

Strasbourg, le 12 novembre 2012
[inf16a_2012.doc]

T-PVS/Inf (2012) 16

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

CONVENTION RELATIVE A LA CONSERVATION DE LA VIE SAUVAGE
ET DU MILIEU NATUREL DE L'EUROPE

**Standing Committee
Comité permanent**

32nd meeting
32^e Réunion

Strasbourg, 27-30 November 2012
Strasbourg, 27-30 novembre 2012

**BIENNIAL REPORTS (2009-2010)
RAPPORTS BIENNAUX (2009-2010)**

*Memorandum drawn up by
the Directorate of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity
The document is being circulated in the form and the languages in which it was received by the
Secretariat*

*Note du Secrétariat Général établie par
la Direction de la Gouvernance démocratique, de la Culture et de la Diversité
Le document apparaît sous la forme et rédigé tel qu'il a été reçu au Secrétariat*

CONTENTS / SOMMAIRE

1. Albania / Albanie
2. Austria / Autriche
3. Cyprus / Chypre
4. Denmark / Danemark
5. Estonia / Estonie
6. Norway / Norvège
7. Slovak Republic / République slovaque
8. Sweden / Suède
9. Switzerland / Suisse
10. “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” /
“L’ex -République yougoslave de Macédoine”

ALBANIA / ALBANIE

BIENNIAL REPORT (2009-2010)

COMPETENT AUTHORITIES TO GRANT EXCEPTIONS:

Biodiversity Directorate

General Directorate of Policies

Ministry of Environment, Forests and Water Administration

Address: Rruga e Durrësit, No.27,

Tirana - ALBANIA

Albania after the entering into force of the Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) Agreement in April 2008, during this biennium applied to the EU to get the candidate status.

In this context the priority as stated also in the previous biannual report continued to be the transposition of the EU *acquis* into the national legislation.

So for the first time in Albania a dedicated Law “On hunting” was elaborated and approved on 11.3.2010, no. 10253. This Law fully endorses the principles of the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity. A number of by-laws related to the implementation of the Bern Convention in Albania were also elaborated, such as:

- Government Decree (Decision of the Council of Ministers) “On the determination of the hunting season in the Republic of Albania”, no. 553, dated 7.7.2010;
- Government Decree (Decision of the Council of Ministers) “On the approval of the list of wild fauna species object of hunting”, no. 546, dated 7.7.2010;
- Government Decree (Decision of the Council of Ministers) “On the approval of hunting tariffs”, no. 700, dated 13.8.2010.

As regards species protection during 2010 in close collaboration with MEDASSET the action plan for the conservation of sea turtles and their habitats in Albania was drafted.

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES (Appendix I):

There were no exceptions made for the biennium 2009-20010 concerning strictly protected flora species in Albania.

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY:

According to the provisions of the Law “On the protection of wild fauna”, no. 10006, dated 23.10.2008 and the new Law no. 10253, dated 11.3.2010 “On hunting”, falconry is not allowed in Albania.

However, this kind of hunting is never been practiced in Albania, due to the absence of tradition and conditions as well.

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX III):

<u>Name of the species</u>		<u>Exceptions made</u>				
Name of species	No. of licences	No. of individuals (when practical)	Action permitted (a to f)	Reason (i to v)	Means of killing/capture	Impact on population
Protected fauna species present in Albania (PPNEA/CORA research/2009 ref.)	1	1 ind. per species	c	iv	nets	Not detrimental

Protected 1 1 ind. per c iv nets Not detrimental
bat species species
present in Albania
(Sachanowitz, K./Eurobats research project/April-July 2010)

**EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING
SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV:**

According to the provisions of Law on hunting as well as Law on wild fauna protection, prohibited means of capture and killing as listed in the Bern Convention are addressed directly by the means of a separate dedicated Article stated as “prohibited means of capture and killing”.

For the biennium 2009-2010 there were no exceptions made referring to this issue.

However there have been a number of reports on the use of illegal means of capture and killing of migratory birds noted during the hunting season in Albania, mainly by foreign hunters. The Forestry Police has identified 16 such cases that were penalized by fines as determined by the Law “On hunting”.

Report compiled by:

Biodiversity Directorate
General Directorate of Policies
Ministry of Environment, Forests and Water Administration
Tirana
ALBANIA

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE**BIENNAL REPORT****2009 -2010****AUSTRIA****COMPETENT AUTHORITIES TO GRANT EXCEPTIONS**

The departments of the provincial governments and the district administration authorities of the federal provinces.

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES

Name of the species	Number of licenses	Number of specimens	Reasons for issuing of licenses	Impact on population
<i>Carex secalina</i>	1	-	A	none
<i>Dracocephalum ruyschiana</i>	4	-	A	none
<i>Liparis loeselii</i>	4	-	A	none
<i>Physoplexis comosa</i>	1	-	A	none

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX II)

Name of species	No. of licences	No. of individuals (when practical)	Action permitted (a to f)	Reason (i to v)	Means of killing/capture	Impact on population
Chiroptera	11	-	c, d	IV, V	hand, net	none
Microchiroptera	8	-	c, d	I, IV	net	none
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	1	1	c, d	I, IV	trap	none
<i>Lutra lutra</i>	2	15	c, d, f	I, IV	trap	none
<i>Felis silvestris</i>	1	-	f	IV	trap	none
<i>Spermophilus citellus</i>	1	10	c	IV	trap	none
Reptilia	3	-	c, d	I, IV	hand	none
<i>Lacerta agilis</i>	2	30	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Lacerta viridis</i>	1	10	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Podacris muralis</i>	1	50	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Zamenis longissimus</i>	1	22	c	IV	hand	none
Amphibia	10	-	c, d	I, IV	hand	none
<i>Salamandra atra</i>	2	-	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	1	-	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Triturus dobrogicus</i>	3	-	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Rana arvalis</i>	1	-	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Rana dalmatina</i>	1	-	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Rana sp.</i>	1	160	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Bombina bombina</i>	1	200-300	c	IV	hand	none
	1	5	c	IV	hand	none
	2	-	c	IV	hand	none
<i>Bombina variegata</i>	1	200-300	c	IV	hand	none
	1	5	c	IV	hand	none
	2	-	c	IV	hand	none

Hyla arborea	3	-	c	IV	hand	none
Pelobates fuscus	3	-	c	IV	hand	none
Bufo viridis	3	-	c	IV	hand	none
Lepidoptera	22	-	a, c, d	IV	hand	none
Parnassius apollo	1	-	c	IV	hand	none
Odonata	5	-	a, c, d	IV	hand	none
Osmoderma eremita	1	-	c	IV	hand	none

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX III)

<u>Name of the species</u>	<u>Exceptions made</u>
Castor fiber	IV
Soricidae	IV
Gliridae	IV
Zootoca vivipara	IV
Reptilia	IV, V
Natrix natrix	IV
Amphibia	IV, V
Salamandra salamadra	IV
Triturus alpestris	IV
Triturus vulgaris	IV
Thymallus thymallus	IV
Coregonus lavaretus	IV
Rutilus frisii	IV
Decapoda	IV
Austropotamobius torrentium	IV
Margaritifera margaritifera	IV

CYPRUS / CHYPRE



**REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, NATURAL RESOURCES
AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

Biennial Report of the Republic of Cyprus (2009 - 2010)

Prepared by Environment Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment

October 2012

1. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES (ART.5- APPENDIX I)

No exceptions granted

2. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART.6- APPENDIX II)

No exceptions granted

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

No exceptions granted

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART.7 - APPENDIX III)

<u>Name of the species</u>	<u>No of individuals involved</u>	<u>Exceptions made</u>	<u>Impact on the population</u>
----------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------

Gyps fulvus Total 9

7 Vultures at the FD enclosure/vulture at the Restaurant are part of a European-funded project and will be released when adapted to local conditions. Birds will be kept in other enclosures as well for acclimatization. Birds that have been in the enclosure for years will be evaluated and if found fit for release they will be released in the wild(iv)

2 at the Limassol zoo. Birds at Limassol zoo have been there for decades and are present for educational reasons (iv).

Ovis gmelini ophion Total 24

17 at the FD and 7 in a private bird Park at Pegeia. Mouflons are kept exclusively for display purposes. Both at the State enclosure (Stavros) and private bird Par (Pegeia, Pafos) serve to show the largest terrestrial mammal, unique to Cyprus (iv).

Impact on population: none

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX II

No exceptions granted

DENMARK / DANEMARK**1. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES**

Name of the species	Number of licences	Number of specimens (when practical)	Reasons for issuing of licences ¹	Impact on population
---------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------	--	----------------------

2. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX II)

Name of species	No. of licences	No. of individuals (when practical)	Action permitted (a to f)	Reason (i to v)	Means of killing/capture	Impact on population
Pelobates fuscus	3	30 adult, 30.000 eggs		iv	n.a.	+
Bufo calamita	4	10 adult 100 larvae 60.000 eggs		iv	n.a.	+
Hyla arborea	1	40 eggs		iv	n.a.	+
Bombina bombina	3	10 adult 18.000 eggs		iv	n.a.	+
Triturus cristatus	2	10 adults 30 larvae		iv	n.a.	+
Lacerta agilis	1	10 adults		iv	n.a.	0
Rana dalmatia	1	100 larvae		iv	n.a.	0
Zamanis situla	2	28 adults		trade ²		0
Emys o. orbicularis	1	25 adults		trade ³	n.a.	0
Timon Lepidus	1	10 adults		trade ⁴		+
Bufo viridis	2	11 adults 50 larvae		iv		0
Rana temporaria	3	190 adults		iv		

¹ A – for research/education/repopulation or reintroduction
 B – for exploitation
 C – for other overriding public interest (which?)

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX III)⁵

Name of the species

Exceptions made

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV

Name of species	No. of licences	No. of specimens	Reasons	Method used	Impact on population
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	---------	-------------	----------------------

² Trade of live animals in captivity.

³ Trade of live animals in captivity.

⁴ Trade of live animals in captivity.

⁵ If exceptions concern the prohibited means of capture and killing for Appendix III species, use the form 2.4 on Appendix IV.

ESTONIA / ESTONIE**1. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES
(ART. 5 - APPENDIX I)**

Name of the species	No. of specimens involved (when practical)	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ⁶	Impact on population

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted
The controls involved
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)
Comments/notes

**2. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES
(ART. 6 - APPENDIX II)**

Name of the species	No. of specimens involved (when practical)	Authorised action (art. 6, a. to f.) ⁷	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ⁸	Impact on population
Bufo calamita 2010	20	c	1	iv	none
Canis lupus 2009	108	a	140	ii, iii	Population slightly decreasing
Canis lupus 2010	125	a	135	ii, iii	Population stable
Ursus arctos 2009	45	a	60	ii	Population stable
Ursus arctos 2010	57	a	60	ii	Population stable
Branta leucopsis 2009	1085	a	1085	ii	none
Branta leucopsis 2010	2887	a	2887	ii	none

⁶ i.: protection of flora /fauna
ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)
iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

⁷ A: Deliberate killing
B: Deliberate damage to or destruction of breeding or resting sites
C: Deliberate capture and keeping
D: Deliberate disturbance of wild fauna
E: Deliberate destruction or taking of eggs
F: Possession and internal trade

⁸ i.: protection of flora /fauna
ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)
iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART. 7 APPENDIX III)⁹

Name of the species	No. of individuals involved (when practical)	Exception made	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ¹⁰	Impact on the population

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted
The controls involved
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)
Comments/notes

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV

Name of the species	No. of specimens (when practical)	No. of licences	Reasons (art. 8, a. to e.) ¹¹	Method used ¹²	Impact on the population

⁹ Kindly note that exceptions to species listed in Appendix III concern only those captured or killed using indiscriminate means of capture or killing and in particular methods specified in Appendix IV.

¹⁰ i.: protection of flora /fauna
 ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
 iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)
 iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
 v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

¹¹ A. Protection of flora and fauna
 B. To prevent serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
 C. In the interests of public health and safety / air safety / overriding public interests
 D. For research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
 E. Taking, keeping or other judicious exploitation of certain wild animals and plants in small numbers and under certain conditions (see art. 8)

¹² Choose from article 8 : 1 to 18 – See for reference pages 6-7 of this document

NORWAY / NORVEGE

BIENNIAL REPORT FROM NORWAY 2009-2010

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE AND NATURAL HABITATS

*Submitted by the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management, P.O. Box 5672 Sluppen,
NO-7485 Trondheim, Norway.*

Norway signed the Convention on 19th of September 1979, it was ratified on 27th of May 1986 and it entered into force on 1st of September 1986.

I. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Norwegian reservations

No new reservations or exceptions have been made by Norway during the reporting period.

1. Norway ratified the Bern Convention on 27 May 1986, with a reservation with respect to the prohibition listed in Appendix IV on the use of semi-automatic weapons capable of holding more than two rounds of ammunitions for hunting of the following species included in Appendix III: Red Deer *Cervus elaphus*, Roe Deer *Capreolus capreolus* and Moose *Alces alces*.
2. This reservation applies furthermore to the use of semi-automatic weapons used for sealing and whaling, conducted in accordance with Norwegian laws and regulations.
3. Following the decision of the Standing Committee to include several Cetacean species in Appendix II of the Convention in December 1987, Norway made reservations regarding six of the species. The reservations were withdrawn for three species in 1989: Pilot Whale *Globicephala melaena*, Bottle-nosed Whale *Hyperoodon rostratus* and Sowerby's Beaked Whale *Mesoplodon bidens*. The reservation is maintained for the following three species: Killer Whale *Orcinus orca*, White-sided Dolphin *Lagenorhynchus acutus* and White-beaked Dolphin *Lagenorhynchus albirostris*.
4. Norway made a reservation in April 1996 regarding the reclassification of Narwal *Monodon monoceros* and Fin Whale *Balaenoptera physalus* from Appendix III to II. Norway's view on these two species is thus for the time being based upon their former listing in Appendix III of the Convention.
5. In April 1991 Norway made a partial reservation with respect to Bryophytes listed in the Appendix concerning species protection. This applies to all Appendix I species occurring in Norway. To our present knowledge these are the following eight species: *Scapania massalongi*, *Atractylocarpus alpinus*, *Buxbaumia viridis*, *Cynodontium suecicum*, *Dicranum viride*, *Drepanocladus vernicosus*, *Meesia longiseta* and *Orthotrichum rogeri*. However, the reservation does not cover obligations contained in other Articles of the Convention, such as the obligations following from Article 4, § 1: "Each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in the Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats." In other words, Norway did not object to ensuring habitats of the Bryophyte species included in Appendix I, but did not intend to adopt legislative species protection measures.

However, all the mentioned moss species were included in the list of protected species by Royal Decree in 2005.

6. Following the decisions of the Standing Committee in December 1996 Norway made an objection in March 1997 regarding the inclusion of *Rheum rhaponticum* in Appendix I of the

Convention. This species is now regarded as introduced in Norway and from Norway's point of view inclusion in Appendix I of this species is in conflict with Article 11-2b of the Convention, which call for the strict control of non-native species. However, the objection does not imply any change in the present management practice concerning this species.

