



Secretariat provided by the
United Nations Environment Programme
(UNEP)

Agenda item 12
Doc. StC 5.17
06 June 2008
Original: English

FIFTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

24 – 25 June 2008, Bonn, Germany

Review on the stage of preparation and implementation of Single Species Action Plans

INTRODUCTION

According to Paragraph 7.4 of the AEWA Action Plan the Agreement Secretariat, in coordination with the Technical Committee and the Parties, shall prepare a series of international reviews necessary for the implementation of the Action Plan, including, *inter alia*, a Review on the stage of preparation and implementation of Single Species Action Plans.

After a call for tenders the compilation of this review was commissioned to Rubicon Foundation. Information from Range States on the implementation of 15 SSAPs was collected through questionnaires, but unfortunately the feedback was not satisfactory. However, the review was compiled despite of the constraints.

This review was approved by the Technical Committee at its 8th meeting in March 2008. Conclusions and recommendation from the review served as a basis for draft Resolution 4.8.

ACTION REQUESTED FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE

The Standing Committee is requested to approve the Review on the stage of preparation and implementation of Single Species Action Plans for submission to the 4th session of the Meeting of the Parties.



Review of the implementation and the effectiveness of 15 action plans for waterbird species

Report to the AEWA Secretariat

**Prepared by
Umberto Gallo Orsi & Canan Orhun
Stichting Rubicon**

April 2008

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	4
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	6
Executive summary	7
Recommendations	8
Single Species Action Plans	8
To improve the implementation of the SSAPs	10
Introduction	11
1 Evaluating the implementation and the effectiveness of the action plans	12
Methods	14
Implementation	14
Effectiveness	15
Results	16
Data gathering	16
Effectiveness of the Action Plan	16
Species accounts	20
Dalmatian Pelican <i>Pelecanus crispus</i>	21
Pygmy Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax pygmeus</i>	25
Northern Bald Ibis <i>Geronticus eremita</i>	29
White-headed Duck <i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	32
Lesser White-fronted Goose <i>Anser erythropus</i>	37
Light-bellied Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	41
Red-breasted Goose <i>Branta ruficollis</i>	44
Marbled Teal <i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	47
Ferruginous Duck <i>Aythya nyroca</i>	52
Corncrake <i>Crex crex</i>	56
Black-winged Pratincole <i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	63
Sociable Lapwing <i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	66
Great Snipe <i>Gallinago media</i>	69
Slender-billed Curlew <i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	72
Audouin’s Gull <i>Larus audouinii</i>	76
Conclusions and recommendations	80
2 Conservation initiatives which contribute to achieving the aims of the AEWA convention	82
Recommendations	84
3 Criteria for the identification of priority species for which Single Species Action Plans (SSAP) should be developed	85
Species for which a SSAP is required	85
Proposed criteria for new action plans	87
Conclusions and recommendations	97
4 Species/populations for which action plans should be updated / revised.	100
5 Lessons Learnt	101
References	103
Action Plans endorsed by international treaties	103
Other Action Plans	105

Annexes

Annex 1 Sample questionnaire

Annex 2 Overview of level of replies

Annex 3 List of contributors

Annex 4 List of all IBAs selected for the SSAP species and their protection status.

Annex 5 Returned questionnaires

Annex 6 Updated Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan with reference to international SSAPs and population figures and trends

Abbreviations and acronyms

AEWA	African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (The Hague, 1995)
AL	Albania
AM	Armenia
AOS	Azerbaijan Ornithological Society
ASPB	Armenian Society for the Protection of Birds
AT	Austria
AZ	Azerbaijan
BA	Bosnia & Herzegovina
Barcelona Convention	Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona, 1976)
BE	Belgium
Bern Convention	Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern, 1979)
Bonn Convention	<i>See</i> CMS
BY	Belarus
CAFF	Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna
CD	Conservation Dependent
CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CI	Conservation International
CH	Switzerland
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species (Bonn, 1979)
CN	China
CR	Critically Endangered
CS	Serbia & Montenegro (now separate countries)
CSL	Central Science Laboratory (United Kingdom)
CSR (1999)	Wetlands International, 1999. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. AEWA Technical Series No. 1, Bonn, Germany
CSR 2 (2002)	Scott D.A., 2002. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. Second Edition. Information document to the MOP2 (Inf 2.14), Bonn Germany
CSR 3 (2007)	Delany S., Scott D.A., Helmink T. & Martakis G., 2007. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. Third Edition. AEWA Technical Series No.13. Bonn, Germany
DE	Germany
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (United Kingdom)
DK	Denmark
DOPPS	Društvo za Opazovanje in Proučevanje Ptice Slovenije (BirdLife in Slovenia)
EN	Endangered
EU	European Union
FI	Finland
FP	(AEWA) Focal Point
FR	France
GCCW	Georgian Center for the Conservation of Wildlife (BirdLife in Georgia)
GE	Georgia
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GR	Greece

HU	Hungary
IAGNBI	International Advisory Group for the Northern Bald Ibis
IBA	Important Bird Area
IE	Ireland
INFS	National Italian Wildlife Institute
IRBGWG	International Red-breasted Goose Working Group
IT	Italy
IUCN	World Conservation Union
IWC	International Waterbird Census
KG	Kyrgyzstan
KZ	Kazakhstan
LC	Least Concern
LI	Liechtenstein
LIFE	Financial instrument supporting environmental and nature conservation projects in the EU
LPO	Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux (BirdLife in France)
LU	Luxembourg
MARPOL	International Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution from Ships, 1973 as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto (MARPOL 73/78)
MD	Moldova
MK	Macedonia
MN	Mongolia
MOP	Meeting of the Parties
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
mtDNA	Mitochondrial Deoxyribonucleic acid
Natura 2000	Network of sites identified in the EU for their importance for biodiversity
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NL	Netherlands
NO	Norway
NP	National Park
NSAP	National Species Action Plan
NT	Near Threatened
Ramsar Convention	Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, 1971)
RU	Russian Federation
SE	Sweden
SEO	Sociedad Española de Ornitología (BirdLife in Spain)
SI	Slovenia
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSAP	Single Species Action Plan
TJ	Tajikistan
ToR	Terms of Reference
TSBWG	Threatened Steppe-breeding Waders Working Group
UA	Ukraine
UK	United Kingdom
UNEP	United Nation Environment Programme
VU	Vulnerable
WBDB	World Bird Data Base
WG	Working Group
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Acknowledgements

The authors want to thank for their inputs all those who replied to the questionnaires (see Annex 3 for the full list) and provided up-to-date information about conservation actions, protection status and population size of the SSAP species. This work would not have been possible without their contribution. Special thanks go to the AEWA Secretariat which, in addition to providing the funds to carry out the evaluation, has readily helped supply the contact details of national focal points, working groups and experts. BirdLife International kindly supplied the IBA data from the World Bird database which has been used for the analysis. Very useful discussions were held with Sergey Dereliev (AEWA), Boris Barov and Ian Burfield (BirdLife International), Simon Delany and Szabolcs Nagy (Wetlands International) and Baz Hughes (Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust), in particular regarding the prioritization process for new SSAPs and the structure of the questionnaire. We are grateful also to the Members of the AEWA Technical Committee for their comments on the first draft; their views and comments have been invaluable.

We take responsibility of any error and mistake this report may contain.

Executive summary

The present report aims at:

- Review of the progress made in conserving waterbird species through preparation and implementation of Single Species Action Plans (SSAPs);
- Report on other conservation initiatives which contribute, through the development and implementation of species action plans, toward achieving the aims of the AEWA;
- Prioritize the species/populations for which action plans should be developed / updated / revised;

The review assessed fifteen SSAPs that were published in three groups.

Questionnaires in English or French were sent to all AEWA Focal Point, existing working groups and individual experts for a total of 405 questionnaires. Based on the previous experience and taking into consideration that other questionnaires were being distributed (during the same time period) regarding other AEWA issues, the questionnaire were kept as simple as possible. The reply rate has been limited (18% on average), but for all species, also following further research efforts, information were collected to provide a realistic picture of the implementation level.

The documents published in 1996 cover Dalmatian Pelican, Pygmy Cormorant, Lesser White-fronted Goose, Red-breasted Goose, Marbled Teal, Slender-billed Curlew and Audouin's Gull. Of these only the SSAP for Pygmy Cormorant and Audouin's Gull have met their long term targets. The documents published in 2004 cover Black-winged Pratincole, Sociable Lapwing and Great Snipe. For the first two species good progress is reported, while only limited results have been achieved for the Great Snipe.

In 2006 the SSAPs for Northern Bald Ibis, Light-bellied Brent Goose, White-headed Duck, Ferruginous Duck and Corncrake were published. For these species the deadlines are still some time away, but progress have been reported for Northern Bald Ibis (good), White headed duck (some), Ferruginous Duck and Corncrake (limited). The population targets set for the Light-bellied Brent goose have been already reached.

For each species specific recommendations have been put forward and are presented below.

The level of implementation (and of replies) is in general strongly biased toward Europe and more specifically towards the EU. This for a number of reasons including: strong legislation (e.g. the Council Directive 79/409/EEC); the presence of specific funding instrument (e.g. LIFE); and the fact that in the EU biodiversity conservation is considered a fairly high priority when compared to countries with different socio-economic conditions.

Other factors that have influenced the implementation of the SSAP are:

- Distribution of the species restricted to a limited number of countries /sites.
- The existence of a group of committed persons and organisations active at international or national level.
- Cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations.

Beyond the EU, CMS and Bern Convention, other international treaties foresee the development of species action plans as a tool to achieve their conservation. The Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) has developed an action plan for three Eider species relevant for AEWA. The Barcelona Convention has developed an action plan for 10 AEWA species. The Abidjan

Convention and the Nairobi convention also foresee the development of species action plans through specific protocols. The other regional sea conventions (also coordinated by UNEP) will follow a similar process (protocol and action plan).

National and International NGOs are natural partners in the implementation of the SSAPs and in particular BirdLife International and its national partners, Wetlands International and the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (UK) have been engaged since the production of the first documents and cooperation should continue.

Conversely the WWF (International and national autonomous offices), Conservation International and other conservation NGOs do not use the SSAPs as reference document although their work contribute significantly to their implementation.

Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan indicates species/population which require a SSAP. Since its first publication more updated information has been collected and the list has been revised. The list includes 91 taxa/populations belonging to 68 species. The reports developed a prioritization process testing different options.

Priority in the development of SSAPs should be given according to the threat status of each species and between species belonging to the same category to those with a declining trend and then with a smaller population size within the AWEA region.

For populations/taxa belonging to species not listed as threatened but composed by less than 10,000 individuals, priority should be given according to the population trend (declining taxa first, then stable and eventually increasing) and size(smaller first).

Recommendations

Single Species Action Plans

Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*

- Update the existing SSAP

Pygmy Cormorant *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*

The species no longer qualifies for an AEWA SSAP.

Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*

- A working group needs to be established and officially endorsed by AEWA;
- The new range states (Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Ethiopia), identified through satellite tagging, need to be engaged;
- Threats need to be better understood and addressed in both populations by identifying the drivers and implementing solutions at each site with the involvement of the local populations.

White-headed Duck *Oxyura leucocephala*

- Control Ruddy Duck in all western Palearctic countries;
- Provide legal protection for White-headed Duck and key sites.

Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*

- Continue the process of updating the action plan.

Red-breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis*

- The existing Red Breasted Goose Working Group should to develop a revised action plan to address the dramatic decline recorded in the last few years.

Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota*

- Research efforts should concentrate on the breeding ecology of the goose and the impact of climate change on its habitat, distribution and breeding success;
- In the next 3 years site protection should be improved outside the EU and proper management implemented at all sites;
- A formally recognised (i.e. with ToR approved by the AEWA Technical Committee) and operational (i.e. with a coordinator) Working Group should be established in order to facilitate the re-establishment of mechanisms (such as the Sister reserve MoU) promoting international cooperation and funding for the implementation of the Action Plan.

Marbled Teal *Marmaronetta angustirostris*

- Update the existing SSAP

Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*

- To develop 'Fishponds best practice guidelines', focusing on habitat creation and management in cooperation with land owners and practitioners;
- To improve knowledge of distribution, status and trend of the species in Asia;
- To improve protection and management of key sites.

Corncrake *Crex crex*

Within the EU:

- Introduce incentives for appropriate land management targeted more specifically at the conservation of the species, covering a high percentage of its range, especially in North-eastern part of the EU (Baltic and the Central Eastern European Countries);
- Cross-compliance management rules should take into account the requirements of the species (e.g. not to cut the vegetation in an area before the end of the breeding season).

In the breeding range outside the EU:

- Establish a standardized annual monitoring programme and national surveys once every five years
- Prevent abandonment of areas important for the Corncrake through providing aid to sustainable rural development which meets the species' requirements.

In the passage/wintering range

- Re-assess distribution and threats of the species.

Black-winged Pratincole *Glareola nordmanni*

- The Working Group needs to include members from more countries in order to cover the wide range of the species and promote research and conservation actions;
- Further work is needed to understand the ecology of the species and the threats to the species at the breeding areas;
- Studies on the migration path and strategy should be undertaken, possibly with the use of satellite tags and colour rings;
- The SSAP will soon need to be re-assessed based on the better knowledge acquired during the first years of intense research.

Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius*

- The Working Group needs to include members from more countries in order to cover the wide range of the species and promote research and conservation actions;
- Further work is needed to understand the ecology of the species and the threats to the species at the breeding areas and in the wintering areas (newly discovered or confirmed by satellite tracking);
- The SSAP will soon need to be re-assessed based on the better knowledge acquired during the first years of intense research.

Great Snipe *Gallinago media*

- Establish a specific working group to stimulate interest and actions in countries where the Eastern population occurs, beyond the Baltic Republics;
- Promote a better understanding of the status, trend and threats in the Russian Federation;
- Create new protected areas to increase the percentage of national population breeding in protected sites;
- Develop management plans for protected areas with specific measures for the species.

Slender-billed Curlew *Numenius tenuirostris*

- The existing draft developed for the CMS MoU needs to be finalised and work should start in order to keep the interest awake and train personnel in Central Asia and the Middle East

Audouin's Gull *Larus audouinii*

- Update the existing SSAP

To improve the implementation of the SSAPs

- Ensure that the EU keeps the SSAPs as a reference for LIFE by continuing the engagement with the Ornithological Committee.
- Promote the SSAPs as reference for International donors (bilaterals, multilaterals, private donors) showing the positive experience with the EU.
- Concentrate the efforts in those countries which are most important for the conservation of the species.
- The development of National action plan(s) should be used as an opportunity to build cooperation between governmental and non governmental organisations and other stakeholders.
- The International species groups should be structured to facilitate the work of the experts; to coordinate the scientific research and monitoring; to build commitment of the governments and to produce effective policy changes as appropriate.
- Continue the ongoing cooperation with GOs and NGOs which have proven effective;
- Explore potential cooperation with Regional Seas Conventions of the UNEP family;
- Proactively seek to engage WWF and CI in the implementation of the SSAPs

Introduction

Paragraph 2 of the AEWA Action Plan describes single species action plans (SSAP) as one of the main approaches for delivering species conservation by the AEWA Contracting Parties. Parties are invited to “...*cooperate with a view of developing and implementing international single species action plans for populations listed in Category 1 of Column A of Table 1 as a priority and for those populations listed with an asterisk in Column A of Table 1.*”

The development of SSAPs is considered as being one of the main mechanisms to deliver species conservation by the AEWA contracting parties in a coordinated manner. Species action plans are also promoted by other international bodies and national governments.

