</b>	<b>183000</b>	<b>107 442</b>
Permanent staff, senior management and office costs	lumpsum		161 900	161900	0
Pensions Permanent staff	lumpsum		21 100	21100	0
Temporary staff and office costs	27	3979,33	107442	0	107442

The Bern Convention Special Account will be used to cover expenses that cannot be covered by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe.

The activities that will not receive additional contributions will not or partially be implemented.

The Council of Europe provides around 374,900 € in 2017 (€ 191,900 for financing the programme of activities including overheads, and € 183,000 for staff, office, pensions and high level management costs).

### CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR 2017

	Meeting	Date	Place
1	Group of Specialists on the European Diploma (1day)	8 March 2017	Strasbourg
2	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting of the Bureau (1day)	21 March 2017	Strasbourg
3	Select Group of Experts on IKB and Group of Experts on the Conservation of birds (back-to-back meetings) (2 days)	tbd	tbd
4	Group of Experts on Invasive Alien Species back-to-back with a Seminar on the “Eradication of IAS in small European islands” (2 days)	May or June 2017	Madeira (Portugal)
5	Group of Experts on Amphibians and Reptiles (1.5 days)	tbd	tbd
6	Select Group of Experts on Climate change (1 day)	tbc	tbc
7	2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Bureau (1.5 days)	18-19 September 2017	Strasbourg
8	Emerald Network evaluation Seminar (2 days)	tbd	tbd
9	Group of Experts on Protected areas and Ecological Networks and Restricted Group of Experts on Reporting on the Emerald Network (back-to-back meetings) (2.5 days)	25-27 September 2017	Serbia
10	37 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee	5-8 December 2017	Strasbourg