Norway also made a statement concerning the interpretation regarding the inclusion of marine species in the Appendices after the Standing Committee meeting in December 1996: Concerning the adopted list of marine species in Appendices II and III, Norway understands that these listings only apply to the geographical area of the Mediterranean Sea, as it is reflected in Article 1.1 of the Convention for the protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal region of the Mediterranean adopted in Barcelona on 16th February 1976 and amended on 15th of June 1995.

7. Following the decisions of the Standing Committee in December 1997 Norway made an objection in February 1998 regarding the inclusion of *Dracocephalum ruyschiana* in Appendix I of the Convention. Since this species was considered rather common in its range in Norway a strict protection of this species under the obligations given by the Convention was not considered relevant since Appendix I species primarily should be regarded as endangered or vulnerable.

However, Norway supports the idea of listing populations with unfavourable conservation status in parts of the distribution area.

However, *Dracocephalus ruyschiana* was included in the list of protected species by Royal Decree in 2005.

Geographical coverage

At the time of ratification Norway made a declaration to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe stating that the Convention shall apply to the continental territory of the Kingdom of Norway. With respect to the territories in Svalbard and Jan Mayen, the Government of Norway will promote national policies for the conservation of wild flora and fauna and natural habitats in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, with a reservation in respect of the conservation and management of the population of Arctic Fox *Alopex lagopus* in Svalbard.

An in-depth study on the implementation of the Convention in Norway and the other Nordic countries was presented to the 19th Meeting of the Standing Committee, cf "Implementation of the Bern Convention. Nordic Countries: Norway." Report to the Council of Europe by Cyrille de Klemm, T-PVS (99) 20 rev. of 22 November 1999, and also published in "Nature and Environment", no 103, February 2000.

The new nature diversity act of 2009

The new act on nature diversity was approved by the Parliament on 19th June 2009 (no. 100). This act replace or partly replace a number of other acts (e.g. the Nature Conservation, the Wildlife Act, the Act on Freshwater fish and Salmonids). The main principles of the new act are to protect biological, geological and landscape diversity and ecological processes through conservation and sustainable use (section 1). It places a general duty of care to all sectors (section 6). Other key concepts are 'environmental principles' such as the precautionary principle, the ecosystem approach and the polluter pays principle (section 9,10, 11). The new act broadens the scope of protection of specific natural habitats, so called 'selected habitat types' (section 52). Identified and appointed habitat types will be subject to regulations. A similar regime is introduced for species, so called 'priority species and their natural habitats' (section 23). For invasive alien species a new regulation is still under production.

General information on the new act:

<http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/md/press-centre/Press-releases/2009/new-nature-diversity-act.html?id=553630>

Summary of proposition to the Parliament:
http://www.regjeringen.no/pages/2265991/PDFS/OTP200820090052000EN_PDFS.pdf

The Nature Diversity Act in English:

<http://www.regjeringen.no/en/doc/Laws/Acts/nature-diversity-act.html?id=570549>

As a result of the new act and section 23 on ‘priority species’ 8 species were approved with separate regulations for each species by Royal Decree on 5th of May 2011. These are deemed to be the first in a series of expected priority species. The appointed species were: *Anser erythropus*, *Limosa limosa*, *Cicindela maritima*, *Osmoderma eremita*, *Scolitantides orion*, *Dracocephalum ruyschiana*, *Herminium monorchis* and *Cephalanthera rubra*.

Action plans

The Directorate for Nature Management has by 2011 nominated 120 species for development and implementation of action plans. In the period 2003-2010 action plans for the following species have been published: *Alopex lagopus* (see DN-report 2-3003 and later updates), *Anser erythropus* (see DN-report 2-2009 and 4-2011 in English), *Parnassius mnemosyne* (see DN-report 3-2010), *Rana lessonae* (see DN-report 2-2006), *Triturus cristatus* (see DN-report 1-2008), *Crex crex* (see DN-report 3-2008), *Margaritifera margaritifera* (see DN-report 3-2006), *Bubo bubo* (see DN-report 1-2009), *Emberiza hortulana* (see DN-report 5-2009), *Cucujus cinnaberinus* (see DN-report 4-2009), *Cephalanthera rubra* (see DN-report 1-2006) and *Zostera noltei* (see DN-report 1-2010). New action plans in preparation will include both species and species groups (eg bats).

II. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING ARTICLES 5, 6, 7 AND 8

1. STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES¹⁾ – APPENDIX I

In Norway the following Appendix I species occur: *Aster sibiricus* (protected by Royal Decree 2 October 1981), *Braya purpurascens* and *Oxytropis deflexa* ssp. *norvegica* (both protected by Royal Decree 25 January 1983), *Cypripedium calceolus* and *Platanthera obtusata* ssp. *oligantha* (both protected by Decree issued by the Directorate for Nature Management 1 June 1989).

A proposal to protect 52 species (43 vascular plants and 9 invertebrates) from the Directorate for Nature Management was approved by Royal Decree on December 21st 2001. This new decree includes all plant and invertebrate species on Appendix I and II not previously protected in Norway.

The new protection includes the following Appendix I species: *Botrychium simplex*, *Botrychium matricariifolium*, *Botrychium multifidum*, *Luronium natans*, *Silene furcata* ssp. *angustiflora*, *Trisetum subalpestre*, *Najas flexilis*, *Cypripedium calceolus*, *Platanthera obtusata* ssp. *oligantha*, *Papaver lapponicum*, *Polemonium boreale* and *Saxifraga hirculus*. The older decrees on *Aster sibiricus*, *Braya purpurascens* and *Oxytropis deflexa* ssp. *norvegica* is still in force. *Liparis loeselii* is considered extinct in Norway.

A proposal by the Directorate for Nature Management presented in June 2004 included species protection of *Dracocephalum ruyschiana*, in addition to eight Appendix I species of moss that occur in Norway: *Scapania massalongi*, *Hamatocaulis vernicosus*, *Buxbaumia viridis*, *Atractylocarpus alpinus*, *Cynodontium suecicum*, *Dicranum viride*, *Meesia longiseta* and *Orthotrichum rogeri*. All these species were subsequently protected by Royal Decree on July 13th 2005.

As a result of the acceptance of the biodiversity act (see paragraph I) in 2009 and its section 23 on ‘priority species’ 8 species were approved with separate regulations for each species by Royal Decree on 5th of May 2011. These are deemed to be the first in a series of expected priority species. The appointed flora species were: *Dracocephalum ruyschiana*, *Herminium monorchis* and *Cephalanthera rubra*.

¹⁾All species names according to the taxonomy used in the Appendices of the Convention.

Regulations and exceptions

The Directorate for nature management can as the management authority for the applicable acts and regulations give conditional exemptions for collection of protected species. As part of the ongoing mapping of new localities the directorate has encouraged amateurs and professionals alike to register for permits to collect in protected species.

The collections must be registered with scientific institutions and limitations to the number of samples that can be collected will be stated in the permit. Limitations aim to avoid threatening the existence of local populations. On average the directorate issues annually 1-5 exemptions from the decree, normally with a time limit of one to three years. The exemptions are mostly issued to

scientific institutions or consultants working on mapping programmes. Frequently the exemptions do not result in collections of the protected species.

2. STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES – APPENDIX II

Specific regulations have been adopted for the removal of individuals of wildlife species causing damage to crops, livestock, forests, water or other forms of property, or in the interest of public health and safety. Generally, other solutions shall within reasonable limits have been pursued in order to avoid damage, before permit is given to remove protected species. The Directorate for Nature Management has issued a Decree dated 1 September 1997, which states that permits may be issued for different species on three different management levels. These being municipality level, county level and national level.

Nationwide protection of Appendix II species

A proposal on species protection in Norway adopted by Royal Decree on December 21st 2001 include the following invertebrate Appendix II species: *Leucorrhinia albifrons*, *Leucorrhinia caudalis*, *Leucorrhinia pectoralis*, *Parnassius apollo*, *Parnassius mnemosyne*, *Coenonympha hero*, *Cucujus cinnaberinus* and *Dytiscus latissimus*.

A proposal by the Directorate for Nature Management presented in June 2004 includes species protection of *Graphoderus bilineatus*, which was subsequently protected by Royal Decree on July 13th 2005.

After the rediscovery of *Osmoderma eremita* in 2008, the species was given nationwide protection by the Directorate for Nature Management on August 22nd 2008.

As a result of the biodiversity act (see paragraph I) in 2009 and its section 23 on ‘priority species’ 8 species were approved with separate regulations for each species by Royal Decree on 5th of May 2011. These are deemed to be the first in a series of expected priority species. The appointed fauna species were: *Anser erythropus*, *Limosa limosa*, *Cicindela maritima*, *Osmoderma eremita* and *Scolitantides orion*.

Regulations and exemptions

Exemptions from the general protection of wildlife is possible under a differentiated management regime according to species and level of potential damage. Generally applications for exemptions for more numerous species is handled by the municipal level (1), while the County Governor handles more sensitive species (2). The Directorate for nature management as the national wildlife management authority handles the most sensitive species (3).

1. Municipality based Wildlife Boards

The following Appendix II species may be removed if permitted by the local Wildlife Board (one in each municipality) if they are damaging wooden constructions, crops etc.: Green Woodpecker *Picus viridis*, Grey-headed Woodpecker *Picus canus*, Black Woodpecker *Dryocopus martius*, Great Spotted Woodpecker *Dendrocopos major*, Greenfinch *Carduelis chloris* and Yellowhammer *Emberiza citrinella*.

2. County Governor

The County Governor may, when the following Appendix II species cause damage, issue permits for removal: Otter *Lutra lutra*, bats Microchiroptera, Mute Swan *Cygnus olor*, Pink-footed Goose *Anser brachyrhynchus*, Common Tern *Sterna hirundo*, Arctic Tern *Sterna paradisaea*, Golden Eagle *Aquila chrysaetos*, Goshawk *Accipiter gentilis* and Sparrowhawk *Accipiter nisus*. However, the Directorate has warned that bats are protected and should not be disturbed. To facilitate any issues related to bats a system of advisors and assistance is funded by the directorate. No known incidences related to bats have been registered in the reporting period.

3. The Directorate for Nature Management

The Directorate for Nature Management may, under particular circumstances, issue permits for removal of protected wildlife, either when wildlife causes damage or for scientific purposes. Such permits have in the biennial period been issued for the following Appendix II species: Brown Bear *Ursus arctos*, Wolverine *Gulo gulo* and Wolf *Canis lupus* (see table 1)

The Directorate for nature management issued on 18th June 2004 (no 913) a regulation for handling of dead specimen of wildlife (ie those found dead). This regulation outlines national regulations for taxidermists and it lists for which species should be tagged and for which species it is necessary to apply for a licence to keep. The last requirement applies for 47 species (incl. bats, carnivores and birds) and is made mandatory from 2004. Of these 47 species it is necessary to register ownership and tag 8 species back in time, ie old specimens.

Large carnivore management

Management of large carnivores in Norway is regulated by the Nature Diversity Act of 2009 and the Wildlife Act of 1981. The Directorate for Nature Management issued in 2005 a regulation on the management of predators, including regulations of bear, wolverine, wolf, lynx and golden eagle. In this regulation the Norwegian populations goals for bear, wolf, lynx, wolverine and golden eagle is defined, which are the management authorities, and giving guidelines under which specific circumstances killing of carnivores can be allowed.

Approximately 200 persons are engaged on a seasonal basis to map and monitor the national occurrence of carnivores, and to report on relevant incidences involving carnivores in relation to incidences with husbandry. Every incidence of dead or injured husbandry is analysed, whether these are killed by a large carnivore or by other causes (natural mortality, accidents etc) and registered in a database. Also an overview of dead carnivores segregated on different causes of mortality (natural, licensed or quota hunted, accident, illegal or other) is available from 1997 until now in this database. E.g. through the use of GIS-technology the public may enter the database via a map of the country and sample information from different levels (municipal, regional or national) as well as information on single cases, see 'rovviltportalen' below. On the webpage of the national statistical agency (Statistics Norway) statistical information on the number of dead carnivores can be found (both in English and Norwegian), cf www.ssb.no/rovdyrav or www.ssb.no/english This statistics is based on different calculations and includes also animals found dead (natural causes).

In 2007 the Directorate for Nature Management opened a website called 'Rovviltportalen' ('the large carnivore gate') (www.rovviltportalen.no). The text is only in Norwegian. This website aim to simplify access to information on the issue by the general public and others. The site publishes interactive maps of sites with records of the four large carnivores and maps on husbandry carcasses found. The information also covers Golden Eagle. The site gives information on national policy, on population monitoring, gives oversight of meetings on the issue, media-clippings, specific information on each species concerning its biology and hunting practices. The site gives overviews of all licenses issued and the results of these. It is also a site giving information of requirements for hunters, and for registration of hunters, the most recent quotas, it contains access to electronic application for compensation for livestock or semi-domestic reindeer killed by large carnivores, and financial support for preventive measures to avoid killing of husbandry, etc. The site is regarded as a success and is widely used.

Exceptions for threatened or vulnerable populations of species:

The Norwegian policy towards the large carnivores is based on the White Paper to the Parliament no 15 (2003-04). The policy was debated again in the Parliament in June 2010, and revised with minor changes compared to the White Paper of 2003-04. For these species reference is also given to "Recommendation no 59 (1997) on the drafting and implementation of Action Plans of wild fauna species", "Recommendation no 74 (1999) on the conservation of large carnivores", "Recommendation no 82 (2000) on urgent measures concerning the implementation of Action Plans for large carnivores in Europe" and 'Recommendation no 115 (2005) on the conservation and management of transboundary populations of large carnivores.' In general, Norway has accepted all the recommendations from the Bern Convention regarding large carnivores.

The number of individuals killed or found dead of the three species of large carnivores on Appendix II are listed in table 1. When it is agreed upon the Directorate for nature management normally issues pending permits (licenses) for these species, or if the population level within each region is reached, the pending permits are issued by a Regional Board for large carnivores which has the authority within the region. The County Governors have the authority to confirm the final permit,

when it is deemed necessary. The number of pending permits issued will therefore normally be higher than the number of actual animals felled.

Brown Bear *Ursus arctos*

For brown bear, see further information under Recommendation no 10 (December 1988) in chapter III below. In 2010 the national population count 166 animals confirmed by DNA-analysis of hair and scat samples collected during the season.

Wolverine *Gulo gulo*

For wolverine, reference is given to the Norwegian contributions to the "Final Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Wolverines (*Gulo gulo*) in Europe" under the Bern Convention, cf T-PVS (98) 27 rev., Strasbourg, 21 January 1999 (cf also "Nature and Environment" no 115). In 2010 the national population counted approximately 362 individuals and 66 dens.