The third Meeting of Parties (MOP3) in paragraph 6 of Resolution 3.11, requested the Technical Committee urgently to implement the international context reviews specified in paragraph 7.4 of the Action Plan which will provide future Meeting of Parties with context on these issues.

Stichting Rubicon has been asked by AEWA to:

1. Review of the progress made in conserving waterbird species through preparation and implementation of single species action plans as per item 7.4 (e) of the Agreement’s Action Plan;
2. Report on other conservation initiatives which contribute, through the development and implementation of species action plans, toward achieving the aims of the AEWA;
3. Prioritize the species/populations for which action plans should be developed / updated / revised based on clear criteria;
4. Summarise lessons learnt.

1 Evaluating the implementation and the effectiveness of the action plans

The evaluation of the action plans is based on two questions:

- To what extent have the recommendations of the action plan been implemented?
- Have the short, medium or long term biological aims of the action plan been achieved?

The species covered by a Single Species Action Plan that have been assessed are:

Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*,
Pygmy Cormorant *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*,
Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*,
White-headed Duck *Oxyura leucocephala*,
Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*,
Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota* (East Canadian High Arctic population),
Red breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis*,
Marbled Teal *Marmaronetta angustirostris*,
Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*,
Corncrake *Crex crex*,
Black-winged Pratincole *Glareola nordmanni*,
Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius*,
Great Snipe *Gallinago media*
Slender-billed Curlew *Numenius tenuirostris*,
Audouin's Gull *Larus audouinii*.

The documents were developed following two different formats and published in three periods.

In 1996 the following seven Action Plans were published: Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*, Pygmy Cormorant *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*, Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*, Red-breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis*, Marbled Teal *Marmaronetta angustirostris*, Slender-billed Curlew *Numenius tenuirostris* and Audouin's Gull *Larus audouinii*. They were endorsed by the Ornis Committee (EU) in 1995, by the Bern Convention Standing Committee in 1996 and by the CMS COP5 in 1997.

In 2002 BirdLife International developed for AEWA a new format for the Single Species Action Plan (AEWA/MOP2.20) and since then the format has been used for the 8 SSAPs produced by AEWA.

In 2004 the SSAPs for Black-winged Pratincole *Glareola nordmanni*, Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius*, and Great Snipe *Gallinago media* were published. They were endorsed by AEWA MOP2 in 2002 and by the Bern Convention Standing Committee in 2003.

In 2006 the SSAPs for Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*, White-headed Duck *Oxyura leucocephala*, Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota* (East Canadian High Arctic population), Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*, and Corncrake *Crex crex* were published. All of them were endorsed by AEWA MOP3 in 2005 and by the Bern Convention Standing Committee in 2006, while the Ornis Committee (EU) endorsed the plans for White-headed Duck and Corncrake.

Table 1a – Endorsement status of the 15 SSAPs assessed (see Annex 6 for more details).

Common Name <i>Scientific name</i>	AEWA Action Plan Table 1 column A	Publication year	Endorsed by		
			EU (Ornis)	Bern Conv.	Bonn Conv.
Dalmatian Pelican <i>Pelecanus crispus</i>	1a 1c	1996	YES	YES	YES
Pygmy Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax pygmeus</i>		1996	YES	YES	YES
Northern Bald Ibis <i>Geronticus eremita</i>	1a 1b 1c	2006		YES	
White-headed Duck <i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	1a 1b 1c	(1996), 2006	YES, 1996, 2006	YES	
Lesser White-fronted Goose <i>Anser erythropus</i>	1a 1b 2	1996	YES	YES	YES
Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	2	2006		YES	
Red-breasted Goose <i>Branta ruficollis</i>	1a 1b 3c	1996	YES	YES	YES
Marbled Teal <i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	1a 1b 1c	1996	YES	YES	YES
Ferruginous Duck <i>Aythya nyroca</i>	1a 1c	(1996), 2006	YES 1996	YES	
Corncrake <i>Crex crex</i>	1b	(1996), 2006	YES, 1996, 2006	YES	YES
Black-winged Pratincole <i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	3b 3c	2004		YES	
Sociable Plover <i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	1a 1b 1c	2004		YES	
Great Snipe <i>Gallinago media</i>		2004		YES	
Slender-billed Curlew <i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	1a 1b 1c	1996	YES	YES	YES
Audouin's Gull <i>Larus audouinii</i>	1a 3a	1996	YES	YES	YES

Methods

The collection of information, about the implementation of the action plans, has been done through a questionnaire (Annex 1) sent to all AEWA Focal Points and to a number of organisations and individuals (working groups leaders, experts, etc). The questionnaires to the Focal Points were sent by post (on a CD) and by e-mail. Three reminders were sent before the deadline and the deadline was eventually extended from the 30th September to 30th November 2007 in an attempt to increase the number of replies. The questionnaire included a list of Important Bird Areas (IBA) selected for at least one of the SSAP species for each country. The recipients were asked to fill the questionnaire(s) (one for each species occurring in their country) and to update the protection status of the IBAs indicating whether the site had a management plan and its level of implementation.

The IBA list was kindly provided by BirdLife International from its World Bird Database assessed in June 2007. Two files were provided: one with the list of all IBAs selected for each of the 15 species and the second with the protection status of the IBAs contained in the previous file.

In order to improve the amount of information, specific phone interviews were carried out with selected experts and a thorough internet search was carried out in several languages (English, Spanish, and French).

The two previous assessments of the implementation of the action plans (Gallo Orsi 2001, Nagy & Crockford 2004) were also used.

Several National Reports to the AEWA MOP3 have been used in search of further information about the implementation of conservation activities targeting the relevant species.

The main sources for the population size and trends of the taxa, used along side the replies to the questionnaires have been the third Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area (Delany *et al.* 2007), the fourth Waterbird Population Estimates (Wetlands International. 2006) and the BirdLife International datazone (<http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/index.html>). Few other reports and draft documents were also used.

Implementation

The assessment of the implementation and effectiveness of Species Action Plans have been carried out in 2001 and in 2004. Those two reports cover the 23 documents produced in 1996 (Heredia *et al.* 1996). The first report covers all Europe, while the second assesses its implementation within the European Union.

In both cases a very complex questionnaire was developed and each correspondent was asked to assess the implementation of each action with a scoring system. This allowed the calculation of a *National Implementation Score* and of an *Average Implementation Score*.

In this occasion the questionnaire was significantly simplified for a number of reasons in particular because of the experience gathered with the previous exercises by the authors and by Dr. Nagy. The national assessment process was not as effective and straightforward as hoped. The authors of the final assessments had to re-assess each action in order to standardize (using the descriptions of the actions taken) the assessments between the countries and within the same questionnaire. The process therefore was still based to a certain extent on the experts' assessment. Furthermore the

format and time scales of the Actions Plans were very different and would have been difficult to compare them.

Finally the AEWA National Focal Points were receiving at the same time questionnaires regarding other aspects of the AEWA-related work. In order to reduce the workload of the recipients (in the hope to keep the reply rate as high as possible) the questionnaire was made in a way to minimise the time needed for compiling it and as informative as possible.

Effectiveness

The outcome of the implementation of the action plans was measured in relation to the short, medium and long term aims set in the action plan. On this basis the following categories were distinguished:

- None of the aims were achieved;
- Short term aims achieved;
- Medium term aims achieved;
- Long term aims achieved;
- Status unknown

Results

This chapter summarises the results of the analysis of the implementation and effectiveness of the SSAPs. Separate species accounts provide further details for each species.

Data gathering

Questionnaires were sent by post and or e-mails to over 120 addresses in 95 countries. Replies were received from 26 countries (27%).

On a species basis the reply rate ranged from 0% (Black-winged Pratincole and Sociable Lapwing¹) to a maximum of 50% (Light-bellied Brent Goose and Red-breasted Goose) of the countries contacted. The average response has been of 18%. Annex 2 provides the full overview of the replies received.

Overall over 60 specialists directly contributed to the provision of data. The full list is given in Annex 3.

Effectiveness of the Action Plan

All SSAPs published in 1996 have reached the deadlines set in the document (all were supposed to be reviewed within 3-5 years and the long term targets were set at ten years); those published in 2004 have just reached their short term deadlines, while those published in 2006 will reach their first deadline in 2009.

Table 1b - Targets set in the SSAPs and their deadlines. S = Short term; M = Medium term; L = Long term

Species	Target	Deadline
Dalmatian Pelican	S: to prevent any further declines below 1994 levels in the population size and distribution of the Dalmatian Pelican.	1999
	M-L: to increase the population size of the Dalmatian Pelican to a level at which it no longer qualifies as a globally threatened species.	2006
Pygmy Cormorant	S: to prevent declines below 1994 levels of population size and distribution.	1999
	M-L: to increase the population size to a level at which it no longer qualifies as "Near Threatened".	2006
Northern Bald Ibis	L: to conserve the Northern Bald Ibis by securing the wild colonies, increasing the number of birds and improving our understanding of their needs	2015
White-headed Duck	L: White-headed Duck global population and range stable	2015
Lesser White-fronted Goose	S: to maintain the current population in known areas through its range.	1999
	M-L: to ensure an increase in the Lesser White-fronted Goose population.	2006
Light-bellied Brent Goose	S: to maintain the current population and distribution of the species throughout its range.	2009
	L: to increase to and then maintain the population size at or above 25,000 birds, thus removing it from Category A2 of the AEWA and removing the requirement for national action planning	2015
Red-breasted Goose	S: to maintain Red-breasted Goose numbers at no less than 70,000 birds.	1999
Marbled Teal	S: to maintain the current population and area of occupancy of the Marbled Teal throughout its range.	1999
	M: to promote population increase of the species within its current range.	2002
	L: to promote expansion of the breeding population to other suitable areas.	2006

¹ The information available in the website of the Threatened Steppe-breeding Waders Working Group and an internet search resulted in enough information to provide a realistic assessment of the successful ongoing work

Species	Target	Deadline
Ferruginous Duck	L: Ferruginous Duck global population and range stable	2020
	L: Ferruginous Duck removed from the IUCN red list	2050
Corncrake	L: to maintain current population level of the species throughout its breeding range.	2015
	L: to increase population by 20% in those parts of the breeding range where large declines were reported in the second half of the 20 th century	2015
Black-winged Pratincole	S: to define the main factors affecting the population of the Black-winged Pratincole in the breeding, staging and wintering areas and to undertake actions to reduce their negative impact.	2007
	S: to optimise relationships between man and birds in agricultural habitats used by the Black-winged Pratincole.	2007
	L: to protect the Black-winged Pratincole from extinction.	2024
	L: to ensure stability of the Black-winged Pratincole population within its breeding and wintering range.	2024
Sociable Lapwing	S: to define main factors affecting the population of the Sociable Lapwing in the areas of breeding, staging and wintering, and to undertake actions to reduce negative impact of the key negative factors.	2007
	S: to organise co-ordinated targeted research to clarify general population characteristics such as breeding success, mortality rates and causes of mortality, current distribution, seasonal changes in habitat requirements, migratory links / distribution of birds from certain breeding areas to particular migration corridors and wintering grounds.	2007
	S: to ensure that all appropriate actions defined in this Action Plan are undertaken in order to stop further decline of the Sociable Lapwing throughout its range.	2007
	L: to reverse the population trend of the Sociable Lapwing, with the species occurring with stable or increasing numbers within the “traditional” breeding and wintering ranges of the mid 20th century.	2024
Great Snipe	S: to increase knowledge about the Great Snipe (e.g. habitat use, breeding range and population size particularly for the eastern population, and migration and wintering conditions), in order to increase the effectiveness of the reviewed version of the Great Snipe Action Plan to be produced in 2005.	2005
	S: to maintain the population of the Great Snipe at a level that will guarantee it long-term conservation in all its present range.	2007
	L: to restore the population to a level that will remove the species from the “Near Threatened” category.	2019
Slender-billed Curlew	S: to prevent the extinction of the Slender-billed Curlew.	1999
	M: to prevent any further decrease in the Slender-billed Curlew population	2002
	L: to secure a significant increase in the number of Slender-billed Curlews.	2006
Audouin’s Gull	S: to maintain the current population throughout its range.	1999
	M-L: to ensure expansion of the species’ range and numbers particularly in smaller colonies.	2006

Of the 7 SSAPs published in 1996, only two have met the targets set.

The Pygmy Cormorant is now classified as *Least Concern*, i.e. is no longer a threatened species. Its population in Europe has undergone a moderate increase in the period 1990 - 2000 and the large Romanian and Azerbaijan populations have been stable (BirdLife International, 2004).

The Audouin’s Gull has expanded its range and the global population is bigger, but the species is mostly concentrated in few large colonies.

Table 2 - Achievement of aims set in the SSAPs. The species are grouped by publication year of the SSAP.

Year	Species	Threat Status		Short term	Medium term Aims achieved	Long term
		original	current			
1996	Dalmatian Pelican	VU	VU	N		
	Pygmy Cormorant	NT	LC	Y	Y	Y
	Lesser White-fronted Goose	VU	VU	N		
	Red-breasted Goose	VU	EN	N		
	Marbled Teal	VU	VU	N		
	Slender-billed Curlew	CR	CR	N		
	Audouin's Gull	CD	NT	Y	Y	Y
2004	Black-winged Pratincole	DD	NT	Good progress		2024
	Sociable Lapwing	VU*	CR	Good progress		2024
	Great Snipe	NT	NT	N	?	2019
2006	Northern Bald Ibis	CR	CR	Good progress		2015
	White-headed Duck	EN	EN	Some progress		2015
	Light-bellied Brent Goose	LC [#]	LC [#]	Y	-	Y
	Ferruginous Duck	NT	NT	Limited progress		2020
	Corncrake	NT	NT	Limited progress		2015

* The species was upgraded to CR as a result of the data collected during the development of the SSAP.

The Threat Status refers to the whole species, the SSAP targets only the East Canadian High Arctic population.

For the other species the situation is not completely negative as it may appear. Most of the conservation efforts have been carried out in Europe and with some good successes. Recent surveys, monitoring and threat assessment in Asia are improving our knowledge about the consistency of the different populations and of the severity of the threats to wetlands and their fauna. Therefore the global status of the species has not changed despite the successes in the western part of their ranges.

The Dalmatian Pelican has benefited from the conservation work carried out in Europe and its population wintering in Black Sea & Mediterranean is still increasing. The Eastern population is smaller than estimated at the time of the SSAP and only recently effective conservation work has become possible in Central Asia.

The Red-breasted Goose for few years (at the time of the deadline set in the SSAP) reached the target populations of >70,000 wintering individuals, several roosting places were protected and a monitoring scheme was established (Dereliev, 2006). Unfortunately in the last few years the population dropped by 50% and for this reason the target is no longer achieved.

In Spain active conservation work for the Marbled Teal resulted in several sites being protected and the population continuing to fluctuate but not declining. In Europe the situation is not very clear with a small decline in the breeding population and a large increase in the wintering population.

The implementation of the three SSAPs published in 2004, have reached the deadlines for the short term aims.

The improvement of our knowledge about the Black-winged Pratincole and Sociable Lapwing in the last few years has been impressive and in some cases has hit the news on a global scale, but more work needs to be done in the wintering areas to identify the threats.

No review of the SSAP for the Great Snipe has been carried out although scientific work on the species has continued and two new national action plans have been developed.

Among the group of SSAPs published in 2006, the Light-bellied Brent Goose continued its recent positive trend and the population is above the target of 25,000 wintering individuals, but it would be

too early to downgrade it in the Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan since the regulating factor of the breeding success and the potential effects of climate change on the species are still unclear. Good progress has been made in the implementation of the Northern Bald Ibis SSAP with the discovery of the wintering grounds of the Syrian population and the continuing good breeding success in both wild populations. Less progress, also because of their lower conservation priority, has been made on Corncrake and Ferruginous Duck.

Because the limited level of responses it has not been possible to developed a numerical index of the implementation level on a country-by-country basis. Only a general assessment of the implementation could be given for each action plan. The results are given in the species accounts.

Species accounts

Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*,
Pygmy Cormorant *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*,
Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*,
White-headed Duck *Oxyura leucocephala*,
Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*,
Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota*
(East Canadian High Arctic population),
Red breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis*,
Marbled Teal *Marmaronetta angustirostris*,
Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*,
Corncrake *Crex crex*,
Black-winged Pratincole *Glareola nordmanni*,
Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius*,
Great Snipe *Gallinago media*
Slender-billed Curlew *Numenius tenuirostris*,
Audouin's Gull *Larus audouinii*.

Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Recommendation 5.1 (1997)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995

Status

Targets: In the short term, to prevent any further declines below 1994 levels in the population size and distribution of the Dalmatian Pelican. In the medium to long term, to increase the population size of the Dalmatian Pelican to a level at which it no longer qualifies as a globally threatened species.

Status: The species population wintering in the Mediterranean and Black Sea has increased to 4,350-4,800 individuals while the Eastern population has declined to 6,000-9,000 individuals.

Changes in national populations since the SSAP publication (1996)

Country	Population in SAP (pairs)	Year	Current population (pairs)	Year	Source
Albania	40–70	(1990s)	19-19	1992-2002	1
Armenia	?		5-8	1997-2002	1
Azerbaijan	?		3-10	1996-2000	1
Bulgaria	70–90	(1990s)	86-130	2005-2007	2
Georgia			Present	2003	1
Serbia	10–20	(1980s)	4-7	2000-2002	1
Greece	190–260	(1990s)	>1200	2003-2007	2
Romania	70–150	(1990s)	400-450	1990-2002	1
Russian Federation (European part)	400–450	(1990s)	350-450	1990-2000	1
Turkey	100–150	(1990s)	220-250	2001	1
Ukraine	6–14	(1990s)	3-14	1990-2000	1
Total	886–1,204		2,000-2,500		

Sources: 1: BirdLife International (2004); 2: replies to the questionnaire.

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWAs Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Populations	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)	2,000-3,000	2,300-3,200	4,350-4,800
SW Asia & S Asia (win)	10,000-13,000	10,000-12,500	6,000-9,000

Evaluation: Both the short and long-term targets of the action plan have been achieved for the western population of the species where the conservation efforts and the focus of the Action Plan are concentrated. The Central Asian population is declining. The Mongolian population (not covered by AEWAs and by the Action Plan) is almost extinct.

Protection Status

The species is fully protected by law in the European Union, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Russian Federation, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine.

National and regional species action plans

There has been no national species action plan adopted in any country. An Action Plan covering the Globally Threatened Waterbirds (including the Dalmatian Pelican) has been developed by BirdLife International and its national partners in the Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia).

Site protection

Designation: Of the 38 IBAs selected globally for the species breeding records 26 are somewhat protected; of the other 127 IBAs where the species does not breed, 66 are protected to some extent.

Albania: The only known colony at Karavastas lagoon has some kind of legal protection, however it is not enforced.

Greece: The entire population breeds within protected areas. The largest known breeding colony (ca. 1,000 pairs) within National Park of Prespa is protected since 1974.

Montenegro: The colonies are officially protected but the level of effective protection needs improvement.

In Romania and Bulgaria the entire population breeds within protected areas.

Management plans: Only 14 sites (mostly in Greece) have a management plan. Three protected areas (Ekvoles potamou Strymona, Limnes Chimaditida-Zazari in Greece and Srebarna in Bulgaria) have management plans that address the species requirements.

Site management:

Albania: Burning and cutting of reeds in spring at key sites is forbidden, but occasionally happens causing great damage. Disturbance related to illegal transport of immigrants and goods to Italy is affecting the colonies in Albania and Montenegro.

Bulgaria: The breeding colony at Srebarna is managed by cutting reed and providing artificial platforms in a cooperation effort between the Ministry of Environment and 'Le Balkan'.

Commercial fishing is prohibited and only limited sport fishing is allowed. Wardening is provided by the Ministry.

Greece: There is no official wardening in place, but extensive wardening is carried out through the efforts of the NGO the Society for the Protection of Prespa - SPP. Some actions were undertaken during the project LIFE (1999-2003) to manage the hydrological regime of Amvrakikos wetland.

Russian Federation: Funds have been allocated recently for the management and effective wardening of Svetlinsky regional biological reserve where 40 pairs breed.

Turkey: The Gediz Delta has a Management Plan and the need of protecting the delta from urban encroachment has been included in the Environmental Management Plan of Izmir.

Hunting does not seem to be a major problem anymore in Europe, while it is still reported to be a threat in Asia.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation: Only some key areas are protected from habitat loss, pollution, changes in hydrological regime and disturbance, however, the majority of wetlands are not.

Greece: Habitat restoration has been carried out at Amvrakikos wetland and Mikri Prespa.

Romania: In the Danube Delta the erosion of Ceaplace Island on Lake Sinoe, hosting an important colony, was stopped in 2004 by the Biosphere Reserve in cooperation with Romanian

Ornithological Society (ROS).

Turkey: At the Gediz Delta increased protection has resulted in an increase of the Pelican colony from 10-20 to almost 80 pairs.

Burying power lines:

Greece: At Lake Prespa mortality was significantly reduced by changing the wires into thicker, more visible cables. In Amvrakikos power lines were buried in areas where the problem was not so significant.

Research and Monitoring:

Greece: The breeding numbers are monitored since 1983 by Tour du Valat and local partners revealing new breeding sites. Tour du Valat is also following the development of the new colony in Kerkini on artificial platforms since 2004.

Tour du Valat has also initiated, promoted and provided expertise in other countries (e.g. Turkey, Bulgaria).

Mid-winter counts are carried out regularly in most countries, although results tend to underestimate numbers since roosting sites are often in secluded parts of the wetlands.

Several other research issues identified in the action plan, such as monitoring the effect of conservation measures, mortality rate and causes, existing or potential conflicts between people and pelicans, impacts of pelicans on fish populations and dispersal of pelicans have been studied but mainly in Greece. The BirdLife International IBA program in Central Asia is providing updated and detailed information on the distribution of the species and conservation status of the wetlands hosting the species.

Conclusions

The Action Plan for Dalmatian Pelican has been implemented to quite a high level in the western part of the range with a significant contribution from Tour du Valat and other NGOs. The most important tasks are to maintain the positive achievements in a more systematic way and expand the experience toward the eastern populations which are still declining.

Therefore:

- A revised Action Plan should improve the involvement of governments and non governmental organizations in the Middle East and Central Asia.
- Management plans should be prepared and implemented for more sites including measures to manage human activities, disturbance and conflict resolution;
- The protection of wetlands from habitat loss and pollution should be strengthened in the framework of the national implementation of the National Wetland Strategies, National Biodiversity Conservation Strategies and Action Plans and in the EU the Water Framework Directive.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Country	Protection status			Management Plan			complete			partial			none			unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	no					
Afghanistan															1	1		
Albania				3												3		
Armenia																	Regional Waterbird AP	
Azerbaijan		1			1			4								6	Regional Waterbird AP	
Bulgaria	1			1	14			6								22		
Georgia					1			4								5	Regional Waterbird AP	
Greece	3	8		5	3			1								20		
Iran, Islamic Republic of	1	3		1	7			6					1			19		
Iraq								5								5		
Kazakhstan	3		2			1	4		4							14		
Macedonia, the former Yugoslav Republic of		1			1											2		
Montenegro					1											1		
Romania	1				1		1	1								4		
Russia		3			11			13	1				1			29		
Turkey		8			3			4								15	Regional Waterbird AP	
Turkmenistan																8		
Ukraine					1			1								2		
Uzbekistan																8		

Pygmy Cormorant *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Recommendation 5.1 (1997)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995

Status

Targets: In the short term to prevent any further declines below 1994 levels in the population size and distribution of the Pygmy Cormorant. In the medium to long term, to increase the population size of the Pygmy Cormorant to a level at which it no longer qualifies as Near Threatened.

Status: The species has been downgraded to ‘Least Concern’ in the global Red List in 2005 largely as a result of better estimates from the eastern part of the range (in particular Azerbaijan) but also because of the range expansion in the 1990s (Italy, Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, etc) and moderate increase of the population in Europe where most of the breeding pairs occur.

Changes in national populations since the SSAP publication (1996)

Country	Population in SSAP (pairs)	Year	Current population (pairs)	Year	Source
Albania	100-300	1990s	0-25	1996-2002	1
Armenia			200-400	1998-2002	1
Azerbaijan			8,000-12,000	1996-2000	1
Bosnia & Herzegovina			50-60	1990-2000	1
Bulgaria	60-180	1990s	350-400	1997-2001	1
Croatia	-		8-28	2003-2007	2
Georgia			Present	2003-2003	1
Greece	557-590	1990s	1,250-1,310	1997	1
Hungary			250-300	2004	2
Israel	Possible breeder	1994	136-200	2007	2
Italy	-		600-800	2006	2
Macedonia			100-150	1999-2000	1
Moldova	200-500		8-12	1990-2000	1
Romania	4,000	1990s	11,500-14,000	1999-2002	1
Russian Federation	150-250		2,000-5,000	1990-2000	1
Serbia & Montenegro	150	1980s	2,400-2,800	2000-2002	1
Slovakia	-		0-1	1980-1999	1
Turkey	2,000-5,000	1990	1,300-1,800	2001-2001	1
Ukraine	10-30		550-750	1990-1998	1
Total European ² population estimate	13,000		28,000-39,000		1

Sources: 1: BirdLife International (2004); 2: Replies to the questionnaire.

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Population	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
Black Sea & Mediterranean	25,000	23,000-37,000	23,000-37,000
Southwestern Asia	25,000-100,000	25,000-100,000	25,000-100,000

Evaluation: The targets set in the Action Plan have been achieved, although partly at least as a results of better knowledge of the population size.

² The countries considered in the SSAP do not overlap with the population limits used in the Conservation Status Reports. In particular the birds breeding in Azerbaijan and Israel are included in the Southwestern Asia population figure.

Protection Status

The species is fully protected in the EU, and in most of the countries where it occurs. The species is often mistaken by hunters and fish-farmers for the Great Cormorant (*P. carbo*) and killed by mistake even within culling programmes aimed at the larger species or illegally by fish farmers. In Hungary hunters involved in the control of Great Cormorant are given specific training on how to distinguish the two species.

National and regional species action plans

There is a National Species Action Plan only in Greece, produced in 1999 in the framework of a LIFE project.

Site protection

Designation:

About 12,000-22,500 breeding pairs are within 30 IBAs that are somewhat protected.

The SPA network also supports the majority of the EU population during the breeding season and covers all IBAs selected for the species in this season.

Greece: The species' breeding population is well covered by SPAs. 95% of the national breeding population is in four SPAs and all IBAs are classified as SPAs.

Italy: All colonies, including the latest established in Apulia, are within SPAs, the vast majority of the pairs are within the Emilia-Romagna Po Delta Regional Park.

Hungary: The small, but increasing, breeding population is dispersed in several colonies that are all within protected areas. Most of the breeding pairs are in the Hortobágy NP.

The situation outside the EU is less clear, 14 of the 23 IBAs selected for the presence of breeding pairs have some level of protection; only 35 out of 79 of the IBAs where the species occurs outside the breeding period are somewhat protected.

In the Balkan countries (Albania, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia) only 4 IBAs were designated for the presence of breeding colonies and all are, at least partially, protected; of the other 20 IBAs in the region 12 are protected. In Croatia the entire breeding population occurs in protected areas.

In Turkey the 17 protected IBAs cover more than 80% of the national population.

In Azerbaijan the largest breeding population occurs at Gizilagach State Reserve.

In Armenia the species does not breed in protected areas.

In Central Asia Lake Zholdurbas (Uzbekistan), the IBA with the largest breeding population, is not protected.

Management plans: Although the species' population is fairly well covered by protected areas, only very few of these protected areas have management plans (25%).

Site management:

The fairly good level of protection of the colonies has reduced the problem of tree cutting and disturbance. But the level of implementation of site protection and basic management is not always ideal.

In Italy the main colony is threatened by salt water intrusion resulting in the death of the trees where the main colony is located and no interventions have been planned to address the problem. At the same site the local river authority's intervention has destroyed a potential breeding area close to the colony.

In Greece habitat management at site level have been carried out in the past.

In Croatia, a fire damaged the reed bed where the Pygmy Cormorant bred. The Vranske Lake Nature Park management built breeding platforms for the species.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation: There is less progress in the general protection of wetlands. Hungary: The species mostly occurs in artificial water bodies (mainly fishponds) where ensuring appropriate water quality according to the species' requirements is not guaranteed because of other interests. Reed bed management by mowing has been carried out on over 170 ha and habitat restoration activities have been carried out on over 5,000 ha.

Research and Monitoring: Numbers at breeding and, where relevant, wintering sites are monitored in many countries in Europe. Mid-winter counts (IWC) are probably the most widely used tool. A number of colour ringing schemes have started in Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy and Serbia and the movement of the birds are now quite well understood at least in the western part of the distribution. Also the ecological changes at key sites are better understood in the western part of the distribution range of the species. Movements and dispersal of the species is well understood in Greece and Italy. Feeding ecology and interaction with fisheries, as well as interspecific relationships, are poorly understood.

Awareness raising: Public awareness campaigns on the species were carried out in Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece and Israel, where the fishpond managers have been informed about measures to reduce damage without harming the birds.

Conclusions

There has been good progress in the implementation of the Action Plan. The species' threat status has been downgraded to 'Least Concern'.

The species therefore no longer meet the criteria for an SSAP according to AEWA Action Plan.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Country	Protection status		complete		partial		none		unknown		Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	Management Plan		yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	?		
Albania			5		3				2		10	
Armenia								1			1	
Azerbaijan			2	2	2	2	8	8				
Bosnia and Herzegovina			1	1								
Bulgaria			2	1	3	22		12			40	
Croatia						2		2			4	
Georgia						1		2			3	
Greece			2	9	5	7					23	NSAP
Hungary					1						1	
Iran, Islamic Republic of			3	3	2	2	1	1				
Iraq								3			3	
Israel					4						4	
Italy					1						1	
Kazakhstan								2				
Macedonia, the former Yugoslav Republic of			3	3	2	2	1	1				
Montenegro					3	3	1	1				
Romania			2			1	2	7			12	
Russia					3	3	6	6				
Serbia					1		2	2	1		6	
Syria								1			1	
Turkey				11		7		8	1		27	
Turkmenistan									1	1		
Ukraine						2		4			6	
Uzbekistan									9	9		

Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*

SSAP published 2006
 SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 121 (2006)
 AEWA Resolution 3.12 (2005)

Status

Targets: To conserve the Northern Bald Ibis by securing the wild colonies, increasing the number of birds and improving our understanding of their needs

Status: The Moroccan population remained stable in the last three years (2004-06); the relict Syrian population is still limited to 2 breeding pairs, reproduction success has continued to be high and in 2006 new birds (most likely the birds born in 2003) have appeared at the colony. Knowledge about the migration of the eastern populations and threats has increased enormously, and efforts to understand the methodology to create a free, self-sustaining and migrating population(s) have continued in several countries.