Wolf *Canis lupus*

The population of Wolf is small and endangered in Norway. However, there is a general provision in the Nature Diversity Act for killing large carnivores when there is danger of a direct attack on livestock. Norway has started applying a management regime for wolves that varies according to area. In some parts the wolves will be protected and in other parts sheep and reindeer production is given priority. These management principles are also practised for brown bear and wolverine.

Reference is given to the letter from the Directorate for Nature Management to the Bern Convention of 26 March 1999 on the protection of the Wolf in Norway, i.a describing the agreement between the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management of 7 September 1998. Norway has also contributed to the "Final Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Wolves (*Canis lupus*) in Europe" under the Bern Convention, cf T-PVS (98) 24 rev., Strasbourg, 21 January 1999 (cf also "Nature and Environment" no 113).

The wolf population in Scandinavia is growing. In 2010 the Norwegian population consisted of 33-35 individuals and 3 confirmed breeding. There were 31 confirmed family packs of wolves in Norway and Sweden in 2010; 3 of these family packs were entirely on the Norwegian side of the border.

Table 1. Exceptions concerning brown bear, wolverine and wolf as reported to the Directorate for Nature Management for the hunting seasons (01.04-31.03) 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The numbers also contain specimens killed by road accidents, natural deaths etc.

Species	No. of ind. felled	Licence hunting	
		Lic. issued	Felled
Brown bear <i>Ursus arctos</i>	7	-	-
2000-2001	3	-	-
2001-02	1	-	-
2002-03	4	-	-
2003-04	1	-	-
2004-05	6	-	-
2005-06	5	6	0
2006-07	12	15	3
2007-08	12	16	2
2008-09	18	18	9
2009-10			

<i>Wolverine Gulo gulo</i>			
2000-01	43	44	31
2001-02	32	50	23
2002-03	34	42	28
2003-04	39	50	23
2004-05	49	60	21
2005-06	58	68	38
2006-07	79	91	40
2007-08	76	94	28
2008-09	90	89	35
2009-10	89	102	35
<i>Wolf Canis lupus</i>			
2000-2001	17	-	-
2001-02	2	-	-
2002-03	5	-	-
2003-04	5	-	-
2004-05	7	-	-
2005-06	4	-	-
2006-07	2	2	1
2007-08	5	4	2
2008-09	5	0	0
2009-10	8	4	2

Otter *Lutra lutra*

The population of otter is estimated at 25.000-30.000 individuals and the population is still increasing in Norway. It is perceived as a common species along the coast and is also recolonizing inland areas. The rise and spread of the population causes conflicts with the fish farming industry. The increase in the population has also led to an increase of otters drowning in fishing gear or being killed accidentally by cars. Illegal killing of otters is also known to occur. However, the death rate (both illegal and caused by accidents etc) should be perceived as insignificant in relation to the overall population and the demographic development.

Birds of prey

The numbers stated here for white-tailed eagle, golden eagle and goshawk for the seasons 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 are given in table 2. The numbers are mostly birds found dead. The numbers are regarded as being in the lows. No licence for felling in the reporting periods were given for these species. The national populations of white-tailed eagle is estimated at 3000 pairs, for golden eagle at 850-1200 pairs and of goshawk at ca. 2000-2700 pairs.

Table 2. Numbers of goshawk, golden eagle and white-tailed eagle reported as found dead for the seasons 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Species	Total number
Goshawk <i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	
2003-04	44
2004-05	27
2005-06	15
2006-07	15
2007-08	9
2008-09	21
2009-10	26

Golden eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	
2003-04	4
2004-05	12
2005-06	10
2006-07	14
2007-08	7
2008-09	8
2009-10	11
White-tailed eagle <i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i>	26
2003-04	31
2004-05	43
2005-06	44
2006-07	26
2007-08	32
2008-09	19
2009-10	

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

Falconry is not allowed in Norway, two exceptions from this prohibition were made in the period 2009 to 2010. This was in relation to short visits related to production of a film.

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX III)

The exploitation of all species originally listed in Appendix III is regulated, with fixed hunting seasons for all of the species. For several species hunting and other forms of exploitation is only allowed in some parts of the country, while the species may be totally protected in other parts. Restrictions on hunting periods and geography are decided by the Directorate for Nature Management and each hunting period now lasts for five years until a new revision. The revised hunting periods are based on hunting statistics as well as scientific advice and public advice. In addition the Directorate may stop hunting of species totally or in geographic regions if the circumstances changes or emergencies occur.

Exceptions from the ordinary hunting season may be accepted in order to avoid damage to crops, livestock or reindeer husbandry. In most cases such exceptions require the prior grant of a permit issued by either the local Wildlife Board in a municipality, the County Governor or the Directorate for Nature Management, cf also above under paragraph 2 (on Appendix II species).

Particularly for lynx *Lynx lynx*, Norway has applied a hunting quota system for each county, to regulate the population and to prevent damage on livestock and reindeer husbandry. The quotas are defined by the Directorate for Nature Management or if the regional population level of lynx is reached a Regional Board for large Carnivores has authority to define the quota within the region. In the season 2008-09 the quota for felling of European Lynx was 119, and 110 were actually felled. For 2009-10 the quota was 149 and 134 were felled. In 2010 the national population of lynx counted 441-470 individuals and 75-80 family groups.

Table 3. Quota hunting concerning lynx for the seasons 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10. The total numbers also contain specimens killed by road accidents, natural deaths etc.

Species	Total number	Quota hunting	
Lynx <i>Lynx lynx</i>		Quota	Felled
	48	50	35
2003-04	56	51	44
2004-05	52	48	40
2005-06	85	74	58
2006-07	104	96	90
2007-08	136	119	110
2008-09	147	149	134
2009-10			

The Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* is an Appendix III species. As a measure to safeguard threatened strains of this species in particular watercourses, mainly due to impact of the introduced parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris*, Norway has decided to apply treatment with the poisonous agent rotenone. The Norwegian policy towards the use of this agent is to restore ecosystems that stand a risk of becoming destroyed due to introduced species. Rotenone treatment has mainly been applied in watercourses with salmon stocks to eradicate *Gyrodactylus salaris*. Research has shown that there is no negative impact on e.g. the populations of the Pearl Mussel *Margaritifera margaritifera*, another Appendix III species, from these rotenone treatments. Some lakes have also been treated with rotenone to try to eradicate the European Minnow *Phoxinus phoxinus* from areas where this species has been introduced.

A Norwegian case study on *Gyrodactylus salaris* was worked out in 2000 and submitted to the Convention on Biological Diversity in May 2001. A trial with an aluminium based solvent has proven less toxic to non-target species and at the same time highly effective against the parasite. It is thus expected to become a more widespread method in the years to come.

Protection of Appendix III species

On Appendix III Norway holds three species: the freshwater crayfish *Astacus astacus*, the pearl mussel *Margaritifera margaritifera* and the leech *Hirudo medicinalis*. The first two have a long standing protection regime in Norway, while the leech was given a formal and total species protection in Norway by Royal Decree on December 21st 2001.

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV

The only exception made for means of killing as specified in Appendix IV, is the use of semi-automatic weapons, cf. the Norwegian reservation under I.1-2 above. In addition, persons authorised by the Directorate for nature management may use mist nets or other nets, traps and tape recorders to catch birds or other animals for scientific purposes (ringing etc.). These birds or other animals are normally released afterwards, and therefore the use of these methods will not cause local disappearance of or serious disturbance to populations of a species as stated in Article 8. Obligatory training programmes (2 different courses) with exams have to be passed for persons to hold a license for bird trapping and ringing. The same kind of programme is applicable for bat handling and ringing.

III. IMPLEMENTATION IN THE PERIOD 2000-2010 OF RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

Resolution no 1 and recommendations no 14, 15 and 16 on habitat conservation: Thematic county nature protection plans

A systematic conservation programme for different types of natural habitats (thematic nature protection plans), based on regional inventories, was initiated in Norway in the beginning of the 1970s. Regional (county) conservation plans for wetlands (especially those important for waterfowl), mires/bogs (primarily selected on botanical and hydrological criteria), broad-leaved forest (selected mainly on botanical criteria) and important seabird colonies were given priority. In 1985 inventories

started in order to identify coniferous forests for protection, and elaboration of conservation plans for coniferous forests have been given high priority since 1988, when the recommendations from a national task force on protection of coniferous forest were presented.

In the reporting period work has been carried out to implement a national plan for marine protected areas. This will concern coral reefs and special marine ecosystems, as well as representative sites and particular sites for flora and fauna (cf the white paper Report to the Storting no 43 (1998-99) on the Protection and Use of the Coastal Environment).

By the end of 2010 the work 70 thematic county nature protection plans were finalized. The Phase I plan for establishment of a network of coniferous nature reserves has been completed, as has phase II (additional coniferous forests). A phase III is currently running (an extension of the forest protection scheme). It includes not only coniferous forests, but also other types of forested areas.

In addition to this a program for new national parks and landscape protection areas are almost completed. When this program is fulfilled it is expected to raise the percentage of Norway under nature conservation protection to between 16 and 17%.

Preparation of a county conservation plan is a time-consuming process, including the following steps:

- Systematic inventories and evaluation of sites based on scientific criteria
- The County Governor collects information on properties, names of landowners and other formalities concerning sites of high conservation priority, and makes preliminary judgements concerning conflicts with other interests
- The County Governor informs landowners, the municipalities and different agencies at the county level about the conservation proposal
- These are given the opportunity to make preliminary comments on the conservation proposals
- The County Governor elaborates a draft conservation plan, which is sent to the Directorate for Nature Management for technical/scientific approval
- The County Governor sends the proposal to landowners, organisations and municipalities at the local level and agencies at the county level for a formal hearing
- Landowners, municipalities and others at the local level give their written comments to the plan
- The County Governor makes his final proposal for a conservation plan
- The Directorate for Nature Management sends the plan to organisations, agencies and ministries at the national level for comments
- The Directorate for Nature Management analyses the comments, finalises the conservation plan, and presents its proposal to the Ministry of Environment
- The Ministry of Environment presents the proposal to the Government, and the Government adopts the conservation plan through a Royal Decree.

Following the legal establishment of protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act, the decision has to be published, the sites have to be marked in the field, the question of possible economic compensation to land owners has to be settled (the land will normally still be owned by private land owners), and management plans may be elaborated if necessary.

The total land area under legal protection increased from 24.557 km² (7.58 %) in 2000 to 26.298 km² (8.12 %) by 2002, to 47.143 km² (14.6%) by the end of 2008 and by the end of 2010 it was 52.021 km² (16,1%). Table 4 gives the status for area protection in Norway by the end of 2010. The conservation programme with the intent of a total of 16% terrestrial area under protection (incl freshwater) has thus been achieved. Analysis of the established protection network and new goals for terrestrial and marine protection will further increase the area under protection.

During the reporting period the Directorate for Nature Management has been working with a gap analysis (evaluation) of terrestrial protected areas in Norway (finalized June 2010).

In 2007 the Directorate for Nature Management issued a report from The Norwegian Pilot Project on Emerald Network (cf. final project report from Norway (T-PVS/Emerald (2007) 18)). The Pilot Project forms the basis for the second phase, which is the implementation of the Network itself. This is coordinated with the evaluation of protected areas.

Table 4. Number and area of protected areas in Norway by the end of 2010

Type	Number	Area km ²	Percentage of mainland
National park	33	29.960	9.3
Nature reserve	2009	5.333	1,7
Landscape protection	196	16.301	5
Other	477	427	0,1
Total	2.715	52.021	16.1

Other areas

In addition to the figures given in Table 2, approximately 2.900km² of sea areas are protected (out of ca. 90.000 km² inside 12 nautical miles, and two areas (totally covering 63 km²) are protected according to the Wildlife Act. Twenty-two areas are protected according to the Svalbard Act (totalling 35.029 km², equalling 65% of its land area). Of marine waters around Svalbard ca. ¾ of the territorial waters out to 12 nautical miles have been protected. A new act on the environment on Svalbard entered into force on 1st July 2002, cf. Svalbardmiljøloven.

Table 5. Number and area of protected areas in Svalbard by the end of 2010

Type	Number	Area km ²	Percentage of mainland
National park	7	14.487	23,7
Nature reserve	21	25.314	41,5
Other areas	1	14	0,02
Total	29	39.815	65,3%

Management of protected areas

The need for an improved overall strategy for management of protected areas in Norway led to the establishment of a committee on protected areas and a report published in 1989. The committee formulated a general strategy for future management of protected areas, and proposed some general criteria for allocation of resources to management actions.

The following general aims for management of protected areas have been adopted:

- Evaluate the needs for ecological management actions in all protected areas
- Develop management plans for those areas where certain actions are considered to be necessary, or eventually only short notes concerning more "stable" areas

- Make management plans realistic (scientifically, economically and with respect to practical implementation)
- Simplify/revise some existing (too ambitious) management plans
- Implement long term ecological management in a representative sample of sites, aimed at maintaining a certain ecological condition

According to the regulations for each protected area (protected under the Nature Conservation Act), a management plan for the area may be developed and adopted by the management authority.

Such a management plan may include three main parts:

1. Plan for ecological management, including
 - action plan for restoring ecological character
 - action plan for maintaining ecological character
 - action plan for enhancing ecological conservation aims
2. Plan for utilisation, including
 - arrangements for public access and information
 - arrangements for special groups of people
 - guidelines for the land owners use of the area
3. Plan for wardening, including
 - agreements on wardening
 - instructions for wardens

As a follow up of this work an action plan for a number of prioritised nature protected sites was published in 1996, cf Report from the Directorate for Nature Management no 4. Further work to revise a handbook for management of nature protected sites was initiated, and a new version of the handbook was published in the year 2000.

In 1998 an initiative was taken by the Ministry of Environment to delegate the management of conserved areas to the municipal level in Norway. During the reporting period all municipalities (450) have been offered the possibility to take over responsibility for the management of protected areas. In principle, this initiative covers all types of protected areas in Norway. In the early phase 16 municipalities with ca. 100 protected areas participated. This has now been replaced by a new programme with participation of 70 municipalities. Municipalities accepting the offer will be trained to cope with the task. An evaluation of this was completed in 2008.

The Norwegian policy regarding management of protected areas and species is stated in the white paper "Report to the Storting no 42 (2000-01): Biological Diversity. Sector Responsibility and Coordination." Furthermore, the actual status of the environment is updated in annual white papers called "The National State of the Environment", e.g Report to the Storting no 24 (2000-2001) and no 26 (2006-2007): The Environmental Policy of the Government and the State of the Environment in Norway.

Furthermore, the Directorate for Nature Management has issued a "National Master Plan for Monitoring of Biological Diversity" (DN Report 1998-1, Trondheim (170 pp; ISBN: 82-7072-289-8)). The Norway/UN-Trondheim Conference in September 1999 had as its main theme "The Ecosystem Approach for Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity".

Based on a framework for monitoring of protected areas outlined in 2006, the Directorate for Nature Management in 2007 and 2008 has been working with guidance on setting and assessing conservation objectives. Conservation objectives are already being included as an important part in all new management plans.

A new act on nature diversity entered into force in 2009 and replaced the Nature Conservation Act when it comes to protection of areas and management of protected areas.