Changes in populations since the SSAP publication (2006).

Country	Population in SAP (pairs)	Year	Current population (pairs)	Year
Morocco	94	2004	95	2006
Syria	3	2003	2	2006

Source of 2006 data: C. Boehm *et al.* 2007.

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Population	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
Morocco	200	190	227
South-western Asia	>27	>27	7

Evaluation: As the deadlines are still quite a few years away the overall targets have not been reached yet. While population parameters seem promising and a number of critical conservation actions have been undertaken, threats have neither been fully addressed, nor investigated yet.

Protection Status

The species is fully protected in all breeding countries and Turkey although in Syria the legislation needs updating. The legal situation in Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Ethiopia is still unclear.

National and regional species action plans

A National Action Plan is planned for 2008 in Morocco; the plan will expand the series of conservation plans agreed in the 1990s to 2000 which have been the guiding documents for the work in Souss-Massa National Park. The implementation of the plans was hindered by financial constraints. An International Advisory Group for the Northern Bald Ibis (IAGNBI) has been established and endorsed by BirdLife International and IUCN. It has an advisory role and does not plan to evolve into an AEWA Working Group on the species. At the IAGNBI's meeting (in September 2006) the experts involved in the main approaches (in-situ and ex-situ conservation) met and agreed on priorities, protocols and exchanged information and data. At the meeting updates to the Action Plan were agreed.

Site protection

Designation:

Morocco: The NP Souss-Massa hosts the largest colony, while the second breeding site is covered by a lower level of protection (SIBE).

Syria: The location of the colony was declared as Ibis Reserve, but without staff or management plan; it relies on the staff and resources of the nearby reserve Talila.

Turkey: Birecik area is only partially protected.

The sites in Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Ethiopia where the Syrian satellite tagged birds stopped and wintered are not protected.

Management plans: Only Souss-Massa has a management plan in place, although the Ibis Reserve in Syria has implemented a number of actions specifically aimed at the ibis.

Site management: One effective intervention to improve breeding success in both countries has been the provision of safe water sources near the breeding colonies. Human disturbance (alongside hunting) was a major problem in Syria. The hiring of a number of wardens and the training provided to two rangers has improved the situation.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation: In Morocco habitat loss by illegal building in the National Park has been halted but not completely solved. The park has implemented two projects promoting sustainable tourism and fishing activities in order to avoid disturbance from tourism and mortality from discarded fishing lines.

Ex-situ conservation: The experimental work aimed at defining the protocols for the reintroduction of captive-bred animals continue through four different projects based on the substantial captive population existing in Europe. Some progress has been made but the method currently available is suitable only to establish a resident population. Plans for a captive ‘backup’ population in Morocco are being considered.

Research and Monitoring: Monitoring at breeding sites is carried out regularly. In Morocco twice a week year round; in Syria the colony is regularly under surveillance.

Satellite tagging of three adults in 2006 and the possibility of observing the birds at staging sites (in Yemen) and at the wintering area (in Ethiopia) provided a large amount of information regarding the migration strategy (adults and juveniles do not winter in the same areas) and habitat selection.

Morocco: Birds have been satellite tagged but remained in the known areas.

Turkey: Birds have been satellite tagged. Unfortunately no information is yet available on this initiative and this is of some concern as it coincides with a change in the management structure locally.

Preliminary studies on the feeding habitat have been carried out in Ethiopia. Feeding habitat selection is quite well understood also due to a number of studies carried out on feral and Moroccan populations.

Awareness raising:

Morocco: Awareness raising among local population is a regular part of the Souss-Massa NP activities.

Syria: The presence of the species has received the attention of the media and of the decision makers following high-level advocacy work. Bird tourism organisations have been asked not to

organize trips to the wintering site before proper protection measures are in place and local population are approached by conservationists.

Conclusions

There has been significant progress in the implementation of the Action Plan in particular for the eastern population. The work in Morocco has continued successfully.

The implementation of the Action Plan seems on track but there is a risk that the current focus on the eastern population could reduce the attention and commitment to the Moroccan population where work is still needed. Two different conservation approaches (ex-situ and in situ) are being followed; this may increase the complexity of the task of saving the species, but both can contribute to it.

The following actions are therefore suggested:

- A working group needs to be established and officially endorsed by AEWA;
- The new range states (Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Ethiopia), identified through satellite tagging, need to be engaged;
- Threats need to be better understood and addressed in both populations by identifying the drivers and implementing solutions at each site with the involvement of the local populations.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status	complete		partial		none	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	no	?	yes	no	no		
Country							
Morocco			1	1	2	4	NSAP planned for 2008
Saudi Arabia	1					1	
Syria		1				1	
Turkey				1		1	
Yemen					2	2	

White-headed Duck *Oxyura leucocephala*

SSAP published 2006
 SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 121 (2006)
 AEW A Resolution 3.12 (2005)
 EU

Status

Targets: The long-term Goal (by 2050) is to remove the White-headed Duck from the IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals.

In the short-term (by 2015) the aim of the plan is to maintain the current population and range of the species throughout its range, and in the medium to long-term to promote increase in population size and range.

The essential short term/immediate activities include:

- For White-headed Duck range states:
 - Produce and implement national White-headed Duck action plan
 - Form national White-headed Duck working group
 - Provide legal protection for White-headed Duck and its habitat
- For Ruddy Duck range states:
 - Eradicate all Ruddy Ducks x White-headed Duck hybrids
 - Eradicate all wild Ruddy Ducks in the priority order:
 - 1 Total prevention of breeding;
 - 2 Birds occurring March-September,
 - 3 Birds occurring October- February,
 - National and international bodies endorse and implement the International Ruddy Duck Eradication Strategy of the Bern Convention
 - Produce national Ruddy Duck control strategy and/or statement of intent
 - Introduce national legislation, where needed, to permit the control of Ruddy Ducks
- Research priorities:
 - Conduct and/or take part in genetic studies to determine the provenance of Ruddy Ducks in mainland Europe
 - Conduct and/or take part in genetic studies to monitor rates of introgression with Ruddy Ducks in Spain and Morocco, and to clarify the modes of hybridization

Status: No Updated population estimates have been produced since the publication of the SSAP. The threat status of the species was re-assessed in October 2005 and the decision was taken to retain the species as Endangered because, despite uncertainty about the possible 'redistribution' of birds in the Middle East, Azerbaijan, etc., the latest total winter figures from Turkey (for 2002 and 2005) suggested that the 'fluctuation' recorded during 1990-2000 has become a real decline.

Up-to-date information on the population size of the White-headed Duck.

Only available updated information are given

Country	Season	Population in SSAP	Years	Current population	Years	Source
Algeria	w	2-348	1995-1999	755	2007	2
Israel	w	1-1,350	1995-2001	2,828	2007-2008	2
Turkey	w	989-2,970	1995-2002	1,006	2005	1

Source 1: BirdLife Threatened European & Central Asian Birds forum; 2: Replies to the questionnaire.

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Populations	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
West Mediterranean (Spain & Morocco)	1,200	2,000-4,500	2,500
Algeria & Tunisia	400	400	400-600
E Mediterranean, Turkey & SW Asia	8,000-15,000	8,000-15,000	5,000-10,000

Evaluation: The overall targets have not been reached yet since the deadline is still several years away.

Protection Status

Azerbaijan: The species is now protected and penalty for illegal killing is ca. 240 Euro.

Morocco: Following the change in legislation in 2006, the species is protected and the penalty for killing, taking or trading White-headed Duck ranges between 350-1,200 Euro and/or detention for 2-6 months.

Algeria: the penalty for illegally killing the species is 2,200-5,200 Euros.

National and regional species action plans

An action plan for the conservation of threatened waterbirds (therefore covering also the White-headed Duck is under development in the Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) coordinated by BirdLife International and its local partners (ASPB, AOS and GCCW).

Site protection

The IBA list in the World Bird Data Base (WBDB) of BirdLife International (as per June 2007) provides further info on the protection status of the sites important for the White-headed Duck. The updated data include information from North Africa, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan and updated data from the Russian Federation. The questionnaires also provided further information about the protection status of several IBAs.

In Kazakhstan (8 IBAs) the most important staging sites are Korgalzhynskiy Zapovednik protected) and Kyzylkol Lake (unprotected). In Turkmenistan (6 IBAs) the most important site is Khazar Reserve and in Uzbekistan (9 IBAs) the most important sites are Karakyr lakes system, Lake Dengizkul and Sudochie Wetland.

In Israel hunting of waterbird has been stopped in the area of the Judean foothill, which host ca. 1800 wintering White-headed Ducks.

Number of IBAs selected for the species and their protection

	SSAP	Current situation (Dec 2007) ³
Number of IBAs selected for the species	111	133
Protection status unknown	16 (14%)	22 (16%)
IBAs with information on protection status	95	111
Fully protected	36 (38%)	35 (32%)
Partially protected	27 (28%)	32 (29%)
Unprotected	32 (34%)	45 (40%)
With Management plan	15 (16%)	20 (18%)

The new data increase the number of the known key sites for the species and indicate that the protection status and the management of the sites have not significantly improved yet. The IBA identification work in Central Asia has not finished yet; the following step will be the promotion of the protection of the sites.

Management plans. Only 20 sites have management plans and almost 50% of these sites are in Spain.

Eradication of Ruddy Duck

The Council of Europe through the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) has been active in promoting the implementation of the Eradication of the Ruddy Duck both as a specific act to protect the White-headed Duck and in the framework of the work on Invasive Alien Species. At the November 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee a new recommendation was proposed about the progress in the eradication of the Ruddy Duck which reiterate the recommendation No. 61 (1997) on the conservation of the White-headed Duck.

The Expert Group on Invasive Alien Species (IAS) met in Reykjavik (Iceland) from 22 to 24 May 2007. This group meets every two years to follow progress on IAS by States and international organisations and to make proposals for further work on IAS-related matters. Part of the information reported here are taken from its report to the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention.

Estonia: The new Invasive Alien Species Regulation listed the Ruddy Duck among the species that cannot be imported in the country.

Belgium: A breeding pair had been shot as soon as detected. The Flemish Region plans to work out a project to actively control the Ruddy Duck.

France: A survey on invasive birds species carried out by LPO (BirdLife in France) in 2006 identified almost 40 breeding pairs of Ruddy Duck. LPO does not oppose eradication programmes as long as they are based on sound scientific data.

Morocco: An action plan for the eradication of the Rudy Duck has been developed by the Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et a la lutte contre la desertification du Maroc in cooperation with IUCN and SEO/BirdLife; its implementation has been hindered by financial constraint, and also by the lack of recent records of the species in the country.

Sweden: Work on developing a national strategy and action plan on invasive alien species is now in progress and will be completed by July 2008. Unfortunately, several pairs of Ruddy Duck have

³ Based on data from WBDB accessed in June 2007 updated with information received through the questionnaire.

been observed nesting in Central Sweden, but have not been eradicated due to administrative problems.

UK: The research on Ruddy Duck control in the UK since 1999 has shown that it is highly feasible to eradicate the species from the country. Several years of active control have allowed the development of a model which predicts the response of the Ruddy Duck population to further control. This model suggests that eradication from the UK is feasible as part of a five-year control programme. The mean time predicted to reduce the population to less than 50 individuals (i.e. by over 99%) is five years. The eradication programme started in September 2005 and will continue until end of 2010. It is supported by a LIFE project and is carried out in cooperation between the Central Science Laboratory (CSL, part of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs - DEFRA), UK and General Directorate for Biodiversity, Spain. So far over 3,400 birds have been killed and the estimated national population has gone from around 4,400 Ruddy ducks to 800-1,200 individuals.

Switzerland: A leaflet was produced and distributed in April 2006 by three ornithological organizations explaining the need for reporting any observation of Ruddy Duck to the Cantonal authorities.

Research and monitoring:

Genetic studies on the White-headed Duck and on the European Ruddy Ducks have been carried out by an international team coordinated by the Estación Biológica de Doñana (Spain). Genetic analysis of the White-headed Ducks showed a highly significant loss of mitochondrial haplotype diversity between the historical and contemporary Spanish samples linked to the severe genetic bottleneck the Spanish population went through in 1970s and 1980s when the population was reduced to 22 individuals.

The limited genetic diversity found in the European population of Ruddy Ducks is consistent with a founder population as small as seven birds. In addition, shifts in allele frequencies at several loci, presumably due to genetic drift in the founding population, result in significant differentiation between the European and North American populations. This confirms that the entire Ruddy Duck population in Europe derives from the 7 birds imported from the US in 1948.

Using a panel of eight nuclear intron markers, 10 microsatellite loci, and mtDNA control region sequences the team found no extensive introgression of Ruddy Duck genes into the Spanish White-headed Duck population, probably due to the early implementation of an effective Ruddy Duck and hybrid control programme.

Conclusions

Significant progress has been made since the publication of the SSAP on some priority activities. In particular the example of Spain and of the UK in addressing the Ruddy Duck issue seems to be convincing the countries with smaller populations that the species can be eradicated. Also the most urgent and short term research targets have been almost met, although more work is needed to assess the introgression of the Ruddy Duck genes in the White-headed Duck.

An Action Plan in the Southern Caucasus covering also this species will be finalised in early 2008, but this is the only national/regional plan developed recently. Not much work seems to be happening in Central Asia yet. No improvement is recorded on the conservation status and management of the key sites or in the protection status of the species.

Special attention should be paid to:

- Controlling Ruddy Duck in all western Palearctic countries;
- Provide legal protection for White-headed Duck and key sites.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Country	Protection status			Management Plan			complete			partial			none			unknown		Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	no	?					
Afghanistan															2		2		
Albania				1													1		
Algeria		4											2				6		
Armenia														1			1	Regional Waterbird AP	
Azerbaijan		1												4			5	Regional Waterbird AP	
Bulgaria				1	3												4	NSAP	
Cyprus	1			1													2		
France																		WG	
Georgia					1												1	Regional Waterbird AP	
Greece		1			1												2		
Iran, Islamic Republic of	3	6		1	1		1	5									17		
Iraq									1								1		
Israel				2					1								3		
Kazakhstan	3		1			1	1			2							8		
Romania	1								1								2		
Russia		1			5				6				2				14		
Spain	6	2		5	8				1								22	NSAP & WG	
Syria									1								1		
Tunisia	1			1					8								10	NSAP under development	
Turkey		14			5				12				4				35	Regional Waterbird AP	
Turkmenistan															6		6		
Ukraine																		NSAP	
Uzbekistan															9		9		

Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Recommendation 5.1 (1997)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995

Status

Targets: In the short-term the action plan aims to maintain the current population of the Lesser White-fronted Goose in known areas throughout its range. In the medium to long term, to ensure an increase in the Lesser White-fronted Goose population.

Status: The decline of the western population has continued since the adoption of the action plan. The recent increase reported from Sweden is related to a captive breeding and release programme. The released birds from Sweden visit Germany and the Netherlands.