In 2007 the Directorate for Nature Management issued a strategy on funding of actions in protected areas. In 2007 the Ministry of Environment issued a national strategy on alien species, where the need for actions in protected areas is highlighted.

The Norwegian policy regarding management of protected areas and species is stated in the white paper "Report to the Storting no 42 (2000-01): Biological Diversity. Sector Responsibility and Coordination." Furthermore, the actual status of the environment is updated in annual white papers called "The National State of the Environment", e.g Report to the Storting no 24 (2000-2001): The Environmental Policy of the Government and the State of the Environment in Norway.

The Norwegian Nature Inspectorate

The Norwegian Nature Inspectorate (SNO) is the national ranger organization and the national authority for nature supervision and inspection of the whole country, on both publicly owned and privately owned land. The organisation was set up in 1997, as a consequence of the Nature inspectorate Act passed by The Norwegian Parliament in 1996.

SNO is organized as a specific part of The Directorate of Nature Management, with special legal powers and tasks. It has a head office in Trondheim (25 persons) and a network of 55 local offices (110 persons) across the country. The local offices are divided into 6 sections; National Parks and Protected Areas Section (2), Coastal Areas Section (2), Large Carnivores Section (1) and Nature Interpretation (1).

SNO has a national responsibility for prevention and control of environmental crime, and co-operates closely with the national and local police and other official and private organisations, such as the municipal committees that oversee grazing, hunting and fishing rights on common land, Norwegian Pollution Control Authority, Norwegian Coastguard Service and the Archipelago Service.

SNO is also responsible for overseeing the national parks and protected areas, as well as conservation merits of national importance, such as endangered and vulnerable species and species where Norway has a special responsibility, e.g. the North Atlantic Salmon and the wild reindeer populations in the mountain areas of Southern Norway.

Protection of water courses

Conservation plans to protect specific watercourses from hydropower development have been approved by the Norwegian Parliament. The fourth conservation plan for the protection of watercourses was adopted in April 1993, resulting in a total of 341 watercourses being protected. To supplement these conservation plans a new supplementary plan was completed in 2005.

Resolution no 5 (1998) concerning the rules for the network of areas of special conservation interest (Emerald Network):

Norway initiated work to implement the Emerald Network in 2004. By 2010 the total number of nationally Protected Areas (PA) evaluated was 197. These cover about 22,500 km² (2.250.000 ha) of the land area, (including freshwater), or about 45 % of the total area of national PAs in Norway. They also cover about 1,000 km² of marine areas, and about 30 % of the total protected sea area. Since some of the PAs are aligned, or very close to each other, they have been proposed as single Emerald sites (ASCI). The number of ASCIs evaluated by now is thus 93. 36 out of 45 classified habitats have been considered relevant for Norway (cf T-PVS/Emerald (2007) 18). Concerning species 106 out of the 132 are considered relevant for Norway.

Resolution no 6 (1998) listing the species requiring specific habitat conservation measures:

The Norwegian policy is generally based on the white paper "Report to the Storting no 42 (2000-01): Biological Diversity. Sector Responsibility and Coordination." Furthermore, the Ministry of the Environment has initiated a nation-wide project on registration of biodiversity in the municipalities. This project has ended in a countrywide database (naturbasen).

The Parliament in 2000 decided to establish a National Data Bank for Species (Norwegian Biodiversity Information Centre, www.biodiversity.no) concentrating primarily on red-listed species. The unit will be in charge of producing updates of the national red list through national expert committees. The first red list from the unit was published in 2006 and the second in 2010. The red list

volumes contain both English and Norwegian text. An accompanying volume to the 2010-list describes 'Environmental Conditions and Impacts for Red List Species'.

Recommendation no 10 (1988) concerning the protection of the Brown Bear *Ursus arctos*:

The management of Brown Bear in Norway is generally in compliance with the ideas and proposals contained in this recommendation. A comprehensive plan for management of large carnivores, including the Brown Bear, was adopted by the Parliament in the spring of 2004 and 2011, cf the white paper "Report to the Storting no 15 (2003-04): Large carnivorous in Norwegian wildlife" and Recommendation S. no 174 (2003-04) and a private member's bill no 163 S (2010-11) to the Parliament. Reference is also given to the Norwegian contribution to the "Final Draft Action Plan for Conservation of the Brown Bear (*Ursus arctos*) in Europe" under the Bern Convention, cf T-PVS (98) 23 rev., Strasbourg, 21 January 1999 (cf also "Nature and Environment" no 114).

Recommendation no 17 (1989) on the protection of the Wolf *Canis lupus* in Europe:

The ideas and proposals contained in this recommendation are, with a couple of exceptions, reflected in Norway's protection and management of its endangered Wolf population. The exceptions are the recommendations contained in § 4 and § 6 of the operational part of the recommendation, which are not considered to be relevant for Norwegian conditions. Reference is also given to document T-PVS (99) 49, and white paper "Report to the Storting no 15 (2003-04): Large carnivorous in Norwegian wildlife" and Recommendation S. no 174 (2003-04) and a private member's bill no 163 S (2010-11) to the Parliament for a more in depth review of the Norwegian management of the Norwegian-Swedish Wolf population, as well as further information given under chapter II.2 above.

Recommendation no 18 (1989) on the protection of indigenous crayfish in Europe:

The management of crayfish in Norway is fully in compliance with the recommendations adopted by the Standing Committee of the Convention. Everyone who wish to harvest crayfish today, need to have a specific licence.

Recommendation no 20 (1991) on the protection of the European Lynx *Lynx lynx*:

The management of European Lynx in Norway is generally in compliance with the recommendations adopted by the Standing Committee of the Convention, cf letter from the Directorate for Nature Management dated 3 May 1996, and white paper "Report to the Storting no 15 (2003-04): Large carnivorous in Norwegian wildlife" and Recommendation S. no 174 (2003-04) and a private member's bill no 163 S (2010-11) to the Parliament on the management of large carnivores, including European Lynx. Reference is also given to the "Nature and Environment" no 112 on this species. See further information on this species under chapter II.4 above.

Recommendation no 22 (1991) on the conservation of the Pearl Mussel *Margaritifera margaritifera* and other freshwater mussels (Unionidae), cf also Recommendation no 80 (2000) on the implementation of the Action Plan for the conservation of the pearl mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*):

The management of Pearl Mussel in Norway is fully in compliance with the recommendations adopted by the Standing Committee of the Convention, as it is fully protected by the Act relating to Salmon- and Freshwater Fisheries. Following the recommendation no 80 Norway has intensified the efforts to study this species, aiming at increasing the knowledge of its biology and also aiming at developing a management strategy for the species. It is suggested that Norway holds more than 80% of the European population of this species. Norway is also continuing to add calcium to acidified watercourses and lakes, resulting in improved habitats for e.g the pearl mussel. An action plan was published in 2006 (see DN-report 2006-3).

Recommendation no 48 (1996) on the conservation of European globally threatened birds, cf also Recommendation no 60 (1997) on the implementation of the Action Plans for globally threatened birds in Europe, and Recommendation no 75 (1999) on the implementation of new Action Plans for globally threatened birds in Europe, and Recommendation no 93 (2002) on the further implementation of Action Plans for Globally threatened birds and on other issues of interest for bird conservation in the Convention's range:

Norway holds breeding populations of two of the species mentioned in the Appendix to Recommendations no 48 and no 60; Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus* and Corncrake *Crex crex*. The Directorate for Nature Management, the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research and the Norwegian Ornithological Society (NOF) are responsible for a program that monitors the population development and breeding success of the Fennoscandian population of Lesser White-fronted Geese. A satellite tracking study has also been accomplished in order to reveal the migratory routes, stopover sites on migration and wintering grounds for the species. The project involves several nations, i.e. Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Finland, Russia, Hungary, Romania, Kazakhstan and Ukraine. See separate action plans published by the Directorate for nature management (DN-report 2008-3 for corncrake and 2009-2 for lesser white-fronted goose).

A monitoring and management project for Corncrakes in Southern Norway is also established. Breeding Corncrakes are localised, and information on the sites is conveyed to local landowners. Mowing of the breeding meadows is recommended postponed.

Recommendation no 75 specifically asks for National Action Plans for four species listed in the Appendix to the recommendation in coordination with the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds Agreement (AEWA) under the Bonn Convention. One of these species is Steller's Eider *Polysticta stelleri*, which is included in the "Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan" under Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), issued in June 1997, and partly funded by the Directorate for Nature Management. This Strategy and Action Plan was implemented in the period 2000-02 under CAFF.

Recommendation no 51 (1996) on action plans for invertebrate species in the Appendices of the Convention and Recommendation no 52 (1996) on habitat conservation for invertebrate species:

Increasing knowledge and focus on rare invertebrate species over the last decade has resulted in both new species protection regimes and new protected sites. Different research programmes has been initiated and two examples are:

Under the national programme for mapping and monitoring of biodiversity, the programme INVENT-ART is an example of reinforced nationwide mapping of rare or undiscovered insects. Some publicised results from this project (now in its third phase) can be seen at: <http://www.artsdatabanken.no/Article.aspx?m=264&amid=8986>

The Norwegian Biodiversity Information Center administer a nationwide Species-programme. Over the last two year 450 new species to Norway has been described, of which 100 were new to science. Most of these are invertebrates. Results from ongoing initiatives under this programme can be seen at <http://www.artsdatabanken.no/artArticle.aspx?m=224&amid=6052>

Recommendation no 53 (1996) on the conservation of European Otter *Lutra lutra*:

A national monitoring programme and studies on the biology of this species have been performed by the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research. Among the conclusions are that this species is still increasing in Norway and are now re-colonising former areas in the southern and interior parts of the country. The total population is probably now between 20.000 and 30.000 individuals and increasing. (See also information on this species under chapter II.2 above.)

Recommendation no 57 (1997) on the introduction of organisms belonging to non-native species into the environment and Recommendation no 77 (1999) on the eradication of non-native terrestrial vertebrates:

The official policy in Norway is fully in compliance with the recommendations adopted by the Standing Committee of the Convention. The 2009 Biodiversity Act has a separate chapter on this issue and a new regulation detailing use of these species will be issued. Of the species listed in the appendix to Recommendation no 77, only the American Mink (*Neovison vison*) is of major concern to Norway, although the Raccoon Dog (*Nyctereutes procyonoides*) might also become a growing problem in the NE part of the country. Both species may be hunted all year around in Norway. Implementation of national action plans against raccon dog (see Norwegian DN-report 2-2008) and mink (see DN-report 5-2011) has started.

Recommendation no 58 (1997) on the reintroduction of organisms belonging to wild species and on restocking and reinforcing populations of such organisms in the environment:

A small number of recovery projects have been undertaken, particularly on threatened bird species. Some have been concluded some years ago with positive results, e.g the re-introduction projects in collaboration with Sweden dealing with *Falco peregrinus* (see under chapter II.2 above) and *Bubo bubo*, and in collaboration with Scotland dealing with *Haliaeetus albicilla*. An example of collaborative efforts between Norway and Sweden on mammals has been the re-introduction efforts of Otter *Lutra lutra* into Sweden based on Norwegian animals. This programme has been ceased due to high levels of mortality at the release sites. In 2010 and 2011 we saw the first attempts to support the wild population of Lesser White-fronted Goose by release of young birds at a staging site.

In 1999 the Directorate for Nature Management (DN) ordered the development of a Status Report and Action Plan on the highly endangered Scandinavian population of Arctic Fox *Alopex lagopus*. During the year 2000 a recovery project to strengthen the population of the Arctic Fox on the Norwegian mainland, involving breeding in captivity, was established. No specimen were caught during 2000, but in 2001 six juvenile Arctic Foxes were caught for this recovery project. An official Action Plan for the Arctic Fox was published in 2003 (cf DN-report 2003-2). In the following years the programme has been perceived as a success and involves several different elements, ia breeding, re-introduction, feeding and culling of red fox as a competitor. The species was listed as CR in the national red list of 2010. The population numbers today less than 100 adults in Norway. A breeding facility was established in 2005. More than 200 pups have been bred at this facility, and 160 of these released into the wild. These pups have themselves been breeding in 2010 and 2011. A record number of pups (271) were born in 2011.

Recommendation no 92 (2002) on sixteen new action plans for most threatened birds on the Convention area:

The recommendation concerns two species in Norway: Gyr falcon and white-tailed sea eagle. The former species has been under a nationwide programme of monitoring for the last two decades. Norway contributes with eaglets within reintroduction programmes in Scotland and Ireland. The national population of sea eagle now counts above 5000 individuals. The gyr falcon population in Norway is stable and it also forms part of a national monitoring programme.

Recommendation no 99 (2003) on the European strategy on invasive alien species

Norway has published a national strategy on IAS, and continues to develop sectoral policies. Norway has been active in the collaboration with Convention activities and inter alia North European countries, cf. www.nobanis.org The Directorate for nature management has established a team focussing on the issue and commissioned a number of research projects on mapping and eradicating IAS. The national threatened species unit was commissioned a task to produce a method to collect and analyse information on IAS. This task culminated in a 'black list' on IAS published in May 2007, cf. <http://www.artsdatabanken.no/Article.aspx?m=172&amid=2581>

A collaboration project with the directorate has been initiated with the union for horticulturalists in Norway and another project together with the union for zoo-traders in Norway. Both projects aims to disseminate information on the risks with alien species and information on current legislation.

Recommendation no 103 (2004) on five new action plans for most threatened birds in the Convention's area

In Norway the recommendation concerns great snipe. This species has been surveyed nationwide and Norway has been leading in the European work in developing an action plan for the species. The Norwegian population is the highest in Western Europe and new breeding sites are still being uncovered. Much scientific studies have been conducted on this species during the last decades.

Recommendation no 109 (2004) on minimizing adverse effects of wind power generation on wildlife

Norway supported the proposed guidelines for development of wind power and how environmental issues should be integrated in the planning. The guidelines on national coordination has now been implemented to a larger extent than in the initial phase of wind mill development. Norway

has in 2006 accepted an invitation from the Convention to evaluate the process concerning wind mill development on Smøla. A major research programme running in the period 2007-2011 on the conflicts with migratory species has been initiated and concluded in 2011.

Recommendation no 110 (2004) on minimising adverse effects of above ground electricity transmission facilities (power lines) on birds

Already in the 1980ies it was conducted studies on the impact of transmission lines on wildlife in general. The knowledge of how these lines influence inter alia bird population is thus quite good. The recommendations from these studies have been made available to the responsible institutions. The recommendation from the Convention and inter alia from the CMS has also been forwarded is continuously implemented on new power lines and when old ones are replaced. A national programme on mitigation was concluded in 2011 and a new programme for concrete mitigation initiated for eagle owl.

Recommendation no 115 (2005) on the conservation and management of transboundary populations of large carnivores

In Norway this particularly applies to the common wolf population with Sweden. This population is managed inter alia through a very close cooperation with the neighbouring country. Updated information on the Scandinavian population and on research cooperation can be found on the web: <http://www.rovdata.no> (in Norwegian) and (in English).

Recommendation no 125 (2007) on trade in invasive and potentially invasive species in Europe

In 2007 a national strategy for alien species was signed by 11 Ministries. The strategy lays the foundation for how each sector handles the issue. Involvement of the private sector has been another approach, involving in particular the zoo-traders and the horticultural enterprises. A national advisory group on aliens species was established in 2007 and major tasks have been to implement action plans and to finance research. One such action plan is the one for raccoon dog (see Directorate for nature management report 2008-2). Norway established a new national nature diversity act in 2009. This act emphasises the need to use ia risk analysis as a fundamental prerequisite before importing alien species. It is expected that a new regulation enters into force in 2013 regulating all import of alien species, except vascular plants.

Recommendation no 134 (2008) on the European code of conduct on horticulture and invasive alien plants

See comments under rec. no 125. A collaborating partnership has been initiated with the private sector to implement the code of conduct in the horticultural business.

Recommendation 135 (2008) on addressing the impact of climate change on biodiversity

In 2007 the Directorate for nature management issued a report on climate change adaption in nature management (see report 2007-2b: Climate change – Nature Management Measures). Recommendations from this report has been followed up by integrating climate change aspects in biodiversity management, e.g in protected area management, combating alien species, semi natural ecosystem management, water management plans. Further development of biodiversity monitoring programmes is also strongly focused, with the terrestrial monitoring program having undergone evaluation with regard to CC effects, and the freshwater and marine monitoring programs being under evaluation. Climate change effects on biodiversity are focused in the research programme NORKLIMA (2004-2013), see www.forskningsradet.no/.../Satellite?...norklima%2FHovedsidemal. An assessment of climate change effects on nature and society in the north (NorACIA), focussing on different sectors, including biodiversity was published in 2010 (start 2006), and specific vulnerability analyses for the effects of CC on cultural landscapes, on freshwater systems and on sea shores in Norway has been undertaken. A Norwegian climate change adaption committee was appointed in December 2008 to analyse risks, vulnerability and adaptation for different sectors, including natural environment. The work ended in A Norwegian Official Report (NOU 2010-10) submitted on 15 Nov. 2010. Particular focus has in 2010 and 2011 been on addressing the indirect effects of CC – e.g. potential effects on biodiversity from mitigation measures. In 2011 the Norwegian Directorate for Nature evaluated the potential conflicts with biodiversity of a list of 202 possible mitigation measures suggested by an official commission.

Recommendation no 138 (2008) on the European Strategy for plant conservation

Norway has in 2006 started a programme to develop action plans and fund the approved action plans. The first plant species to get its action plan was the red hellebore (see DN-report 2006-1) and *Zostera noltei* (see DN-report 2010-1). New action plans for other plant species are under development (*Herminium monorchis* and *Dracocephalus ruyschiana*). The hellebore, *Herminium* and *Dracocephalus* were all appointed as 'priority species' in 2010 with individual set of regulations applicable and management regimes established.

Recommendation no 139 on the control of the raccoon dog

Norway has established a national action plan aiming to eradicate and hinder establishment of this species, cf DN-report 2008-2.

Recommendation no 144 (2009) on the wind park in Smøla (Norway) and other wind farm developments in Norway

Norway has funded an international research programme on the impacts of windturbines in general and with the Smøla plant as an example. Norway also acted as a host for an international windturbine conference in 2011 on ia mitigation techniques. The results from this programme will contribute to future windturbine development in Norway.

IV. SPECIES LISTED ON APPENDIX I, II AND III NOT HAVING LEGAL PROTECTION

All of the species originally listed on these Appendices have legal protection as prescribed by the Convention.

Cetaceans

The small Cetacean species added to Appendix II by the decision of the Standing Committee in December 1987, are all protected under the Act relating to Sea Water Fisheries of 3 June 1983 (including those species for which Norway has made reservations).

Freshwater fish

The taking of freshwater fishes listed in Appendix III is regulated under the Act relating to Salmon- and Freshwater Fisheries.

SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

THE REPORT RELATES TO THE YEARS 2009-2010 AND TO THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC AS THE CONTRACTING PARTY OF THE BERN CONVENTION

Introduction: to the Bern Convention since January 1997.

The national legislation relevant for implementation of the Bern Convention in the period covered by the Biennial report (2007-2008):

- Act No. 543/2002 Coll. on Nature and Landscape Protection as amended (valid since January 1st, 2003);
- Order No. 24/2003 Coll. by which is executed the Act No. 543/2002 Coll. as amended (valid since February 1st, 2003);
- Act No. 15/2005 Coll. on Trade on the Protection of Species of Wild Fauna and Flora by Regulating Trade therein amending and modifying some Acts as amended (valid since April 1st 2005)
- Order No. 110/2005 Coll. Implementing some Provisions of the Act No. 15/2005 Coll. on the Protection of Species of Wild Fauna and Flora by regulating Trade therein amending and modifying some Acts as amended (valid since April 1st, 2005);
- Act No. 24/2006 Coll. on Environmental Impact Assessment and on change and amending of some acts (valid since February 1st, 2005)
- Act No. 274/2009 Coll. on Hunting
- as amended (valid since September 1st, 2009);
- Order No. 344/2009 Coll. as amended (valid since September 1st, 2009);
- Act No. 139/2002 Coll. on Fishing (valid since April 1st, 2002);
- Order No. 185/2006 Coll. on Fishing (valid since April 15th 2006);
- Act No. 364/2004 Coll. on Water Protection (valid since July 1st, 2004).

The following authority is competent to report on derogations issued according to the Article 9 of the Bern Convention:

The Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic
Department of Nature Protection and Landscape Development
(Námestie Ľ. Štúra 1, 812 35 Bratislava 1, Slovakia)

Data has been compiled by the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic (the expert body of the Ministry for nature protection providing data for each of the decisions of the state administration body related to species protection).

Bratislava, March 1st, 2012

1. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES

Tab. 1.1 (2009)

Name of the species	Number of licences	Number of specimens (if practical)	Reasons for issuing of licences ¹³	Impact on population
<i>Daphne arbuscula</i>	1	Max. 50 (fructus)	A (research)	Small number
<i>Vascular plants</i>	3	?	A (research)	Small number
<i>Bryophyta</i>	1	?	A (research)	Small number

Tab. 1.2 (2010)

Name of the species	Number of licences	Number of specimens (if practical)	Reasons for issuing of licences ¹⁴	Impact on population
<i>Vascular plants</i>	1	?	A (research)	Small number
<i>Pulsatilla slavica</i>	1	?	A (research)	Small number
<i>Daphne arbuscula</i>	2	Seeds Parts of plants	A (research)	Small number

Note:

Approvals are often issued for the sake of making inventory of species occurring in the specified area. In these cases the applicant does not ask to permit collect the concrete species but of the order or family. Therefore in the tables (in the part 1, 2 and 4) of this report there are indications of these exceptions (without stating which species are concerned), in many of these cases the exception does not concern the species listed in the appendices of the Bern Convention.

2. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APP. II)

Tab 2.1 (2009)

Name of species	No. of licences	No. of individuals (if practical)	Action permitted (a to f)	Reason (i to v)	Means of killing/capture	Impact on population
Mammals						
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	7	7 (3 realized)	a	iii	Regulation shooting	None
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	29	32 (19 realized)	a	ii,iii	Regulation shooting	None
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	2	2 (0 realized)	a	iii	Protective shooting	None
<i>Sicista betulina,</i> <i>Microtus tatricus</i>	1	?	c	iv	Monitoring, collection of data,	None
Birds						
<i>Merops apiaster</i>	1	?	d	iii	Disturbance to allow the	None

¹³ A – for research/education/repopulation or reintroduction
B – for exploitation
C – for other overriding public interest (which?)

¹⁴ A – for research/education/repopulation or reintroduction
B – for exploitation
C – for other overriding public interest (which?)

					exploitation of minerals	
<i>Prunella collaris</i>	1	?	c, d	iv	Capture (nets)	None
<i>Aves</i> sp.	3	?	d	iv	Capture (ringing)	None
<i>Hirundo rustica</i> , <i>Delichon urbica</i>	3	?	b	ii, iii	Destroying of nests during nesting period at airports in the interest of air safety	None
<i>Delichon urbica</i>	2	?	b	ii, iii	Destroying of nests during nesting period at airports in the interest of air safety	None
Reptiles						
<i>Reptilia</i> sp.	2	?	c, d	iv	Monitoring. Capture and release	None
Amphibia						
<i>Amphibia</i> sp.	1	?	c, d	iv	Monitoring. Capture and release	None
<i>Lepidoptera</i>	2	?	c	iv	Collection and release	None
Insects						
<i>Coleoptera</i>	4	?	a, c	iv	Collection and release	None
<i>Orthoptera</i>	1	?	c, d	iv	Monitoring	None
<i>Odonata</i>	1	?	c,d	iv	Monitoring. Capture and release	None

Tab. 2.2 (2010)

Name of species	No. of licences	No. of individuals (if practical)	Action permitted (a to f)	Reason (i to v)	Means of killing/capture	Impact on population
Mammals						
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	22	22 (8 realized)	a	iii	Protective shooting	None
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	8	8 (7 realized)	a	ii,iii	Protective shooting	None
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	4	4 (2 realized)	a	iii	Regulation shooting	None
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	44	48 (29 realized)	a	ii,iii	Regulation shooting	None
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	3	?	a	iv	Monitoring	None
<i>Spermophilus citellus</i>	2	150	b, d	iv	Repopulating	None

these species						
Reptiles						
<i>Lacerta viridis</i>	1	?	c	iv	Monitoring	None
Insect						
<i>Coleoptera</i> sp.	2	?	a	iii	Monitoring	None
Amphibia						
<i>Amphibia</i> sp.	1	?	c	iv	Monitoring	None
Birds						
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	3	?	a	vi	Falconry	None
<i>Aquila pomarina, Bubo bubo</i>	1	?	a, c	iv	Ringling	None, released
<i>Ciconia ciconia</i>	1	?	c	iii	Destruction, damage to and removal of nests	None
<i>Aves</i> sp.	1	?	c	iv	Ringling	None
<i>Merops apiaster,</i>	1	?	b	iii	Destruction, damage to and removal of nests	None
Butterflies						
<i>Lepidoptera</i> sp.	2	?	a	iv	Monitoring	None,

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

General remark: as Slovak republic is since 1.5.2004 member of European Union, in this meaning "import" is only situation if the bird is brought from abroad on EU, so movement of bird among member states of EU is not recognised as import and we do not issue any permit.

Name of species: *Accipiter gentilis*

Number of birds in captivity: **21 individuals**

Origin of birds: **0 % (0 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

19 % (4 individuals) imported

81 % (17 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **1600-1800 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **2 (? , DE)**

2010: **2 (AT, HU)**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: *Accipiter nisus*

Number of birds in captivity: **1 individual**

Origin of birds: **100 % (1 individual)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

0 % (0 individuals) imported

0 % (0 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **1600-1800 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **none**

2010: **1**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Name of species: *Aquila chrysaetos*

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **16 individuals**

Origin of birds: **6 % (1 individual)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

19 % (3 individuals) imported

62 % (10 individuals) reared in captivity

13 % (2 individuals) present - rearings from Slovakia

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **90 - 95 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **1**

2010: **none**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **2 (Russia)**

2010: **1 (CZ)**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: *Aquila heliaca*

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **0 individuals**

Origin of birds: **0 % (0 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

0 % (0 individuals) imported

0 % (0 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **90 - 95 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: ***Bubo bubo***

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **5 individuals**

Origin of birds: **60 % (3 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

40 % (2 individuals) imported

0 % (0 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **90 - 95 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **1**

2010: **2**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin): 2x Russia 2009 alebo 2010?

2009: **2 (Russia)**

2010: **none**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: ***Buteo buteo***

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **8 individuals**

Origin of birds: **100 % (8 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

0 % (0 individuals) imported

0 % (0 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **90 - 95 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **3**

2010: **5**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: *Falco biarmicus*

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **0 individuals**

Origin of birds: **0 % (0 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State - injured

0 % (0 individuals) imported

0 % (0 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **90 - 95 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: *Falco cherrug*

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **61 individuals**

Origin of birds: **0 % (0 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State

6 % (4 individuals) imported

82 % (50 individuals) reared in captivity

12 % (7 individuals) present- rearings from Slovakia

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **10 - 40 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **none**

2010: **none**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **3 (DE, AT)**

2010: **1 (CZ)**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: *Falco peregrinus*

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **58 individuals**

Origin of birds: **2 % (1 individual)** captured from the wild in the State

22 % (13 individuals) imported

67 % (39 individuals) reared in captivity

9 % (5 individuals) present- rearings from Slovakia

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **40 - 70 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **1**

2010: **none**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **5 (AT, DE, HU)**

2010: **8 (CZ, GB)**

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

Name of species: *Falco tinnunculus*

Number of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention): **10 individuals**

Origin of birds: **100 % (10 individuals)** captured from the wild in the State

0 % (0 individuals) imported

0 % (0 individuals) reared in captivity

Estimated population in the wild (in the State): **40 - 70 breeding pairs**

Number of birds captured from the wild each year:

2009: **7**

2010: **3**

Number of birds imported (specify country of origin):

2009: **none**

2010: none

Means authorised for capture:

Controls involved:

Falconry is according to the hunting legislation allowed only for the members of the Slovak Club of Falconers. Owner (keeper) must have registration of each bird on regional authority of nature and landscape protection. Keeping of birds is controlled by the Slovak Environmental Inspection and district environmental offices. Details on the evidence, marking and the evidence of the origin of the birds that are subject to falconry are specified in the Act No 15/2005 Coll. as amended and its Order No. 110/2005 Coll.

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (APPENDIX III)¹⁵

Table 4.1 (2009)

Name of the species	Exceptions made
Birds	
<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	2 permissions for killing to prevent serious damage to fisheries
Mammals	
<i>Marmota marmota latirostris</i>	1 permission for re-introduction
Reptiles	
<i>Elaphe longissima</i>	1 permission for research and education
Annelida	
<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i>	1 permission for research and education

Table 4.2 (2010)

Name of the species	Exceptions made
Mammals	
<i>Marmota marmota latirostris</i>	1 permission for monitoring
Birds	
<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	1 permission to prevent serious damage to fisheries
<i>Ardea cinerea</i>	1 permission to prevent serious damage to fisheries

Notes:

In 2005-2006 (as a result of amending of hunting legislation– the Order No. 172/1975 Coll. and of adoption of the Order No. 24/2003 Coll.) the following species of the Appendix III, naturally occurring in Slovakia, were subject to “partial protection” (with stated hunting season or stated protected season respectively):

- *Lepus capensis* hunting season : 1.11. – 31.12.
- *Martes foina* 1.12. – 28./29. 2.
- *Martes martes* 1.12. – 28./29. 2.
- *Meles meles* 1.9. – 31.11.
- *Putorius (Mustela) putorius* 1.10. – 28./29.2.
- *Cervus elaphus* 1.9. – 31.12.
- *Capreolus capreolus* 1.9. – 30.11. females, 16.5.-30.9. – males
- *Bonasa bonasia* 1.10. – 15.11., males only
- *Streptopelia decaocto* 1.8. – 31.12.
- *Fulica atra* 1.10. – 16.1.
- *Scolopax rusticola* 16.3. –30. 4.
- *Anser albifrons* 16.10. – 15.1.
- *Anser fabalis* 16.10. – 15.1.
- *Anser anser* 16.10. – 15.1.
- *Anas platyrhynchos* 16. 9. – 15.1.