Changes in breeding population in Europe in the last two decades

Country	Population in Birds in Europe ⁴ (pairs)	Year	Current population (pairs)	Years	Source
Finland	15-20	1992	0-15	1999-2001	1
Norway	30-50	1990	15-20	2007	2
Russia European	1,000-2,500	No year given	200-400	1995-2000	1
Sweden	1-5	1987	10-15	2003-2004	3

Sources: 1: BirdLife International (2004), 2: Replies to questionnaire; 3: Nagy & Crockford (2004)

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

N Europe & W Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian	15,000 (CSR, 1999)	8,000-13,000 (CSR 2, 2002)	8,000-13,000 (CSR 3, 2007)
--	-----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluation: The objectives of the action plan have not been achieved yet. The main reasons for decline seem to be located at staging areas in Russian Federation and Kazakhstan, where juvenile mortality is extremely high due to hunting, and not in the breeding areas.

Protection Status

The species is legally protected in all countries where it occurs (but no information is available from Syria and Iraq). Hunting of look-alike species poses a problem in many countries in particular in Russian Federation and Kazakhstan where most of the satellite tagged birds are lost.

National and regional species action plans.

National Action Plans have been developed for Greece, Bulgaria and Ukraine. In Estonia, Finland and Norway national action plans are under development (first draft expected in early 2008). A regional action plan for waterbirds (including this species) is being developed for the Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) and coordinated by BirdLife International. National working groups have been established in Finland and Norway. The international Lesser White-fronted Goose Working Group that has been the driving force in the implementation of the

⁴ The SSAP does not provide population estimates by country.

action plan is currently not working as in the past due to disagreement of conservation priorities and protocols.

Site protection

Site designation: Along the migration route and the wintering quarters, 63 (61%) of the 103 IBAs identified for the species have some form of protection. According to the IBA database the only site selected for breeding in the Russian Federation is unprotected.

Finland: The remaining breeding areas are not known.

Sweden: The known breeding site of the feral population is designated as an SPA.

Norway: The breeding population occurs outside protected areas.

Management plans: Management plans address, to some extent, the species' conservation requirements at only eleven protected areas (all of which are SPAs or proposed SPAs). Six of the sites where management plans explicitly target the species are located in the Oulu region of Finland, and two in Estonia (Matsalu Nature Reserve, Nigula Nature Reserve). Specific management is carried out in the Evros Delta (Greece). Management targeted at geese in general is implemented in Hungary, where over 19,000 ha are managed through grazing host 50-60 birds during migration.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation: In several EU countries agriculture and land use policies take into account the species at least locally. Several LIFE projects (one is currently ongoing involving Finland, Norway, Estonia, Hungary and Greece) have offered an important contribution to the implementation of the action plan in Europe, providing the opportunity to study the species also outside the EU.

Estonia: In the framework of the ongoing LIFE project habitat management (reed cutting and game crop) is being carried out.

Finland: Habitat management (controlled grazing and reed cutting) is carried out at all staging sites.

Hungary: Almost 20,000 ha are managed by grazing for the species and 24,000 ha have been restored.

Species management: Measures have been taken in Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania and Sweden to prevent hunting disturbance and accidental killing during hunting other goose species.

Greece: Two of the four key sites are strictly protected from disturbance.

Finland: In almost all traditional staging areas along the coast hunting is no longer allowed.

Population of red fox is being controlled in the potential breeding areas to reduce goose mortality.

The establishment of an alternative migration route from Sweden through Germany to the Netherlands based on captive birds has been started. There is considerable progress in the implementation of the action plan in these countries, however the impact of the reintroduction project on the wild population should be considered carefully in collaboration with other range states. In Finland a reintroduction programme was interrupted in 1998, while in Norway a reinforcement programme using local birds is being considered.

Research and Monitoring: There has been a significant advance in the location and monitoring of key staging and wintering areas at different parts of the breeding range, Fennoscandia, Polar Ural and Putorana Plateau (Russian Federation). These three populations meet in Northern Kazakhstan; the Scandinavian birds then move west around the Black Sea and reach Greece, the others winter between Azerbaijan, Iraq and Syria. The areas were located with the help of satellite tracking and colour ringing. Those in Western Europe are regularly monitored, while monitoring efforts and skills should be improved in South-eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia. The

Fennoscandian breeding population is closely monitored. Habitat requirements of the species are well understood and applied in most countries.

Awareness-raising: Much awareness raising activity has been implemented in Finland, Hungary, Estonia and Greece in the framework of the LIFE projects and, in the framework of the ‘introduction’ project, in Germany and the Netherlands. Printed materials have been produced and distributed in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine.

Efforts have been made in Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands and Russian Federation to raise awareness in relation to identification problems, but the majority of hunters and land owners still cannot distinguish the species from the White-fronted Goose (*A. albifrons*). Training of wardens is necessary in Estonia, Germany, Russian Federation, Ukraine and Kazakhstan.

Conclusions

There has been significant progress in the implementation of the action plan. Especially the Fennoscandian countries have implemented the recommendations of the action plan to a high degree. Countries along the traditional migration routes of the Fennoscandian population (in particular Estonia, Hungary and Greece) have also made considerable efforts to protect key staging areas and all these key staging areas within the EU are already protected. However, the N Europe & W Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian population also uses another route through Russian Federation and Kazakhstan where most of the losses happen.

Despite the high level of the implementation of the action plan, the species is in a critical situation and a revised international action plan is under development. This exercise will address the disagreements amongst key stakeholders concerning the way forward.

The following actions are therefore suggested:

- The management of the key sites should be further improved to meet the species’ requirements.
- Restrictions on hunting in the vicinity of the key sites should form part of the conservation measures to avoid accidental killing of the species.
- Conservation efforts should focus more than in the past in Southern Russia and Northern Kazakhstan where most of the satellite tagged individuals have ‘disappeared’.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status Management Plan	complete			partial			none			unknown		Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	no	?		
Country													
Afghanistan										1		1	
Armenia		1										1	Regional Waterbirds AP
Azerbaijan		2						1				3	Regional Waterbirds AP
Belarus		1										1	
Bulgaria				1	1							2	NSAP
Estonia						1		1				2	Under development
Finland		2		1								3	NSAP under development WG in place
Georgia					1							1	Regional Waterbirds AP
Greece		2		2	1							5	NSAP
Hungary				1								1	
Iran, Islamic Republic of	2	2			4			4		1		13	
Iraq								3				3	
Kazakhstan	2		1				1	1	1			6	
Norway				2								2	NSAP Under development WG in place
Romania								1				1	
Russia		1		2	15			14		38		70	
Sweden					1					4		5	
Turkey								1				1	
Turkmenistan											2	2	
Ukraine	1							4				5	National Action Plan
Uzbekistan											5	5	

Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota*

SSAP published 2006
 SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 121 (2006)
 AEWA Resolution 3.12 (2005)

Status

Targets: Short: to maintain the current population and distribution of the species throughout its range.

Long: to increase to and then maintain the population size at or above 25,000 birds, thus removing it from Category A2 of the AEWA and removing the requirement for national action planning

Status: The latest population figures of 32,000 wintering individuals indicates a continued recovery, related to a number of consecutive years of good productivity.

Changes in wintering population size (individuals) since the SSAP publication.

Population in SSAP	Year	Current population	Year
27,000	2003	32,000	2007

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Population	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
Canada & Greenland/Ireland	20,000	20,000	26,400

Evaluation: The action plan was published in 2006, overall targets have not been reached (but the deadline is still several years away). There is an effective network of experts coordinating the monitoring of the winter population and providing a network for researchers.

Protection Status

The subspecies is fully protected in all range countries. Limited hunting is allowed during migration in Canada. Some illegal shooting takes place in Greenland, Iceland and UK.

Working Group and international cooperation

Steps have been taken to renew the Sister Reserve MoU which proved a useful tool for promoting joint research and commitment toward the conservation of the species. A network of experts in regular contact is nevertheless in place with no formal recognition or role.

Site protection

Designation: Most of the wintering areas in Northern Ireland and in the Republic of Ireland are protected except two. With the increase of the population size the species is occurring in other sites which should be protected.

Iceland: Most of the sites have some level of protection, with only one site not receiving any protection.

Canada: Several protected areas host breeding pairs, but no reliable population figures are available for them.

Greenland: The only IBA identified for the species is not protected.

Management plans: Although the species' population is well covered by protected areas, only Breidafjörður (Iceland) appears to have a formal management plan. The situation may be better than it appears, but the experts agree that this aspect has substantial potential to improve.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation: Grazing is managed at several sites on both sides of the border in Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland maintaining feeding habitats for the geese, although the effectiveness for the species is still unclear.

Research and Monitoring:

Extensive satellite tracking is providing crucial information on migration strategy, location and importance of several stop-over sites and survival during migration.

Studies are ongoing on habitat selection and feeding ecology at the breeding areas, stop-over (Iceland) and wintering sites (Ireland and UK).

Over 1,500 birds have been colour ringed since the action plan was produced (thus meeting the target set by the plan at 200 birds colour-ringed per year) and an extensive network of observers has produced over 30,000 re-sights. Data are being analyzed and are providing further information on the species ecology and survival.

More opportunities have arisen for studying the breeding of the species as over 70 nests have been located in Canada at a site (previously the largest sample of nest studied was 14).

Monitoring is carried out regularly and with good coverage at winter grounds and some monitoring is also carried out at staging sites in Iceland. Harvest is regularly monitored in Canada.

Awareness raising: The satellite tracing has received enormous attention as it featured in a very popular program on UK television. The amount of re-sighting of the ringed birds indicates a good level of awareness among nature lovers.

Conclusions

The taxon has maintained a positive trend and is currently over the target of 25,000 individuals set in the action plan. However, in the past, the population has shown wide fluctuations and it would be too early to consider the action plan successfully implemented.

Most of the important threats identified have not been investigated yet (e.g. impact of climate change at breeding and staging/wintering sites) or addressed (potential of oil pollution and proper management).

Therefore:

- Research efforts should concentrate on the breeding ecology of the goose and the impact of climate change on its habitat, distribution and breeding success;
- In the next 3 years site protection should be improved outside the EU and proper management implemented at all sites;
- A formally recognised (i.e. with ToR approved by the AEWA Technical Committee) and operational (i.e. with a coordinator) Working Group should be established in order to facilitate the re-establishment of mechanisms (such as the Sister reserve MoU) promoting international cooperation and funding for the implementation of the Action Plan.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status	complete		partial		none	unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	yes	no	no	no		
Country								
Canada		1			1		2	
Greenland (to Denmark)						2	2	
Iceland	1			1	4		6	
Ireland		8		14	1		23	
United Kingdom	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	

Red-breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Recommendation 5.1 (1997)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995


Status

Targets: In the short term, to maintain the Red-breasted Goose population at no less than 70,000 individuals.

Status: The current population estimate is only 38,500 individuals and has fluctuated during the last 10 years with a severe negative trend. In the 1990s the species' monitoring results indicated a population recovery (perhaps as a result of better coverage), but subsequently the number of birds monitored at the two main known wintering regions (north and west of the Black Sea and in Eastern Azerbaijan) have declined, more significantly in the western areas. As a result of the rapid drastic decline the species is now classified as Endangered (formerly was Vulnerable).

Changes in the population estimates of Red-breasted Goose

Source: International Red-breasted Goose Working Group (IRBGWG) www.brantaruficollis.org



Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (Figures in individuals)

Northern Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian	70,000 (CSR, 1999)	88,000 (CSR 2, 2002)	38,500 (CSR 3, 2007)
--------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation: The species current situation is worse than at the time the Action Plan was developed. The decline has been rapid and steep and the causes are not clear, yet. Since the publication of the Action Plan the monitoring of the species and the knowledge about the winter ecology has improved.

Protection Status

The species is fully protected in all countries where it occurs regularly, but the level of law enforcement is still insufficient in many countries. Alongside accidental mortality (the species forms mixed flocks with other hutable goose species), hunting results in severe disturbance because of the lack of buffer zones around the staging and wintering roosts and feeding sites.

National and regional species action plans

A regional action plan for threatened waterbirds covering also the Red-breasted Goose is under development in the Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey) coordinated by BirdLife International.

In general activities are coordinated by the International Red-breasted Goose Working Group. The group has launched the Red-breasted Goose Common Monitoring and Research Programme and has started the process of reviewing the 1996 international action plan.

Bulgaria: A National Species Action Plan has been adopted.

Romania and Ukraine: National Species Action Plans are under development.

Russian Federation: Regional Action Plans for Kalmykia and Taimyr are in the planning stage.

Site protection

Site designation: 33 (50%) of the 65 IBAs identified for the Red-breasted Goose have some level of protection under national legislation. For four sites in the eastern regions of Russian Federation the protection status is unknown. All sites in Azerbaijan, Greece and Iran⁵ are protected; about 75 % of the sites are protected in Bulgaria, Romania and Kazakhstan; about 50% in Russian Federation and Turkey; and, only 25% in Ukraine.

Management plans:

Greece: Practical site actions have been implemented at Evros Delta.

Romania: Management plan specifically addressing the needs of the species has been developed for Lake Techirghiol. The lake was also declared a Ramsar site in 2006.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation:

Greece: Scientific studies were undertaken on restoration and conservation management of Drana lagoon (part of Evros Delta).

Hungary: Management of feeding areas is carried out including for other goose species.

Romania: Wheat was cultivated near Lake Techirghiol for the wintering geese and anti-poaching surveillance was improved.

Species management:

Greece: Hunting mortality has been assessed in the framework of a LIFE project.

Romania: Use of rodenticides is still considered a problem and pressure has been put on the authorities to improve control and vigilance.

Research and Monitoring: Monitoring of key sites is implemented in Bulgaria, Romania and Ukraine every two weeks during winter coordinated by the IRBGWG. Monitoring takes place also in Russian Federation, Greece, and Azerbaijan mainly in the framework of the IWC. Conditions at the breeding grounds are monitored by the Annual International Arctic Birds Breeding Conditions Survey, while other information is collected by the Scandinavian researchers monitoring the Lesser White-fronted Goose in Kazakhstan. Research on the ecology (breeding and wintering) of the species need to be improved as well as the causes of the wide fluctuations in numbers the species underwent in the recent past. Feeding ecology has been studied in Greece and Romania.

Awareness raising:

Romania and Ukraine: Targeted awareness raising activities about the species are implemented.

⁵ Records from Iran come from the 1970s.

Hungary: Visiting hunters receive printed information about the different goose species and their protection status.

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey: Posters about threatened waterbirds (including this species) have been produced and distributed.

Conclusions

The sudden reduction of wintering individuals was recorded because the species was monitored at the main wintering sites in Bulgaria and Romania in the framework of the implementation of the international action plan. This decline has stimulated a revitalization of the working group, improved cooperation between countries and the process of drafting a new action plan has started. It is not clear what is causing the populations decline and the wide fluctuations observed in the wintering areas.