¹⁵ If exceptions concern the prohibited means of capture and killing for Appendix III species, use the form 2.4 on Appendix IV.

Since April 2005 all species of the Appendix II and Appendix III were protected species according to the Act No. 139/2002 Coll. and Order No. 185/2006 Coll. and at the same time the following fish species naturally occurring in Slovakia were subject to the legislation of fishing:

- *Acipenser ruthenus* protected 15.3.-31.5, length limit 45 cm
- *Thymallus thymallus* protected 1.1. – 31.5., length limit 27 cm
- *Hucho hucho* protected 1.1. – 31.10.*, length limit 70 cm
- *Abramis ballerus* protected 15.3.-31.5., length limit 20 cm
- *Abramis sapa* protected 15.3.-31.5., length limit 20 cm
- *Aspius aspius* protected 15.3.-31.5., length limit 40 cm
- *Chondrostoma nasus* protected 15.3.-31.5., length limit 30 cm
- *Gobio albipinnatus* angling all year
- *Leucaspis delineatus* angling all year
- *Siluris glanis* protected 15.3.- 15.6., length limit 70 cm
- *Cottus poecilopus* protected 15.3.-31.5., no length limit

* in the River Dunajec and Poprad protected 1.1.-31.8.

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV

Tab. 4 (2009/2010)

Name of species	No. of licences	No. of specimens	Reasons	Method used	Impact on population
<i>Chiroptera</i>	1	?	iv	nests	None, ringing and released
<i>Spermo-philus citellus</i>	1	?	iv	trap	None, released
<i>Accipiter gentilis, Anthus campestris, Anser anser, Ardea cinerea, Buteo buteo, Ciconia ciconia, Falco tinnunculus, Perdix perdix, Phalacrocorax carbo, Vanellus vanellus</i>	1	?	iii	artificial light sources	None, released
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	1	?	iv	traps	None, released
<i>Pisces</i> sp.	2	?	iv	Electrical and electronic devices capable of killing and stunning	None, released
<i>Anser anser, Ardea cinerea, Buteo buteo, Egretta alba, Falco tinnunculus,</i>	1	?	iv	(Semi)automatic weapons; Artificial light sources; Acoustic alarms	None, released
<i>Delichon urbica, Hirundo rustica, Vanellus vanellus</i>	1	?	iii	(Semi)automatic weapons; artificial light sources; acoustic alarms	None
<i>Ardea cinerea, Egretta alba, Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	1	?	ii	(Semi)automatic weapons; Acoustic alarms	None
<i>Buteo buteo, Delichon urbica, Falco tinnunculus, Hirundo rustica, Numenius arquata, Vanellus vanellus</i>	1	?	ii	(Semi)automatic weapons; Acoustic alarms	None

SWEDEN / SUEDE**2. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES
(ART. 5 - APPENDIX I)**

Name of the species	No. of specimens involved (when practical)	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ¹⁶	Impact on population	Information on the conservation status of the derogated species
Pulsatilla patens (Nipsippa)2009	300 seeds	1	iv	Negligible	favorable conservation status of the species, but insufficient status of habitat
Najas flexilis (sjönajas) 2010	10	1	iv	Negligible	bad
Dicranum viride barkkvastmossa 2010		1	i	Positive	unfavourable
Alisma wahlenbergii (småsvälv) 2010-2014	seeds collection	1	iv	Positive	unfavourable
Botrychium simplex (dvärglåsbräken) 2010 -2014		1	i, iv	Negligible	favourable
Dichelyma capillaceum (hårklomossa) 2010-2014		1	i, iv	Negligible	

The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled	The County administrative board usually by claiming reports.
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted	
The controls involved	Except international directives and conventions there are also national Legislation and other policy instruments such as: Species protection ordinance.
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	Derogations of the species above concern efforts to protect the species, such as: Inventory (estimation of populationsize), relocation, Increase knowledge of the species to improve measures
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them	Non
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)	
Comments/notes	

¹⁶ i.: protection of flora /fauna

ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property

iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)

iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding

v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART. 6 - APPENDIX II)

Name of the species	No. of specimens involved (when practical)	Authorised action (art. 6, a. to f.) ¹⁷	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ¹⁸	Impact on population	the time and place under which exception where granted	Alternative solutions considered
Accipiter gentilis	9	D	1	i.	Non	2010-08-01 to 2011-03-31 Karlshamns kommun	Non
Accipiter gentilis	30	D	1	i.	Non	2009-08-01 to 2010-03-31 Karlshamns kommun	Non
accipiter gentilis	9	D	1	i.	Non	2010-05-26 to 2012-03-31 Västra Götalands län	Alternative solutions have not been enough
accipiter gentilis	49	D	2	ii.	Non	2010-08-01 to 2010-12-31 Södermanlands län	Non
accipiter gentilis	49	D	2	ii.	Non	2010-08-01 to 2010-12-31 Södermanlands län	Non
Accipiter gentilis	40	D	4	v.	Non	2010-09-01 to 2011-02-15 Hallands län	Non
Accipiter gentilis	15	D	1	ii.	Non	2009-08-01 to 2010-03-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Accipiter gentilis	300	A	1	ii.	Non	2009-04-03 to 2011-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Accipiter gentilis	300 eggs	E	1	ii.	Non	2009-04-03 to 2011-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Accipiter gentilis duvhök	30	D	1	ii.	Non	2009-10-14 to 2010-03-31 Stockholms län	

¹⁷ A: Deliberate killing

B: Deliberate damage to or destruction of breeding or resting sites

C: Deliberate capture and keeping

D: Deliberate disturbance of wild fauna

E: Deliberate destruction or taking of eggs

F: Possession and internal trade

¹⁸ i.: protection of flora /fauna

ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property

iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)

iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding

v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

Accipiter gentilis duvhök	?	D	1	i.	Non	2009-08-01 to 2010-12-31 Motala kommun Östergötlands län	Fright measures will be applied in first hand
Accipiter gentilis duvhök	?	D	3	i.	Non	2009-09-10 to 2010-02-15 Sannarps Egendom i Falkenbergs kommun. Hjulebergs Egendom i Falkenbergs kommun. Torsjö 1:2 i Falkenbergs kommun. Hallands län	
Accipiter gentilis duvhök	?	D	1	i.	Non	2009-09-07 to 2010-02-15 Hallands län	
Accipiter gentilis duvhök	?	D	1	i.	Non	2009-09-01 to 2010-02-15 Hallands län	
Accipiter gentilis duvhök	14 resting sites	D	12	i.	Non	2009-08-01 to 2010-02-28 Ellinge, Näsbyholm, Ousbyholm, Ruuthsbo, Rydsgård Skabersjö, Skarhult, Trollelungby västerslöv, Övedskloster, Widtsköfle, kjugekull Skåne län	Other sites to protect other species from Accipiter
Accipiter gentilis duvhök	30	D	1	i.	Non	2009-08-01 to 2010-03-31 Karlshamns kommun Blekinge län	Non
Accipiter nisus	20	A, D	1	iii. Air safety	Negligible	2008-12-15 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Accipiter nisus sparvhök	Non	A, D	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2009-01-01 to 2010-12-31 Norrköpings flygplats Östergötland	
Anser erythropus fjällgås	max. 10	A, C, D, E	1	i.	Negligible	2009-12-22 to 2011-12-31	-
Asio flammeus jorduggla	20	D, E	1	iv.	Small	2009-06-16 to 2009-12-31	-
Asio otus hornuggla	20	D, E	1	iv.	Negligible		

Bombina bombina	10	D	1	iv.	Non	2009-04-15 to 2009-09-15 Möllehässle, Höganäs	
Bombina bombina	10	D	1	iv.	Non	2009-04-15 to 2009-09-15 Möllehässle, Höganäs	
Bombina bombina	10	E	1	ii.	Non	2009-04-15 to 2009-09-15 Möllehässle, Höganäs	
Bombina bombina	10	D	1	ii.	Non	2009-04-15 to 2009-09-15 Möllehässle, Höganäs	
Bombina bombina	10	D	1	iv.	Non	2009-04-15 to 2009-09-15 Möllehässle, Höganäs	
Bombina bombina klockgroda	10	E	1	iv.	Non	2009-04-15 to 2009-09-15 Möllehässle, Höganäs	
Bombina bombina klockgroda 2009	10	D	1	i, iv	Negligible	Möllehässle 15/4-15/9 2009	
Branta leucopsis	93	A	23	ii.	Negligible	2010-04-01 to 2010-10-31 Gotlands län	Fright measures is not efficient
branta leucopsis	16	A	1	iii. public health	Negligible	2010-04-01 to 2010-09-30 Södermanland s län	Fright measures and disturbance is prior
branta leucopsis	16	A	1	iii. public health	Negligible	2010-04-01 to 2010-09-30 Södermanland s län	Fright measures and disturbance is prior
Branta leucopsis	16	A	1	iii. Air safety	Negligible	2010-01-19 to 2010-09-30 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Branta leucopsis	100	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2010-01-22 to 2012-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Branta leucopsis	21	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2008-03-17 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Branta leucopsis	20	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2008-01-13 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	116	A	29	ii.	Small	2009-01-01 to 2010-12-31 Öland	Fright measures does not work
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås		A	1	iii. public health	Negligible	2009-03-15 to 2009-09-30 Norrköpings kommun	

Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås		A	1	iii. public health	Negligible	2008-03-17 to 2010-12-31 Norrköpings kommun	
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	93	A	23	ii.	Negligible	2009-04-01 to 2009-10-31 Gotland	Fright measures and disturbance is prior
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	10	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-07-10 to 2009-09-30 Timrå kommun, fagervik, fotbollsplaner	Fright measures is not efficient
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	5	A	1	iii. public health	Negligible	2009-09-14 to 2009-09-30 Örestads golfklubb	Fright measures is not efficient
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	0	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-12-03 to 2010-01-31 Barsebäck	Fright measures is not efficient
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	10	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-12-04 to 2010-01-31 Alnarp	Fright measures is not efficient
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	150	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-07-07 to 2009-12-31 Malmö stad	Fright measures is not efficient
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	55	A	2	ii.	Negligible	2009-03-30 to 2011-10-31 Öland	Fright measures is not efficient
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås	150	A, D, E	1	iv.	Negligible		
Branta leucopsis vitkindad gås 2009-2010	116	D	29	ii.	small	Öland	Fright measure does not work
Bufo calamita stinkpadda 2009		D	1	i, iv	Negligible	V Götaland	
Bufo viridis grönfläckig padda 2009	max 20 and max 20000 eggs	E	1	i, iv	Positive	Flaxskär in may 2009	
Bufo viridis grönfläckig padda 2009		D	1	i, iv	Positive	Frösslunda, gammalsby, ottenby, borgholm, mörbylång	
Bufo viridis grönfläckig padda and Bufo bufo vanlig padda 2009		D	1	iv	Negligible	Horn kungsgård 15/4-31/10 2009	
Bufo viridis grönfläckig padda and Bufo calamita stinkpadda 2009		D	1	iv	Negligible	Blekinge	
Buteo buteo	20	A	1	iii. Air safety	Negligible	2008-12-15 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Buteo buteo ormvråk	1	A, D	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2010-01-18 to 2010-12-31 Hallands län	No

Buteo lagopus	1 nest	B	1	iv	Negligible	2010-06-04 to 2010-08-01 Täkt på fastigheten Älgålandet 1:1, Lycksele kommun	
Buteo lagopus	1 nest	B	1	iv	Negligible	2010-06-04 to 2010-08-01 Täktområde på fastigheten Kronoöverloppsmarken 3:1, Storumans kommun	
Buteo lagopus fjällvråk	1 nest	B	1	iv	Negligible	2010-05-12 to 2010-05-14	
Buteo lagopus fjällvråk	1 nest	B	1	iv	Negligible	2009-04-08 to 2009-04-25 Inom täktområde på fastigheten Kronoöverloppsmarken 3:1, Storumans kommun	
Buteo lagopus fjällvråk	1 nest	B	1	iv	Negligible	2009-04-16 to 2009-04-25 Inom täktområde på fastigheten Älgålandet 1:1, Lycksele kommun	
Calidris alpina kärnsnäppa	eggs	E	1	i.	Negligible	2010-01-01 to 2011-12-31	
Canis lupus	6	A	1	iii. Public safety	small	2009	
Canis lupus	8	A	1	iii. Public safety	small	2010	
Canis Lupus	28		* se foot not	ii.		2010	
Chroicocephalus ridibundus; Corvus corax (korp); Larus argentatus; Larus canus; Larus marinus (II)	150	A, D	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2010-11-05 to 2013-12-31 Umeå Flygplats	No
Chroicocephalus ridibundus; Corvus corax; Larus argentatus; Larus canus; Larus marinus	150	A, D	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2010-04-21 to 2012-12-31 Skellefteå Flygplats	No

Chroicocephalus ridibundus; Corvus corax; Larus argentatus; Larus canus; Larus marinus	50	A, D	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2011-02-28 to 2013-12-31 Hemavan Tärnaby Airport AB	No
Chroicocephalus ridibundus; Corvus corax; Larus argentatus; Larus canus; Larus marinus	150	A, D	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2008-02-04 to 2010-12-31 Umeå Flygplats	No
Ciconia ciconia	2 nests	B	1	iii. Public safety	Negligible	2010-08-20 to 2011-03-15 Silvåkra 1:34 , Lunds kommun	
Ciconia ciconia	2 nests	B	1	ii.	Negligible	2010-08-20 to 2011-03-15 Silvåkra 1:34 , Lunds kommun	
Ciconia ciconia	2 nests	B	1	iv.	Negligible	2010-08-20 to 2011-03-15 Silvåkra 1:34 , Lunds kommun	
Ciconia ciconia	2 nests	B	1	iii. Public safety	Negligible	2010-08-20 to 2011-03-15 Silvåkra 1:34 , Lunds kommun	
Ciconia ciconia	2 nests	B	1	ii.	Negligible	2010-08-20 to 2011-03-15 Silvåkra 1:34 , Lunds kommun	
Ciconia ciconia vit stork	2 nests	B	1	ii.	Negligible	2010-08-20 to 2011-03-15 Silvåkra 1:34 , Lunds kommun	
Coenonympha hero brun gräsfjäril 2010-2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Coronella austriaca	2	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2010-04-14 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	No
Coronella austriaca	3	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-05-18 to 2011-01-01 Stockholms län	
Coronella austriaca	3	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-04-01 to 2011-01-01 Stockholms län	
Coronella austriaca	3	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-04-01 to 2011-01-01 Stockholms län	