The following actions are therefore suggested:

- A new action plan should be developed with the full involvement of experts from all range states;
- Proper monitoring and threat assessment need to be implemented along the species' entire flyway;
- Causes of the population changes need to be understood through high quality research on the species' biology;
- All sites should be effectively protected and managed to accommodate the species' requirements.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status	complete			partial		none		unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	yes	no	no		
Country										
Azerbaijan		1							1	Regional Waterbirds AP
Bulgaria	1			2	5		3		11	NSAP
Greece				1					1	
Iran, Islamic Republic of	1				1				2	
Iraq							1		1	
Kazakhstan	2		1			1			4	
Romania	2						2		4	NSAP under development
Russia		2		1	7		11	4	25	Sub National SAP under development
Turkey		1		1			2		4	Regional Waterbirds AP
Ukraine	2				2		8		12	NSAP under development

Marbled Teal *Marmaronetta angustirostris*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Recommendation 5.1 (1997)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995

Status

Targets: In the short term to maintain the current population and area of occupancy throughout its range. In the medium term to promote the population increase of the species within its current range. In the long term; to promote the expansion of the breeding population to other suitable areas.

Status changes: The species is typically fluctuating. CSR3 (2007) indicates the Western population as fluctuating, while the other two populations are still declining but this is not reflected in the tables below which presents only the minimum and maximum. The increase registered in the eastern Mediterranean population is, at least partially, due to better coverage. It has almost disappeared as a regular breeder from the Doñana National Park, where there are very few breeding sites, each of which faces different threats. The species is a new breeder in the Canary Islands (1-4 pair) and in Italy (1-3 pairs).

Changes in national populations since the SSAP publication (1996). Breeding data is given in pairs, wintering data in individuals.

Country	Season	Population in SSAP	Years	Current population	Years	Source
Algeria	Br	20-50	1985-1994			
Armenia	Br	2-15	1985-1994	5-30	1999-2005	3
Azerbaijan	Br	70-200	1985-1994	200-600	1996-2000	3
Egypt	Br	-	1985-1994			
Iran	Br	2,000-4,000	1985-1994			
Iraq	Br	1,000-6,000	1985-1994			
Israel	Br	35-50	1985-1994	23	2006	
Italy	Br	0		1-3	2000-2006	2
Morocco	Br	30-50	1985-1994	20-200	2005	2
Russian Federation	Br	-	1985-1994	1-10	1997-2003	1
Spain	Br	30-250	1985-1994	67-144	2000-2007	2
Syria	Br	>20	1985-1994			
Tunisia	Br	100-150	1985-1994			
Turkey	Br	150-250	1985-1994	150-200	2001	1
Algeria	W	350-400	1985-1994	650	2007	2
Armenia	W	-		-		3
Azerbaijan	W	-	1985-1994	400-500 (staging up to 10,000)	1996-2002	3
Egypt	W	10-100	1985-1994			
Iran	W	25,000-30,000	1985-1994	3,700	1995	4
Iraq	W	>200	1985-1994			
Israel	W	80-200	1985-1994	33	2007	
Italy	W	0		0-4	2000-2006	2
Morocco	W	2,000-3,000	1985-1994	27-1,633	1996-2000	2
Russian Federation	W	-	1985-1994			
Spain	W	50-500	1985-1994			
Syria	W	?	1985-1994			
Tunisia	W	200	1985-1994	4,950	1999	4
Turkey	W	5-20	1985-1994	0-20	1991-2001	1

Sources: 1: BirdLife International (2004), 2: replies to questionnaire, 3: Draft Southern Caucasus action plan for threatened waterbirds, 4: BirdLife International datazone (accessed October 2007)

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)⁶

Populations	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
W Mediterranean/W Med & West Africa	3,000	3,000-5,000	3,000-5,000
Eastern Mediterranean	1,000	1,000	1,000
South-western Asia	5,000-15,000	5,000-15,000	5,000-15,000

Evaluation: The species' range has expanded. This contributes to the mid-term target, but the numbers involved are very limited. The experts agree on reporting a general reduction in the population which is also very difficult to monitor regularly due to the strong fluctuation linked to water availability. The level of knowledge regarding the species distribution and population size, at least in the western and central part of the range has significantly increased. Nevertheless the action plan targets do not seem to have been met.

Protection Status

The species is protected in all the EU countries, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Israel, Morocco, Russia, Tunisia and Turkey.

Azerbaijan, Iran, Russian Federation and Turkey have not yet signed AEWA.

National and regional species action plans:

Italy: A national action plan has been developed and distributed, but implementation is still limited.

Spain: No national strategy or recovery plan is approved despite the legal obligations in that country. Regional conservation plans for the species have been compiled for three regions [Comunidad Valenciana (1992), Andalucía (1999) and Murcia (1999)]. The Andalusian plan is being implemented since 2001. The Spanish Marbled Teal Working Group has met annually since 1994 coordinated by the Ministry of Environment, with the attendance of the regional governments, Ministry of Environment and experts.

Site protection

Designation: 110 IBAs are identified for the Marbled Teal; 49 of them are protected to a certain extent.

Italy: In the past few years the species occurs in Sicily at a number of IBAs which have all been declared SPAs, of which half are also Nature Reserves.

Israel: All IBAs selected for the species are partially protected.

Management plans: Fourteen (14) of the 49 protected IBAs have management plans.

Algeria: The management plan for the Nature Reserve Lac de Réghaïa (former breeding site of the species) has been developed.

Spain: All the plans address the species requirements and are partially implemented.

Turkey: The majority of the key sites have management plans but they are not effectively implemented. Only the Göksu Delta has specific management for the species, but its implementation is far from complete.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation:

Italy: Some farming restrictions have been introduced at the breeding sites, but not fully implemented. Restrictions have been introduced in the natural reserve "Preola Lake and Gorghi

⁶ AEWA does not cover the south Asian population of the species.

Tondi” (IBA, SPA), to avoid disturbance but are not yet completely enforced by the staff of the protected area and rangers.

Morocco: Within the framework of the national strategy for the conservation of biodiversity, conservation actions (habitat restoration and creation) has been carried out in several key sites for the species (parc d’Ifrane, parc de Souss-Massa, Marais de Larache) and two new protected areas were established (Ifrane and Souss-Massa).

Spain: The “Spanish Strategic Plan for the Conservation and Rational Use of Wetlands” incorporates a general objective regarding protection and integrated wetland management. This includes guidelines for different fields that aim to guarantee legal mechanisms to facilitate the wise use and conservation of wetlands.

In 2002, Andalucía initiated a conservation plan for wetlands in the region “Plan Andaluz de Humedales” which will result in a legally binding plan to avoid the deterioration of Andalusian wetlands. This plan has secured an investment of 27 million Euros.

Despite all the above, many important wetlands used by the species suffer from chronic deterioration (contamination, overexploitation of ground water, sedimentation, water level fluctuation, overgrazing in surroundings, arable cultivation without buffer zones, etc.).

Habitat restoration:

To create new breeding and wintering sites:

Italy: In autumn 2007 INFS and the Italian Ministry of Environment started a project for the restoration of 200 ha of freshwater marshes in the nature reserve “Oasi del Simeto” (IBA, SPA, Eastern Sicily) and 100 ha in the nature reserve “Biviere di Gela” (IBA, SPA, Southern Sicily).

Spain: At the El Hondo SPA, Valencian Community, a total of 46 ha of wetlands have been acquired and are being restored. At the Marjal del Moro SPA, an area of 4.8 hectares (formerly dumping areas and arable land) was recovered to inland salt marshes habitats. At three other Andalusian wetlands, Veta la Palma (Parque Nat. Doñana), Hydrological restoration at the Paraje Nat. Brazo del Este (Sevilla) and Codo de la Esparraguera (Trebujena, Cádiz), projects are being carried out, targeted at the species. Carp has been removed from some Spanish wetlands where they were introduced in the past; this will improve the habitat for the species.

Prevent hunting and lead poisoning:

Israel: Hunting has been prohibited in the whole Judean foothill IBA which is only partially protected. Lead use will be prohibited as per autumn 2008.

Italy: Hunting is not allowed in protected areas (but it is allowed in most SPAs).

However, effective wardening and other methods to reduce the hunting of Marbled Teals are not fully implemented. In Italy lead shots will be banned from all wetland SPAs from October 2008.

Spain: Hunting has been banned at important sites (e.g. 65% of El Hondo SPA since 1997), but it still is practiced at other sites that regularly hold the species in Andalusia (Marismas del Guadalquivir surrounding Doñana National Park) and the Valencian Community (Salinas de Santa Pola SPA and partially in El Hondo SPA).

In Spain the use of lead shots is banned at Ramsar sites and all other legally protected wetlands. In practice this has led to a ban of lead shot from all key sites.

Reducing other mortality factors:

In Morocco, the surveillance at wetlands has been improved.

Spain: In 1998, the concrete slopes of an irrigation channel, and adjacent road, were modified at El Hondo SPA, Valencian Community, to prevent nestling casualties.

Rules regulating fishing gear (net width of tunnel fishing traps) and fishing period were established at the Marismas del Guadalquivir, Andalusia, in 1997, so that fishing activity does not affect teal reproduction. Periodic surveys are conducted to enforce regulations. Effectiveness varies by site.

Monitoring and research: Midwinter counts are the most widespread tool for monitoring the species in most of the countries. In Spain coordinated counts are carried out periodically at all known and possible breeding sites. In Italy, the monitoring of the breeding population involves volunteers of an Italian birdwatching club.

The feeding ecology and habitat selection are fairly well documented in particular in the western Mediterranean (Spain and Morocco). Many threats have been identified and assessed; however, some limiting factors remain to be understood (e.g. competition with other aquatic birds).

Awareness raising and education:

Spain: Environmental campaigns has been carried out within the framework of LIFE projects, including production and distribution of leaflets, posters, a comic book among the children and adult local population living around the El Hondo SPA and Salinas de Santa Pola SPA (Valencian Community).

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Morocco and Turkey: Posters about the species have been produced and distributed.

Conclusions

There has been some progress in the implementation of the Action Plan in particular in Spain; the species has colonized new areas (Italy and Canaries) however the status of the species has not improved. Its strong dependence on shallow wetlands puts the species, despite its adaptation to variation in space and time of the available habitat, particularly at risk by climate change.

A revised Action Plan should:

- Improve the involvement of governments and non governmental organizations in North Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.
- Improve cooperation across the Mediterranean
- Promote better management of the most threatened wetlands
- Promote restoration of degraded and transformed natural wetlands.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Country	Protection status		Management Plan			none	unknown		Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	complete	Management Plan	yes	no	?		no	?		
Afghanistan							3		3	
Algeria	1					3			4	
Armenia						1			1	Regional Waterbird AP
Azerbaijan	1		1			4			6	Regional Waterbird AP
Georgia			1						1	Regional Waterbird AP
Iran, Islamic Republic of	1	5		7		9			22	
Iraq						11			11	
Israel			2	2		1			5	
Italy	1		1	1					3	NSAP
Jordan								1	1	
Mali						1			1	
Morocco	5		1	1		9			16	
Spain	5	2	4	1		1			13	3 Sub National SAPs, National WG
Syria						4			4	
Tunisia	1	2	1			17			21	
Turkey		5		2		1			8	Regional Waterbird AP
Turkmenistan								3	3	
Uzbekistan								5	5	

Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*

SSAP published 2006
 SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 121 (2006)
 AWEA Resolution 3.12 (2005)
 EU

Status

Targets:

2020: Ferruginous Duck global population and global range stable

2050: Ferruginous Duck removed from the IUCN red list

The short term essential activities include:

- Development of national SAP and the establishment of national WGs.
- Protection of sites as SPA (EU) or Ramsar sites (non EU)
- Development of guideline for proper fishpond management

Status:

All three populations of the species are declining although the information from the Asian population is still inconclusive. Overall targets are set for 15 years after the preparation of the action plan. There is very little development on the three short term priority actions, yet.

Up-to-date information on the population size of the Ferruginous Duck.

Only available updated information are given

Country	Population in SSAP		Current population	
	Breeding (p: pairs) Non breeding (i: individuals)	Year	Breeding (p: pairs) Non breeding (i: individuals)	Year
Algeria	<2,000 i	2002	913 i	2007
Croatia	1,000-3,000 p 10,000 i (passage)	2004	1,000-3,000 p 2,600-5,500 i	2004-2007
Hungary	550-1,000 p	1997-2002	600-900 p	2004
Italy	70-100 p 10-400 i	2003 1983-2002	60-110 p 304 i	2002-2003 2004
Israel	150-300 i	2002	378 i 215 i (average)	2007 1997-2007
Morocco	?		5-12p	2005
Slovenia	0-10p	1999-2000	1-5p	2000

Changes in the population estimates as per the AWEA Conservation Status Reports ⁷

Population	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
W Mediterranean/North & West Africa	2,000-3,000	2,000-3,000	2,400-2,600
E Europe/E Mediterranean & Sahelian Africa	10,000-50,000	40,000-65,000	36,000-54,000
Western Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa	5,000	25,000-100,000	25,000-100,000

Evaluation:

As the deadlines are still quite a few years away the overall targets have not been reached yet. Few new national action plans are under development. The surveys ongoing in Central Asia for the identification of IBAs may provide a better picture about the population size and trend. In the European Union the new Fishery Fund potentially provides an important tool to address the loss of habitat for the species.

⁷ The population of South, East & SE Asia is not covered by AWEA

Protection Status

The species is fully protected in the EU (therefore also in Cyprus and Latvia countries for which information were not available at the time of the action plan). Problems with visiting hunters are still reported for Hungary and the Balkan Peninsula. Other countries in which the species is protected and for which there was no information in the SSAP are Algeria, Israel and Morocco. In Hungary in order to reduce confusion risks with juvenile Ferruginous Ducks, the hunting season for Common Pochard (*A. farina*) starts on October 1st.

National and regional species action plans

A National Action Plan has been produced in Italy. In Slovenia the Action Plan is part of the Operational Management Programme for Natura 2000 (prepared by the Ministry of Environment). A national plan is under development in Hungary and Mali.

Site protection

Designation: In the BirdLife database there are 240 IBAs identified for the Ferruginous Duck. In 122 of these sites the species is recorded as breeding or resident, 55% of these sites are protected, while 40% of the non breeding sites are protected. Within the European Union 80% of the IBAs are somewhat protected. In Morocco the Bas Loukkos, one of the most important breeding sites of the species in the country has been declared a Ramsar site. In Croatia all carp fishponds, the most important habitat for the species, are potential NATURA 2000 sites.

Management plans: Overall less than 30% of the protected sites have management plans. In Algeria the management plan for the Natural Reserve Lac du Réghaïa has been developed.

Site management:

Morocco: At Bas Loukkos a project on sustainable development of the lake has addressed the grazing management problems affecting the site.

Italy: Projects for the restoration of 200 ha of suitable habitat (freshwater marshes) in the nature reserve “Oasi del Simeto” (IBA SPA, Eastern Sicily) and 100 ha in the nature reserve “Biviere di Gela” (IBA, SPA, Southern Sicily) has started in late 2007.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation:

In Hungary habitat management (reed cutting) has been performed on over 900 ha providing habitat for about 40 pairs and other habitat management practices occur on over 15,000 ha.

In the last 10 years in Italy, through the EU agro-environmental schemes, over 2,200 ha of wetlands have been successfully created which today represent one of the most important areas in the country for the species.

In Lithuania habitat recommendations for the species have been prepared for Natura 2000 sites.

Research and Monitoring:

In Croatia a study on the distribution in the lowlands, covering carp fishponds which are the main breeding habitats, was started in 2007 and will be completed in 2008.

Awareness raising:

In Croatia informational leaflets about the protection status of the species have been distributed to hunter associations. The customs authorities at the borders have been reminded about the prohibition of exporting the birds.

Conclusions

In the two years since the publication of the Action Plan, only limited actions seem to have been taken to implement it beyond ongoing activities described in the document. Hungary and Mali are developing their National Action Plans. All responding countries are reporting conservation actions at several sites. The habitat (re)creation in Italy offers a good example on how EU funding can be effectively directed for the benefit of this (and other) species; the new Fishery Fund offers the opportunity to improve management of (semi-natural) wetlands.

International cooperation is crucial for a species with such a wide range and the WG needs to be put in the position to take a leading role in this task.

The following are the most urgent actions:

- To develop ‘Fishponds best practice guidelines’, focusing on habitat creation and management in cooperation with land owners and practitioners;
- To improve knowledge of distribution, status and trend of the species in Asia;
- To improve protection and management of key sites.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Country	Protection status			Management Plan			complete			partial			none			unknown		Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	yes	no	?	no	?					
Afghanistan															1		1		
Algeria		4											2				6		
Armenia		1											2				3		
Austria		2															2		
Azerbaijan		2			1								4				7		
Belarus		1											1				2		
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1			1												2		
Bulgaria	1			2	6								7				16	NSAP	
Chad		1															1		
Croatia					6								6		1		13		
Egypt	1	1		2	1												5		
Ethiopia													4				4		
Georgia					1												1		
Greece	2	7		2	2					1							14		
Hungary	2	1		3	5												11	NSAP under development	
Iran, Islamic Republic of	3	7		1	3					3	5						22		
Iraq													5				5		
Israel				2									1				3		
Italy	3	2		7	7								1				20	NSAP	
Kazakhstan	1		1							2	1	3					9		
Lebanon															1		1		
Mali		1											4				5	NSAP under development	
Mauritania													2				2		
Montenegro					1												1		
Nigeria		1															1		
Oman													4				4		
Poland		4								1							5	NSAP under development	
Portugal													2				2		
Romania	2				5								4				11		
Russia				2	1								8				11		
Saudi Arabia					2					1	2						5		
Senegal		1															1		
Serbia				3	1					1	1						6		
Slovenia																	-	NSAP	
Syria													3				3		
Tunisia	1												4				5		
Turkey		6			5								9		2		22		
Turkmenistan																9	9		
Ukraine				1	1								4				6		
Uzbekistan																15	15		
Yemen													2				2		

Corncrake *Crex crex*

SSAP published	2006	
SSAP endorsed by	Bern Convention	Recommendation 121 (2006)
	AEWA	Resolution 3.12 (2005)
	EU	

Status

Targets: (by 2015)

To maintain current population level of the species throughout its breeding range;

To increase population by 20% in those parts of the breeding range where large declines were reported in the second half of the 20th century (i.e. Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom).

The essential (short term/ongoing) activities include:

- For countries, which experienced long-term declines and which generally support rather small populations (AT, BE, CH, DE, DK, FI, FR, , GR, HU, IE, IT, LI, LU, NL, NO, SE, SI and UK⁸)
 - Provide farmers with information on corncrake-friendly mowing and habitat management techniques (e.g. provision of early cover, where necessary) in key Corncrake areas.
 - Provide incentive schemes to encourage farmers and nature conservation agencies to delay mowing dates until 1 August or later and apply corncrake-friendly mowing and harvesting techniques
- For countries supporting large populations (BY, KZ, RU and UA⁹), and other countries within the breeding range where breeding population is small or where status is less known (AL, AM, AZ, BA, CN, GE, KG, MK, MD, MN, CS and TJ¹⁰).
 - Prevent abandonment of areas important for the Corncrake through providing aid to sustainable rural development which meets the species' requirements.

Status: Since the 1990s the species' population has undergone a remarkable population recovery in Europe (with some exceptions) although is not always clear how much is directly linked to conservation activities. The recovery in Scotland is certainly linked to it, while the efforts in Ireland have stabilized the population but no recovery registered yet; in France despite some efforts the population is still declining. Information from Russia seems to indicate that the population is stable. The high mobility of the species within the same breeding season is probably linked to amount of rain and agricultural practices. Such mobility makes it quite difficult to understand on a yearly basis the population trends and differentiate trends between countries. No new population estimate is available since the publication of the SSAP.

⁸ AT Austria, BE Belgium, CH Switzerland, DK Denmark, FI Finland, FR France, DE Germany, GR Greece, HU Hungary, IE Ireland, IT Italy, LI Liechtenstein, LU Luxembourg, NL Netherlands, NO Norway, SI Slovenia, SE Sweden and UK United Kingdom.

⁹ BY Belarus, KZ Kazakhstan, RU Russian Federation and UA Ukraine

¹⁰ AL Albania, AM Armenia, AZ Azerbaijan, BA Bosnia & Herzegovina, CN China, GE Georgia, KG Kyrgyzstan, MK Macedonia, MD Moldova, MN Mongolia, CS Serbia & Montenegro (now separate countries) and TJ Tajikistan

Up-to-date information on the size of some national populations of the Corncrake.
Only available updated information is given. Figures in breeding population ('pairs')

Country	Breeding pairs in SSAP	year	Population pair	Year
Croatia	800-1,200	2004	500-1100	2004-2007
Czech republic	1,500-1,700	2000	1,500-1,700	2000-2005
Estonia	15,000-25,000	1998	18,000-25,000	2003
France	551-599	2002	500-600	2002-2006
Ireland	139-157	1998-2002	149	2007
Latvia	26,000-38,000	1995-2003	48,000-58,000	2004
Luxembourg	0-5	2000-2002	2-8	2007
Norway	20-40	1995-2003	83	2005
Slovenia	150-200	1992-1999	341-400	2004
Sweden	150-200	1999-2000	750-800	2005
Switzerland	10-50	1998-2002	7-11	2007
United Kingdom	589	2000-2001	1268	2007

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports
(figures in individuals)

Europe & West Asia/Sub-Saharan Africa	100,000–1,000,000 (CSR, 1999)	3.4-6.0 million (CSR 2, 2002)	>1,000,000 (CSR 3, 2007)
---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Evaluation:

The overall targets have not been reached yet since the deadline is still several years away. According to local experts the impact of the economic development in the Russian Federation on the availability of habitat for the species seems to guarantee a stable population for the next decade in this country. No major changes in the ongoing activities registered since the publication of the SSAP. The changes linked to the new 2007-2013 EU budget and Rural Development Plans could not be assessed yet. The Baltic countries, Poland and Croatia have started agro-environmental schemes which could be beneficial for the species but an effective monitoring system for the schemes is not in place in all countries. The Corncrake Conservation Team met recently and will work to improve management recommendation and promote the SSAP implementation. Only limited progress has been made with the actions targeting the countries with large populations.

Protection Status

The species is protected in Morocco and will be protected with the new law in Congo Brazzaville. No further changes since the publication of the SSAP. The species is protected in most European countries where the species is known to breed; it is still not protected in Ukraine and Russia and its protection status is unknown for the Central Asian countries.

National and regional species action plans

Since the publication of the SSAP the following developments have occurred: Hungary, France and Sweden have developed official national action plans for the species; in Slovenia the plan has been developed by DOPPS (BirdLife in Slovenia) and the relevant parts are included in the Operational Programme – management programme for Natura 2000 (prepared by the Ministry of Environment and approved by the government). In Luxembourg the action plan is under development. Several countries with very important breeding populations still lack such an important guiding document.

Site protection

Site designation:

The importance of protected areas as a tool for the conservation of the species decreases with the increase of the size of the national population. In countries with large populations the percentage is negligible. In countries where the population is small the protected areas play an important role. 371 IBAs have been identified so far for the presence of breeding Corncrakes covering 63,000 calling males. Only 30 IBAs are selected for non-breeding/passage birds. 227 (60%) of the IBAs have some level of protection, most of them within the EU. Latest developments include: In Croatia all sites hosting habitat suitable for the species are included in the proposal of the National Ecological Network and will be proposed as potential NATURA 2000 sites.

In Italy the SPA 'Alpi Carniche' has been enlarged in 2007 to include Corncrake habitat.

Percentage of national corncrake populations have changed (when compared with the data in the SSAP) as follows: Estonia 20%, Norway 5-10%; Slovenia 78-85% and Netherlands 48%.

Management plans:

Only 24% of the IBAs have a management plan.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Provision of incentive schemes to encourage corncrake-friendly agricultural practices:

Beyond what is reported as ongoing in the SSAP, the following activities are being implemented: Croatia: Promotion of Corncrake-friendly mowing system through contacts with local community in Turopolje region.

Czech Republic: Agro-environmental programme for Corncrake – payment to farmers for delayed mowing (after 15th August) on defined breeding sites effectively implemented on ca. 6,000 ha.

Estonia: Grazing of the natural meadows is supported by national semi-natural communities' management support what started nationwide in 2001. Farmers get support for grazing/mowing of all types of natural grasslands.

Hungary: 38,000 ha are maintained as grassland through managed grazing; friendly farming practices implemented on 3,500 ha; some 400 birds are benefiting from the two management schemes.

Luxembourg: Mowing delayed by contract between the regional biological stations and farmers on 1,029 ha of wet meadows with calling birds. Extensive grazing carried out as a pilot project on 151 ha.

Slovenia: Proper farming practices are being promoted by agro-environmental schemes, supporting the management of grazing as well as delayed mowing, on a total of 1,750 ha. (data 2006). Measure of proper mowing was financed on 292 ha from a LIFE III Nature project.

Switzerland: One-year contracts are developed with the farmers for delayed mowing and corncrake friendly mowing of 1-1.5 ha around each calling bird.

Ireland: Governmental scheme promotes delayed mowing on ca. 700 ha affecting ca. 150 birds.

United Kingdom: Proper farming practices (delayed mowing, and from the centre out) are implemented through agro-environmental scheme, SPA management measures and the 'Corncrake Initiative'.

Monitoring takes place every year in the core areas. A national Corncrake Census takes place every 6 years.

Poland: Delayed mowing has been supported on over 100,000 ha in the period 2004-2006, but the mowing is delayed only to early July and the benefit for Corncrake has been negligible. As per 2008 the new agro-environmental scheme will benefit from the experience gained abroad and the mowing will be delayed to a later date allowing more pairs to successfully raise their chicks.

Despite the numbers of countries in which measures are taken not all measures are effective or economically attractive, making their impact limited or even absent. In some cases the delayed date

is still too early for saving the broods or due to the lack of control farmers do not comply with the requirement (i.e. mowing from centre out). France has also reported that the incentives are not high enough to encourage farmers to carry out the appropriate habitat management measures.

In other countries (e.g. Estonia, Lithuania) the agro-environmental schemes often support grassland management, but the measures are usually not specifically targeted at Corncrake

It is worrying that countries with large populations of Corncrake have paid little attention to integrating the species requirements into their respective agricultural policies.

Restoration of habitat:

As indicated in the SSAP it is ongoing in few countries (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, and United Kingdom). In Denmark the restoration work along two river valleys covered more than 3,000 ha. Suitable habitat is developing, and in one area the species has started to occur/breed. This project has been developed and implemented by the local farmers' communities and the project is called "Operation Corncrake".

Activities have also been carried out in other countries:

Estonia: The habitat recreation is undertaken under national scheme to restore semi-natural communities and started nationwide in 2001. Under this scheme the suitable habitats on flooded meadows are restored (e.g. bush thickets removed and open grassland created).

Hungary: 16,500 ha of habitat have been restored and 230 ha created.

Lithuania: Local actions were taken by various NGO (including Lithuanian Ornithological Society and Lithuanian Fund for Nature) to restore suitable habitats for Corncrake during the implementation of various small scale local projects.

Slovenia: Habitat restoration was undertaken during two LIFE III Nature projects by DOPPS (BirdLife in Slovenia) and by the Institute for Nature Conservation at several SPAs. The level of effectiveness has not yet been evaluated.

Raising awareness:

Awareness raising activities, targeted at the farmers and local communities and nature wardens/rangers are always implemented where support schemes are available, in particular in those countries/areas where the measures are reactive (support offered when the calling birds are present).

The extent to which the general public is informed about Corncrake conservation seems to differ between countries depending on the attitude of national conservation organisations. In several countries, such as Austria, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands and the UK the species has attracted the attention and support of decision makers.

Most recently the following activities have been implemented (not reported in the SSAP):

Farming communities received awareness raising material and information about the Corncrake-friendly practices in Croatia, Czech Republic and Italy. Information was spread by leaflets, face-to-face meeting and articles in magazines and newspapers.

In Poland the advocacy work concentrated on the civil servants developing the Rural Development Plans in order to include support for Corncrake friendly farming practices.

Research and Monitoring:

During the implementation of the previous SSAP (1996) the knowledge about the species, its distribution and population size has increased significantly, although the overall population estimate range is still wide because of the great annual fluctuations and the lack of accurate surveys in Central Asia and in several European countries.

In the European part of the Russian Federation a comprehensive monitoring scheme started in 2002. It covered 29 sites in the first three years, it is now continuing on a smaller scale. It is providing a

good understanding of the population size and trend. The species has been observed to thrive in the 'semi-abandoned' farmland where fields are not mowed every year.

Regular monitoring schemes need to be carried out in particular in those European countries hosting important populations (i.e. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland).

In Estonia the species population is monitored in the framework of the Common Bird Monitoring Programme on sample areas.

In Latvia the long-term population and distribution trends have been assessed through the national atlas; the species has undergone a long term decline linked with the decline of grassland and meadows.

In Poland monitoring is carried out in some sites in central Poland and in the framework of the IBA monitoring.

In Italy annual monitoring takes place since 2002 in the most important Corncrake areas. There are plans for using the geo-referenced data to develop and monitor management recommendations under the new Rural Development Plan of the region hosting the bulk of the national population (Friuli-Venezia Giulia Region).

No improvement has taken place yet in the monitoring of the effects of the conservation measures beyond what is reported as ongoing in the SSAP.

Ringling studies carried out in Czech Republic and Latvia have confirmed the long term decline of the species in Europe, the high mobility of males during the breeding season and between years as well as the short life span of the species.

A detailed analysis of all available Corncrake data in Africa has shown that passage and wintering grounds seem to be concentrated in South East Africa (Zambia, Malawi, Botswana, South Africa and Mozambique); most of the data are in grassland-type habitat with varying levels of humidity. Following the development of predictive model of the species presence searches can now be concentrated in certain sites. Grasslands in Africa are facing imminent threats from agriculture and other development and the future of the species may be in serious risk.

In Western Europe (in particular in the Netherlands and Germany) the species is successfully breeding in autumn-sown cereal since it provides sufficient cover and it is harvested in August giving the species the opportunity to raise the chicks. Alfalfa fields represent, on the contrary, an 'ecological trap' since they attract high density of calling males because of the good cover they offer, but the early mowing causes failure to all nests.

The monitoring schemes and improved population estimates following synchronized censuses have revealed fluctuation in several countries. The fluctuations are not synchronous they seem to identify two groups of countries (Western European and Baltic countries. The Scottish population is steadily increasing and not fluctuating and appears to be separated to the other populations which follow different trends).

Working Group

The BirdLife Corncrake Conservation Team meets regularly since 1989. It gathers the researchers involved in scientific work regarding the species and promotes the implementation of the SSAP by developing monitoring protocols, sharing results & good practices through meetings (the last was held in The Netherlands in November 2007) and through a website (www.corncarke.net). Plans for 2008 include a detailed census of all ongoing conservation schemes in order to promote those that prove to be the most cost/effective.