Coronella austriaca hasselsnok	2	D	1	iv. , v.	Non, catch and release	2009-08-13 to 2009-08-21 Örebro kommun	
Coronella austriaca hasselsnok 2009	1	D	1	iv	Non, catch and release	17/8-21/8 2009 Örebro	
Coronella austriaca hasselsnok 2010	2	D	1	iv	Non, catch and release	Kolmården zoo	
Cucujus cinnaberinus cinnoberbagge 2010 - 2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Cygnus cygnus sångsvan	10	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-03-20 to 2009-05-10 Värmlands Säby 1:6 Visnums- Backa 1:27 Kristinehamns kommun	
Cygnus cygnus sångsvan	Non	A	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2008-02-04 to 2010-12-31 Division Flygplatsgrup pen Umeå flygplats	No
Cygnus cygnus sångsvan	Non	A	1	iii. air safety	Negligible	2008-02-20 to 2010-12-31 Hemavan Tärnaby Airport	No
Dendrocopos major större hackspett	Non	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-11-20 to 2009-12-22 Fastigheten Riksbyggen Lyckselehus nr 5, Stormhatten, Lycksele kommun	Fright measures and disturbance is prior
Dendrocopos major större hackspett	2	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-07-13 to 2009-12-31 fastighet Lappland Västra 27 (Herseudsväg en 61 A) i Lidingö kommun.	-
Dendrocopos major större hackspett	2	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-02-24 to 2009-05-15 fastighet Lappland Västra 27 (Herseudsväg en 61 A) i Lidingö kommun.	-

Dryocopus martius spillkråka	1	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2010-11-03 to 2010-12-31 Tavelskäret 22, Täfteå	Fright measures and disturbance is prior
Dytiscus latissimus bredkantad dykare 2010-2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Eptesicus nilssonii nordisk fladdermus	10	D	1	iii. Public safety	Positive	2009-03-30 to 2010-03-29 Stockholms län	
Euphydryas aurinia väddnätfjäril 2010- 2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Euphydryas maturna asknätfjäril	100	D	1	iv.	small	2009-04-20 to 2010-12-31 Stockholms län	
Euphydryas maturna asknätfjäril 2010- 2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Falco tinnunculus tornfalk	20		1	iii. Air safety	Negligible	2008-12-15 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	Alternative solutions are missing
Gallinago media dubbelbeckasin	?	D	2	iv.	Negligible	2009-05-27 2009-06-30 Jämtlands län	-
Gallinago media Dubbelbeckasin			6			2010-05-22 to 2010-06-30 Jämtlands län	
Gallinago media Dubbelbeckasin			5			2009-06-01 to 2009-06-30 Jämtlands län	
Gallinago media Dubbelbeckasin			4			2009-05-27 to 2009-06-30 Jämtlands län	
Graphoderus bilineatus Bred paljettdykare 2010- 2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Grus grus trana	Non	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-09-24 to 2009-10-15 Inom fastigheten Örebro Dömmesta 10:2 i Örebro län	Fright measures and disturbance is prior
Gulo gulo	2	A	2	ii.	Small	2009	Protective hunting
Gulo gulo	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-10-21 to 2010-12-21 Södra Storfjäll i Storuman kommun	Prevented measures have already been taken, such as increases surveillance. This will however not help in spring.

Gulo gulo	4	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-10-21 to 2010-12-21 Södra STorfjäll och Gardfjäll i Vilhelmina kommun	Prevented measures have already been taken, such as increases surveillance. This will however not help in spring.
Haliaeetus albicilla havsörn	0	D	1	i.	Negligible	2010-04-01 to 2010-07-30 Södermanlands län	If nothing is done, the Hydroprogne caspia will fail with reproduction (which happned 2008)
Haliaeetus albicilla havsörn	0	D	1	i.	Negligible	2010-04-01 to 2010-07-30 Södermanlands län	If nothing is done, the Hydroprogne caspia will fail with reproduction (which happned 2008)
Haliaeetus albicilla havsörn	?	D	1	i.	Negligible	2010-05-20 to 2011-12-31 Uppsala län	
Lacerta agilis sandödla	1 breeding site	D	1	i.	Negligible	2011-08-08 to 2016-12-31 Värmland	
Lacerta agilis sandödla	4	A, D	1	iv.	Negligible	2010-06-01 to 2010-07-31 Asketunnan, Kungsbacka kommun	No
Lacerta agilis sandödla 2009		D	1	iv	Non, catch and release	V Götaland	
Lacerta agilis sandödla 2009		D	1	iv	Non, catch and release	Stömstad kommun	
Lacerta agilis sandödla 2010-2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Osmoderma eremita läderbagge	30	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2010-04-29 to 2010-12-31 Östergötland	None, individuals released after catchment.
Parnassius apollo	3	D	1	iv.	Positive	2009-06-23 to 2009-12-31 Stockholms län	
Parnassius apollo apollofjäril	2	D	1	iv.	Positive	2009-12-02 to 2010-08-01 Stockholms län	
Parnassius mnemosyne mnemosynefjäril	20	D	1	i.	Non	2010-06-01 to 2012-12-31 Uppsala län	
Pipistrellus pygmaeus	150	D	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-08-15 to 2009-09-15 Åsen 4:1, Växjö kommun	No
Pipistrellus pygmaeus	300	D	1	ii.	Negligible	2009-08-15 to 2009-09-15 Ellanda 1:9, Växjö kommun	No

Pipistrellus pygmaeus dvärgfladdermus	500	D	1	ii.	Negligible	2010-08-15 to 2010-10-05 Brotorpet 3:3, Ljungby kommun	No
pipistrellus pygmeus	160	B	1	iii. public health	Negligible	2010-05-01 to 2010-05-31 Wapnögård hus nr 7 , Wapnö gods Halmstad	No
Rana arvalis	3	D	1	i.	Non	2011-04-27 to 2011-08-31 Värmland	
Rana arvalis	3	D	1	i.	Non	2010-07-01 to 2010-08-31 Värmland	
Rana arvalis	40	A	1	iv.	Negligible	2010-05-01 to 2010-06-30 Hallands län	No. Generated new knowlege is important for conservation of species.
Rana arvalis	100	D	1	iv.	Negligible	2010-05-12 to 2012-12-31 Uppsala län	
Rana arvalis	120	D	1	iv.	Negligible	2009-04-21 to 2010-12-31 Uppsala län	
Rana arvalis	12	D	1	iv.	Non catch and release	2010-09-10 to 2013-05-10 Stockholms län	
Rana arvalis	2	D	1	iv.	Non catch and release	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-10 Stockholms län	
Rana arvalis	6000 eggs	E	1	iv.	Negligible	2010-04-19 to 2013-07-01 Stockholms län	
Rana arvalis	1200 eggs	E	1	iv.	Positive	2009-05-11 to 2009-06-30 Stockholms län	
Rana arvalis	2000 eggs	E	1	iv.	Positive	2009-05-05 to 2009-07-01 Stockholms län	
Rana arvalis åkergroda 2009	eggs	E	1	i, iv	Negligible	skårbydammen	
Rana temporaria vanlig groda and Rana arvalis åkergroda 2009	1200 eggs	E	1	i, iv	Negligible	Majrov, långsjön	
Triturus cristatus	4 breeding sites	D	1	iv.	Negligible	2009-04-24 to 2009-12-31 Uppsala län	
Triturus cristatus	50	E	1	iv.	Negligible	2009-06-09 to 2010-12-31 Uppsala län	

Triturus cristatus	3 sites	D	1	i.	Non	2010-07-01 to 2010-08-31 Värmland	
Triturus cristatus	4 sites	D	1	i.	Non	2010-05-17 to 2010-06-30 Värmland	
Triturus cristatus	15 sites	D	1	i.	Non	2009-06-04 2009-06-30 Värmland	
Triturus cristatus	300	D	2	iv.	Non	2010-03-24to 2010-10-31 Norrlandet 3:1, Gävle kommun	
Triturus cristatus	300	D	2	iv.	Non	2010-03-24to 2010-10-31 Norrlandet 3:1, Gävle kommun	
Triturus cristatus	1 resting site	D	1	iv.	Non	2010-05-03 to 2010-06-30 Östergötland	No
Triturus cristatus	4	D	1	iv.	Non	2010-03-06 to 2010-06-30 Östergötland	No
Triturus cristatus	3	D	1	iv.	Non	2010-03-05 to 2010-04-30 Östergötland	No
Triturus cristatus	3	D	1	iv.	Non	2010-03-05 to 2010-04-30 Östergötland	No
Triturus cristatus	10	D	1	iv.	Non	2010-05-03 to 2010-06-30 Östergötland	No
Triturus cristatus	?	D	1	i.	Non	2010-05-10 to 2010-12-31 Uppsala län	
Triturus cristatus	2	D	1	iv.	Non	2009-04-27 to 2010-12-31 Uppsala län	
Triturus cristatus	12	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2010-09-10 to 2013-05-10 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	2	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-10 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	0	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-06-25 to 2012-12-31 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	3	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-05-18 to 2011-01-01 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	3	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-04-01 to 2011-01-01 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	3	D	1	iv.	Non, catch	2009-04-01 to	

					and release	2011-01-01 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	100	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-04-01 to 2011-01-01 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus	200	D	1	iv.	Non, catch and release	2009-04-01 to 2011-04-01 Stockholms län	
Triturus cristatus			3			2009-06-01 to 2009-09-30	
Triturus cristatus större vattensalamander 2009	eggs	E	1	iv	Non, catch and release	Hallarumsviken, spraglehall	
Triturus cristatus större vattensalamander 2009	1	C	1	iv	Non, catch and release	Jämtland	
Triturus cristatus större vattensalamander 2009		B, D	1	iii (building of road)	Negligible	Kallerstad	
Triturus cristatus större vattensalamander 2010 - 2014		C	1	i, iv	Negligible	Dalarna	
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-14 Granberget i Malå kommun Västerbotten	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-14 Granberget i Malå kommun Västerbotten	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	3	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-10 Gabna sameby	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	3	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-10 Gabna sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting

Ursus arctos	3	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-07 to 2010-05-10 Gabna sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-13 to 2010-05-14 Talma sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-04 to 2010-05-18 Vittangi sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-05-04 to 2010-05-18 Vittangi sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-04-29 to 2010-04-30 Semisjaur-Njarg sameby	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-04-29 to 2010-04-30 Semisjaur-Njarg sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	1	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-04-29 to 2010-04-30 Semisjaur-Njarg sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	2	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-04-27 to 2010-05-11 Semisjaur-Njarg sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting

Ursus arctos	2	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-04-27 to 2010-05-11 Semisjaur-Njarg sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	2	A	1	ii.	Small	2010-04-27 to 2010-05-11 Semisjaur-Njarg sameby Norrbottens län	Protection of reindeer gets more difficult when the snow conditions gets worse. All fright and other measures have been taken, without result. Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	10	A	1	ii.	Negligible	2009	Protectiv hunting
Ursus arctos	242 quota (245 reported)	A	See fotn ot *	ii.	Small	2009	Licens hunting
Ursus arctos	288 quota (281 reported)	A	See fotn ot *	ii.	Small	2010	Licens hunting

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species	There are no information of the conservation status on birds. Sweden have however published a report on trends, see link . Species not reported in a favourable conservation status, habitat directive 2007 were: Bombina bombina (inadequate but improving) Bufo calamita, Bufo viridis, Coenonympha hero, Coronella austriaca, Cucujus cinnaberinus, Dytiscus latissimus, Euphydryas maturna, Lacerta agilis, Maculinea arion, Parnassius mnemosyne and Triturus cristatus (bad and deteriorating), Osmoderma eremite (bad but stabil)
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled	The County administrative board, the Swedish EPA usually by claiming reports. Sometime in collaboration with ornitologic union, the police, game damage center, SLU, The National Veterinary Institute.
The controls involved	Except international directives and conventions there are also national Legislation and other policy instruments such as: laws, regulations, environmental code, Hunting ordinance, Species protection ordinance.
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	Derogations of the species above concern efforts to protect the species, such as: Inventory (estimation of populationsize), relocation, Increase knowledge of the species to improve measures. Catch and immediate release.
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)	
Comments/notes	

Footnots :

* On 21 October 2009, Parliament decided to grant the Government's proposals in proposition *A new predator management*. The decision meant, among other things, that the Swedish **wolf** population growth rate will be limited temporarily and regulated by licensed hunting supplemented by controlled hunting. Following the parliamentary decision was Environmental Protection Agency to develop and decide on the conditions for the hunt.

On 17 December 2009 the Environmental Protection Agency for the first time on licensed hunting of 27 wolves in the period January 2 January to 15 February 2010 the five counties where there is a breeding herd of wolves - Dalarna, Gävleborg, Västra Götalands, Värmlands och Örebro län. Västra Götaland, Värmland and Örebro.

* A few months in the fall allows licensed hunting of **bears**, the rest of the year may be granted protective hunting of bears that are causing problems. EPA has delegated the right to decide on protection and license the hunting of bears to the county in six counties with fixed strains of bears.

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

For each species used in falconry, state (use a separate sheet for each species):

Name of species:	
No. of birds in captivity (after entry into force of the Convention)	NO PERMITS ARE GIVEN!
Origin of birds:	
% captured from the wild in the State	
% imported	
% reared in captivity	
Estimated population in the wild (in the State)	
No. of birds captured from the wild each year	
No. of birds imported (specify country of origin)	
Means authorised for capture	
Controls involved	

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART. 7 APPENDIX III)¹⁹

Name of the species	No. of individuals involved (when practical)	Exception made	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ²⁰	Impact on the population	Information on the conservation status of the derogated species
<i>Lynx lynx</i>	2009; quota 157 (154 reported) 2010; quota	Hunting of Lynx is conducted according to a license system (within Reindeer management area) and as protective	ii, iii.	The impact on the population is regarded	favourable

¹⁹ Kindly note that exceptions to species listed in Appendix III concern only those captured or killed using indiscriminate means of capture or killing and in particular methods specified in Appendix IV.

²⁰ i.: protection of flora /fauna

ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property

iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)

iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding

v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

	209 (162 reported)	<p>hunting (outside Reindeer management area) by the Swedish EPA.</p> <p>Some derogations have also been given by County Administrative Boards for problematic individuals, protective hunting (2009 – 26 individuals. 2010 – 13 individuals)</p>		as limited.	
<i>Phoca vitulina</i>	<p>2009 – 50 quota (54 reported)</p> <p>2010 – 90 quota (48 reported)</p>	Hunting of harbour seals is conducted according to a license system since 2009	ii. prevent serious damage to fisheries.	The impact on the population is regarded as limited.	Bad and deteriorating
<i>Halichoerus grypus</i>	<p>2009 – 230 quota (128 reported)</p> <p>2010 – 230 quota (92 reported)</p>	Hunting of grey seals is conducted according to a license system.	ii. The reason is to prevent serious damage to fisheries.	The impact on the population is regarded as limited.	favourable
<p><u>Mammals:</u> <i>Lepus timidus</i> (skogshare) <i>Castor fiber</i> (bäver) <i>Meles meles</i> (grävling) <i>Mustela nivalis</i> (småvessla) <i>Martes martes</i> (mård) <i>Cervus dama</i> (kronhjort) <i>Cervus elaphus</i> (dovhjort) <i>Alces alces</i> (älg) <i>Capreolus capreolus</i>. (rådjur)</p> <p><u>Birds:</u> <i>Anas crecca</i> (kricka) <i>Anser anser</i> (grågås) <i>Anas penelope</i> (bläsand) <i>Anas platyrhynchos</i> (gräsand) <i>Anser albifrons</i> (bläsgås) <i>Anser fabalis</i> (sädgås) <i>Aythya fuligula</i> (vigg) <i>Bonasa bonasia</i> (järpe) <i>Bucephala clangula</i> (knipa) <i>Clangula hyemalis</i> (alfågel) <i>Lagopus lagopus</i> (dalripa)</p>		<p>These species have been subject to hunting on a seasonal basis, with regional differences in hunting periods according to the Swedish Hunting ordinance (1987:905).</p>	i., ii., iii.		

<p><i>Lagopus muta</i> (fjällripa) <i>Larus canus</i> (fiskmåsar) <i>Melanitta nigra</i> (sjöorre) <i>Mergus merganser</i> (storskrake) <i>Mergus serrator</i> (småskrake) <i>Perdix perdix</i> (rapphöna) <i>Scolopax rusticola</i> (morkulla) <i>Somateria mollissima</i> (ejder) <i>Tetrao tetrix</i> (orre) <i>Tetrao urogallus</i> (tjäder) <i>Turdus pilaris</i> (björktrast)</p>					
<p><u>Fish:</u> <i>Abramis ballerus</i>, <i>Aspius aspius</i>, <i>Cobitis taenia</i>, <i>Coregonus albula</i>, <i>Lampetra fluvuatililis</i>, <i>Lampetra planeri</i>, <i>Salmo salar</i>, <i>Thymallus thymallus</i>, <i>A. vimba</i>, <i>Triglopsis quadricornis</i></p>		<p>These fish species included in Appendix III are not legally protected. For the commercial fishes (such as: <i>salmo salar</i>, <i>Coregonus albula</i>) and angling species (ex <i>Thymallus thymallus</i>) there are however a number of restrictions in terms of open season, size, quotas and localities for fishing.</p> <p>In 2008 drift-nets were banned in the Baltic Sea.</p>	<p>iii. (public interests) iv.</p>		<p><i>Aspius aspius</i>, <i>Salmo salar</i> - inadequate <i>Cobitis taenia</i> - favourable <i>Coregonus albula</i> - inadequate and deteriorating <i>Lampetra fluvuatililis</i> - bad</p>
<p><u>Invertebrates:</u> <i>Astacus astacus</i> (flodkräfta), <i>Helix pomatia</i> (Vinbergssnäcka and <i>Hirundo medicinalis</i> (blodigel)</p>		<p>These invertebrate species included in Appendix III are not protected under Swedish law. <i>Astacus astacus</i> is subject to seasonal catching and a National Action Plan exists since 1998.</p>	<p>i., iii. (public interests)</p>		<p><i>Astacus astacus</i> – bad and deteriorating <i>Helix pomatia</i> - inadequate and deteriorating</p>
<p>Anser anser (grågås)</p>	<p>40 000 permitted (9000 reported)</p>	<p>Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons or other for Sweden allowed hunting method for protective hunting</p>	<p>iv. ii. iii.</p>	<p>Small</p>	
<p>Anas platyrhynchos gräsand</p>	<p>1000 permitted (420 reported)</p>	<p>Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons or other for Sweden allowed hunting method for protective hunting</p>	<p>iv. ii. iii.</p>	<p>Small</p>	

Anser fabalis sädgås	150 caught with artificial light, 1500 permitted with weapons	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons or other for Sweden allowed hunting method for protective hunting	iv. ii. iii.	Small	
Lagopus lagopus dalripa	150 permitted	Artificial light sources, Motor vehicles in motion	iv.	Negligible	
Lagopus mutus fjällripa	150 permitted	Artificial light sources, Motor vehicles in motion	iv.	Negligible	
Numenius arquata storspov	150 permitted	Artificial light sources, Motor vehicles in motion	iv.	Negligible	
Phalacrocorax carbo	22 000 permitted	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons, <i>Motor vehicles in motion</i> or other for Sweden allowed hunting method for protective hunting	ii.	Regulating. The population size of Phalacrocorax carbo has rapidly increased Since 1990 th and have been causing problems for fishery	
Somateria mollissima ejder	190 permitted	Semi-automatic or automatic weapons protective hunting,	ii. to prevent serious damagefisheries	Small	
Tetrao tetrix orre	150 permitted	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons, <i>Motor vehicles in motion</i> or other for Sweden allowed hunting method for	iii. Air safety, iv.	Negligible	
Tetrao urogallus tjäder	150 permitted	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons, <i>Motor vehicles in motion</i> or other for Sweden allowed hunting method for protective hunting	iv.	Negligible	
Turdus merula koltrast	10 permitted	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons, <i>Motor vehicles in motion</i> or other for Sweden allowed	iii. Air safety	Negligible	

Turdus pilaris Björktrast	375 permitted	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons, <i>Motor vehicles in motion</i> or other for Sweden allowed hunting method	iii. Air safety	small	
Vanellus vanellus tofsvipa	24 reported	Artificial light sources (for iv.) , Semi-automatic or automatic weapons, <i>Motor vehicles in motion</i> or other for Sweden allowed hunting method	iii. Air safety	Negligible	

The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled	<i>The Swedish Police Authority are the supervising authority over the hunting law. The County administrative board, the Swedish EPA are issuing permits of protective hunting.</i>
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted	
The controls involved	International directives and conventions, national Legislation and other policy instruments such as: laws, regulations, environmental code, Hunting ordinance, Species protection ordinance, Ordinance of fisheries, aquaculture and fisheries.
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	No other alternative solution
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them	Fright measures
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)	.
Comments/notes	

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV

Name of the species	No. of specimens (when practical)	No. of licences	Reasons (art. 8, a. to e.) ²¹	Method used ²²	Impact on the population
Several species, mainly <i>Larus canus</i> , <i>Larus ridibundus</i> , <i>Tetrao tetrix orre</i> , <i>Vanellus vanellus tofsvipa</i> , <i>Corvus corax</i> , <i>Anser anser</i> , <i>Perdix perdix</i>			C airport safety	5, 14, 16	Negligible
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	90	1	B	10	Negligible
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	78	4	A	11	Negligible
<i>Lacerta agilis</i>	400	1	D	10	Negligible
<i>Rana arvalis</i>	40	1	D	10	Negligible
<i>Rana arvalis</i>	breeding sites	2	D	11	Positive
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	breeding sites	8	D	11	Positive
Commercially fished fishes		Quotas	C	11	
<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	40	1	C	14	Negligible
<i>Anser anser</i>	3000 permitted, 1216 reported	61	B, C	14	Negligible
<i>Anser fabalis</i>	90	5	B	14	Negligible
<i>Branta leucopsis</i>	260	4	B, C	14	Negligible
Species with open season	General in enclosures	unknown	C, D	14	Negligible
<i>Corvus corax</i>	3	1	B	14	Negligible
<i>Cygnus cygnus</i>	10	1	B, C (air safety)	14	Negligible
<i>Dendrocopos major</i>	2	2	B	14	Negligible
<i>Dryocopus martius</i>	1	1	B	14	Negligible
<i>Gulo gulo</i>	5	2	B	14, 16	Negligible
<i>Canis lupus</i>	2	2	C	14	Negligible
<i>Lynx lynx</i>	10	6	B	14, 15	Negligible

²¹ A. Protection of flora and fauna

B. To prevent serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property

C. In the interests of public health and safety / air safety / overriding public interests

D. For research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding

E. Taking, keeping or other judicious exploitation of certain wild animals and plants in small numbers and under certain conditions (see art. 8)

²² Choose from article 8 : 1 to 18 – See for reference pages 6-7 of this document

Ursus arctos	53	17	B	5, 14,15, 16	Negligible
Phalacrocorax carbo	4400	38	B	14, 16	Negligible
Somateria mollissima ejder	70	2	B	14	Negligible
Pest species*	unlimited		B	5	Negligible

Footnotes:

* In accordance with the Swedish Hunting Regulations 15 § 2, concerning pest species included in appendix 4 of the same regulation.

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Département fédéral de l'environnement,
des transports, de l'énergie et de la communication DETEC
Office fédéral de l'environnement OFEV

Rapport biennal 2009/2010 sur l'application par la Suisse de la Convention relative à la conservation de la vie sauvage et du milieu naturel de l'Europe (Convention de Berne)

SOMMAIRE:

1	DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT DES ESPECES DE FLORE STRICTEMENT PROTEGEES	2
2	DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT DES ESPECES DE FAUNE STRICTEMENT PROTEGEES (ANNEXE II)	2
3	DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT LA FAUCONNERIE	2
4	DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT DES ESPECES DE FAUNE PROTEGEES (ANNEXE III)	2
5	DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT LES MOYENS DE CAPTURE ET DE MISE A MORT ENUMERES DANS L'ANNEXE IV	2

1. DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT DES ESPECES DE FLORE STRICTEMENT PROTEGEES

Nom de l'espèce	Nombre de permis délivrés	Nombre de spécimens (si possible)	Motif de délivrance des permis ¹⁾	Impact sur la population
-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------

Pas de dérogations.

- ¹⁾ A – recherche/éducation/repeuplement ou réintroduction
B – exploitation
C – autre intérêt public prioritaire (lequel ?)

2. DEROGATIONS CONCERNANT DES ESPECES DE FAUNE STRICTEMENT PROTEGEES (ANNEXE II)

Nom de l'espèce	Nombre de permis délivrés	Nombre d'individus (si possible)	Action autorisée (a à f)	Motif (i à v)	Moyen de mise à mort/capture	Impact sur la population
Canis lupus						
2009	3¹⁾	3	a	ii	tir	aucun
2010	1²⁾	1	a	ii	tir	aucun

¹⁾ Autorité qui a délivré l'autorisation: Canton du Valais (2); Canton de Lucerne (1)
Seul un tir fut effectué en 2009 par le Service de la chasse, de la pêche et de la faune (SCPF), Canton du Valais

²⁾ Autorité qui a délivré l'autorisation: Canton du Valais
Autorité qui a effectué le tir: Service de la chasse, de la pêche et de la faune (SCPF), Canton du Valais

**“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA” /
L’ “EX-REPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE”**

Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

BIENNIAL REPORT: 2009-2010

The report covers all exceptions made from the provision of Article 4,5,6,7 and 8 of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention).

Regarding Resolution No 2 (1993) of the Standing Committee (SC) general exceptions have been made in this period.

1. Exceptions concerning strictly protected flora species (Appendix I)

Macedonia did not have made any exception concerning strictly protected flora species.

2. Exceptions concerning strictly protected fauna species (Appendix II)

Name of species*	No of licenses	No of individuals (when practical)	Action permitted (a to f)	Reason (i to v)	Means of killing/ capture	Impact on population
Canis lupus	-	-	C	i	hand	none
Felis silvestris	-	-	C	i	-	-
Anser erythropus	-	-	A	iv	live captive	-
Gallinago media	-	-	A	iv	-	-
Accipiter gentilis	-	-	A	iv	-	-

* In accordance with the Macedonian regulations (Law on Hunting) for the use of this species did not have obligations to request licenses from the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water-Economy/Department of Hunting.

3. Exceptions concerning Falconry

None.

4. Exceptions concerning protected fauna species (Appendix III)

Name of species*	No of license	Name of specimens	Reasons	Method used	Impact on population
Meles meles	-	-	-	-	-
Mustela nivalis	-	-	iv	hand / capture	none
Putorius putorius	-	-	iv	“	-
Vormela peregusna	-	-	iv	“	-
Martes martes	-	-	iv	“	-
Martes foina	-	-	iv	“	-
Phalacrocorax carbo	-	-	iv	“	-
Ardea cinerea	-	-	Iv	“	-

* In accordance with the Macedonian regulations (Law on Hunting, 2010) badger (Meles meles) is strict protected species, for the use of other fauna species did not have obligations to request licenses from the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water-Economy/Department of Hunting.

5. Exceptions concerning the use of means of capture and killing specified (App. IV)

None.

IMPLEMENTATION IN THE PERIOD 2009-2010 OF RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE***Resolution No 1 and Recommendations No 14, 15 and 16 on Habitat conservation:***

In the reporting period the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning continued to realize the Work Program for the last two years (2009-2010).

The Department of Nature protection, especially the Division of Biological Diversity (DBD), with collaboration of the Division of Nature Heritage (DNH) and the Department of Sustainable Development (SSD) in the end of year 2008 (November-December) has prepared the two years Priorities of Nature Conservation in Macedonia (2009-2010). The first priority of the Department of Nature Protection is to fully implement obligation of the International Conventions and Agreements of Nature Conservation, especially CBD, BC/CE, CMS, RCW, AEWA, EUROBATS, CITES etc.

Referring this important document the Division of Biological Diversity has proposed sixth projects for implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations of the SC/BC and the Administration of Environment and they has been included in the Annual Work-Program of MEPP (2009-2010).

Note: Information on the implementation of Resolution No 5 concerning the rules for the network of areas of special conservation interest (Emerald Network, 1998) is included in the Final Report of the realization of the Emerald Network Project in the Republic of Macedonia (MEPP, January 2009).

Authority concerned:
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning
Authority of Environment Protection
Department of Nature Protection
Aleksandar Nastov, Mr.Sc. Head of DBD
Bul. Goce Delcev, bb, MTV, XI,
1000 Skopje
Macedonia
Tel: (+389 2) 3251 466
Fax: (+389 2)3220 165
E-mail: a.nastov@moepp.gov.mk

Macedonian Committee of Wetlands (MRC)
Macedonian Committee of Migratory Species (MBC)
Branko Micevski, Dr. Sc. Faculty of Natural Sciences, Institute of Biology, Skopje
"Gazi Baba" p.fax: 162 , MK-1000 Skopje Macedonia
tel: (+389 2) 31 17 055 ext. 614 2430 927
fax:(+389 2) 24 32 071
E-mail: brankom@ukim.edu.mk

Macedonian Committee of Biodiversity (MCBD)
Vlado Matevski, Academic, Dr. Sc. Faculty of Natural Sciences, Institute of Biology, Skopje
"Gazi Baba" p.fax: 162 , MK-1000 Skopje Macedonia
tel: (+389 2) 31 17 055 ext. 617
fax:(+389 2) 228 141
E-mail: vladom@iunona.pmf.ukim.edu.mk

AN/DBD/10/2011.