Conclusions

There has been some progress in the implementation of the Action Plan since its publication, especially in countries within the EU or in the accession process (Croatia), but further work is needed in order to meet the targets. The countries with large populations, i.e. Ukraine, Russian Federation, and Belarus do not consider the species as threatened and no conservation activities have been implemented although a better understanding of the populations' status and distribution has been achieved. In Central Asia the situation of the species is still largely unclear.

The most important measures for the conservation of the species are:

- Within the EU:
 - To introduce incentives for appropriate land management targeted more specifically at the conservation of the species, covering a high percentage of its range, especially in North-eastern part of the EU (Baltic and the Central Eastern European Countries);
 - Cross-compliance management rules should take into account the requirements of the species (e.g. not to cut the vegetation in an area before the end of the breeding season).
- In the breeding range outside the EU:
 - Establish a standardized annual monitoring programme and national surveys once every five years
 - Prevent abandonment of areas important for the Corncrake through providing aid to sustainable rural development which meets the species' requirements.
- In the passage/wintering range
 - Re-assess distribution and threats of the species.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Country	Protection status		complete			partial			none		unknown			Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	yes	no	?	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	?			
Austria		4		6			2						12		
Belarus	2	3	1	1			2				2		11		
Belgium		4					1						5	Sub National WG	
Bosnia and Herzegovina				1									1		
Botswana				1									1		
Bulgaria			1	2			21						24	NSAP	
Croatia				1									1		
Czech Republic	3	2									4		9		
Denmark			1										1	WG	
Egypt		1		2									3		
Estonia			3	1	1		7						12		
Finland		1		2					1				4		
France		5		14			1						20	NSAP & WG	
Georgia	1		1	1			8						11		
Hungary				3					1				4	NSAP	
Ireland		3		1			3						7	WG. NSAP under development	
Italy		1		1			3			1			6	NSAP (unpublished) & WG	
Kazakhstan			1										1		
Kenya		1	1										2		
Latvia	4	5	3	3							5		20	NSAP & WG	
Liechtenstein	1												1		
Lithuania	1	1	1	4			1						8		
Luxembourg		2											2	NSAP under development	
Netherlands	1		2	1			1	1					6	NSAP & WG	
Norway				1									1	NSAP & WG	
Poland	3	8		12		1	4						28		
Romania	1			2									3		
Russia	4	12	3	28			42			5			94		
Serbia			2				1						3		
Slovakia	3	2	7	6			1						19	NSAP & WG	
Slovenia			1	1		1	3						6	NSAP & WG	
South Africa	6	2					2						10		
Sweden										2			2	NSAP	
Switzerland														NSAP & WG	
Tanzania		1											1		
Ukraine	2		1				43			1			47		
United Kingdom		2		4						1			7	NSAP & WG	
Uzbekistan											1		1		
Zambia		5		1			1						7		

Black-winged Pratincole *Glareola nordmanni*

SSAP published 2004
 SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 103 (2003)
 AEW A Resolution 2.13 (2002)

Status

Targets:

In the short-term (3 years)

1. To define the main factors affecting the population of the Black-winged Pratincole in the breeding, staging and wintering areas and to undertake actions to reduce their negative impact.
2. To optimise relationships between man and birds in agricultural habitats used by the Black-winged Pratincole.
3. To ensure that all appropriate actions defined in this Action Plan are undertaken in order to stop further decline of the Black-winged Pratincole throughout its breeding range.

In the long-term (20 years)

1. To protect the Black-winged Pratincole from extinction.
2. To ensure stability of the Black-winged Pratincole population within its breeding and wintering range.

Status: Results of a number of surveys in Kazakhstan and Russian Federation, and recent observations in South Africa (97,500 birds in a single flock) indicate that the population estimates presented in the SSAP (10,000-15,000 pairs) need to be significantly changed.

Despite the uncertainty about the population size, the global threat status of the species has changed in 2006 from 'Data Deficient' to 'Near Threatened' due to evidence of decline in the breeding grounds as well as in the wintering areas (Southern Africa).

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEW A Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

SE Europe & W Asia/Southern Africa	100,000-1,000,000 (CSR, 1999)	29,000-45,000 (CSR 2, 2002)	29,000-45,000 (CSR 3, 2007)
------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

Evaluation: The knowledge about the species distribution, population size and ecology has improved significantly over the last three years. The very ambitious short term targets have not been met yet; while the implementation level of the SSAP is good in the breeding areas, more work is needed outside the breeding range.

Protection Status

No specific work has been carried out to improve the protection status of the species. Persecution and over exploitation do not seem to be a threat to the species.

Site protection

Designation and management: The BirdLife IBA programme in Central Asia is collecting up-to-date information which will enable a better assessment of the conservation status of the sites where the species breeds. The information gathered during the special surveys will feed into the IBA database. Of the 36 IBAs identified for the presence of the species outside the breeding period, 25 (70%) have some level of protection and only two have management plans.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Research and Monitoring: Surveys have been carried out in 2006 and 2007 in Russian Federation and Kazakhstan. In 2006 in central Kazakhstan over 35 colonies were located in an area of 31,500 km² and a total of 1,500 pairs were estimated. The area represents 1% of the species' known breeding range. Breeding success was quite good (1.26 chick/pair). In 2007 surveys have been carried out in the Pavlodar oblast (region) (NE Kazakhstan) where the population for the whole oblast was estimated between 1,500 and 3,000 pairs and breeding success has been much lower than what was registered the year before. Habitat selection, impact of land use and grazing is being studied. Preliminary results seem to indicate that the location of the colonies is somehow linked to the presence of low vegetation, water bodies and of grazing animals. Recently the species seems to have started breeding also in fallow fields.

Surveys in southern Russia (Stavropol region) confirmed a steep decline at the end of the XX century (estimated in 2001 at 100-200 pairs) and a recovery in the following years bringing the population in the region to 1,800 pairs. In the same region a flock of ca. 20,000 birds was observed at the Chagray water reservoir on September 20th, 2006.

During the IWC counts on 15 January 2006 a flock of 97,500 Black-winged Pratincole were counted at the Vaal Dam (South Africa).

Working group: A Threatened Steppe-breeding Waders Working Group (TSBWWG) has been established by the AEWA Technical Committee to co-ordinate the implementation of the Sociable Lapwing and Black-winged Pratincole Single Species Action Plans. In this working group all Range States of both species and interested groups should be represented. The coordinator of TSBWWG is located in Kazakhstan (the hosting organization is Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Kazakhstan) – the main breeding country of both species.

Awareness raising: The Working Group has established a website (www.tsbwwg.org) and articles have been published in international magazines about the work carried out so far.

Conclusions

The basic research needed to properly assess the conservation status of the species and its threats has successfully started with the support of AEWA Secretariat. The Working Group is in place and has demonstrated the capacity to coordinate activities, collate information and raise awareness about the species.

The SSAP implementation is proceeding well but further work is needed and in particular the following:

- The Working Group needs to include members from more countries in order to cover the wide range of the species and promote research and conservation actions;
- Further work is needed to understand the ecology of the species and the threats to the species at the breeding areas;
- Studies on the migration path and strategy should be undertaken, possibly with the use of satellite tags and colour rings;
- The SSAP will soon need to be re-assessed based on the better knowledge acquired during the first years of intense research.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status Management Plan	complete			partial		none		unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	no	?	no		
Country										
Angola		1							1	
Armenia						1			1	
Botswana					3	1			4	
Ethiopia						1			1	
Iraq						2			2	
Israel				2	3				5	
Kazakhstan	2		1				2		5	
Namibia		3				1			4	
Romania	1								1	
Russia		1		1	5	16			23	
Saudi Arabia						1			1	
South Africa		2				2			4	
Syria						1			1	
Tanzania		1			1				2	
Turkey						1		1	2	
Uganda		2			1				3	
Ukraine	1								1	
Zambia		2							2	

Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius*

SSAP published 2004

SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 103 (2003)
 AEWA Resolution 2.13 (2002)

Status

Targets:

In the short-term (3 years)

1. To define main factors affecting the population of the Sociable Lapwing in the areas of breeding, staging and wintering, and to undertake actions to reduce negative impact of the key negative factors.
2. To organize coordinated targeted research to clarify general population characteristics such as breeding success, mortality rates and causes of mortality, current distribution, seasonal changes in habitat requirements, migratory links / distribution of birds from certain breeding areas to particular migration corridors and wintering grounds.
3. To ensure that all appropriate actions defined in this Action Plan are undertaken in order to stop further decline of the Sociable Lapwing throughout its range.

In the long-term (20 years)

1. To reverse the population trend of the Sociable Lapwing, with the species occurring with stable or increasing numbers within the “traditional” breeding and wintering ranges of the mid 20th century.

Status: No new population estimates for the species have been produced so far, but the extensive fieldwork in Kazakhstan and southern Russia carried out since 2004 and the discovery of large flocks between Syria and Turkey as well as the colour ringing scheme indicate the population is currently larger than what was estimated in the SSAP (600-1,800 individuals).

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Populations	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
SE Europe & Western Asia/NE Africa	< 10,000	400-1,200	400-1,200
Central Asian Republics/NW India	<1,000	200-600	200-600

Evaluation: The knowledge about the species distribution, population size and ecology has improved significantly over the last three years. The very ambitious short term targets have not been met yet, but the implementation level so far of the SSAP is good in the breeding areas and in the newly discovered wintering grounds in the Middle East, while more work is needed in the historical wintering Areas (India, East Africa).

Protection Status

No specific work has been carried out to improve the protection status of the species. Actions have been taken in Syria to protect a large wintering flock from hunting.

Site protection

Designation and management: The BirdLife IBA programme in Central Asia is collecting up-to-date information which will allow a better assessment of the conservation status of the sites where the species breeds. The information gathered during the surveys targeted at the species will feed

into the IBA database. The satellite tagging programme started in 2007 will also provide information on the location of the wintering sites. Only 11 IBAs selected for the presence of the species are currently in the BirdLife database. All three IBAs where the species is registered as breeder Birsuat (Russian Federation), Naurzum State Nature Reserve and Zhusandala (Kazakhstan) are protected.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Research and Monitoring: Since 2004 an international team has been undertaking detailed research work in the Korgazhyn region of central Kazakhstan. Data have been collected on breeding distribution, nest survival, causes of nest loss, and chick survival. Breeding colonies appear to be concentrated around human settlements where short vegetation is present due to the presence of livestock grazing. The main causes of nest loss are predation and trampling by livestock; their relative importance seems to change in time. Several hundred birds have been colour ringed but very few have been re-sighted outside the breeding grounds indicating that the population is certainly bigger than the estimate given in the SSAP. Surveys have been carried out in Syria and Turkey, where over 2,800 birds have been counted along the border between the two countries in February 2007. In India only few tens were observed during targeted searches. Three birds have been satellite tagged and at least one bird has successfully migrated to Sudan. Checking the presence of one of the satellite tagged birds the largest flock on record (> 3,000 birds) was observed in Turkey near the border with Syria in October 2007.

Working group: A Threatened Steppe-breeding Waders Working Group (TSBWWG) has been established by the AEWA Technical Committee to co-ordinate the implementation of the Sociable Lapwing and Black-winged Pratincole Single Species Action Plans. In this working group all Range States of both species and interested groups should be represented. The coordinator of TSBWWG is located in Kazakhstan (the hosting organization is Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Kazakhstan) – the main breeding country of both species.

Awareness raising: Printed material about the species have been produced and distributed in Kazakhstan. Awareness among the scientific and bird watching community has been raised through articles and presentations at conferences. The news on the discovery of the large flock in Turkey has reached the general public. Specific awareness raising activities targeting specific audiences (hunters, land owners) has not yet been carried out.

Conclusions

The basic research needed to properly assess the conservation status of the species and the existing threats has successfully started with the support of AEWA Secretariat and of DEFRA (UK). The Working Group is in place and has demonstrated the capacity to coordinate activities, collate information and raise awareness about the species. The SSAP implementation is proceeding well but further work is needed and in particular the following:

- The Working Group needs to include members from more countries in order to cover the wide range of the species and promote research and conservation actions;
- Further work is needed to understand the ecology of the species and the threats to the species at the breeding areas and in the wintering areas (newly discovered or confirmed by satellite tracking);
- The SSAP will soon need to be re-assessed based on the better knowledge acquired during the first years of intense research.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status Management Plan	complete			partial		none			Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	yes	no	?		
Country										
Azerbaijan		1					1		2	
Iran, Islamic Republic of		1							1	
Iraq							2		2	
Israel				3	1				4	
Kazakhstan	2		2			1		3	8	
Russia		1			1		4		6	
Syria							2		2	

Great Snipe *Gallinago media*

SSAP published 2004

SSAP endorsed by Bern Convention Recommendation 103 (2003)
 AEWA Resolution 2.13 (2002)

Status

Targets: In the short term (3 years):

1. To maintain the population of the Great Snipe at a level that will guarantee it long-term conservation in all its present range.
2. To increase knowledge about the Great Snipe (e.g. habitat use, breeding range and population size particularly for the eastern population, and migration and wintering conditions), in order to increase the effectiveness of the reviewed version of the Great Snipe Action Plan to be produced in 2005.

In the long-term (15 years):

1. To restore the population to a level that will remove the species from the “Near Threatened” category.

Status: The Scandinavian population seems to be stable in the period 1987-2005, although fluctuating significantly on yearly basis. Numbers on Estonia and Latvia haven’t changed since the Action Plan. Since the publication of the CSR (1999) no updated population figures are available for the W Siberia & NE Europe population; the following editions simply reported the last available estimate while the trend is indicated as possibly declining.

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports
 (figures in individuals)

Population	CSR (1999)	CSR 2 (2002)	CSR 3 (2007)
Scandinavia/probably West Africa	18,000-51,000	18,000-51,000	18,000-51,000
W Siberia & NE Europe/SE Africa	100,000-1,000,000	100,000-1,000,000	100,000-1,000,000

Evaluation: The short term target has been reached for the Scandinavian population. No apparent progress is observed in the eastern population including no updated population estimate, with some remarkable exceptions (i.e. Baltic Republics and Hungary).

Protection Status

The species is protected in all EU countries, Algeria, Croatia and Norway and will be protected in Congo Brazzaville. Problems with accidental shooting during legal hunting to look-alike species have been addressed in Latvia by removing the Common Snipe *G. gallinago* from the list of quarry species, while in Norway the distinction between the two species is part of the curriculum for the hunters’ proficiency school.

National and regional species action plans

National Action Plans have been produced for Estonia and Sweden; they are guiding conservation work in the countries.

Site protection

Designation:

Estonia: 70-80% of the population occurs within protected areas and the four IBAs are partially protected.

Latvia: 75% of the population occurs in protected area; all 6 IBAs are protected at least partially protected.

Lithuania: Half of the population occurs in protected areas and both IBAs are somewhat protected.

Norway: Only 10-15% of the breeding population occurs within protected areas and the three IBAs identified for the species are somewhat protected.

Sweden: less than 5% of the leks are within protected areas. Sites where the species occurs during migration are better protected.

Overall there are 72 IBAs identified for breeding Great Snipe and a further 31 were selected for the presence of the species outside the breeding period. 60% of the breeding IBAs and 66% of the non-breeding sites are protected to certain extent, but only two non-breeding sites have a management plan.

Management plans: Of the 43 protected IBAs where the species breeds only 13 have a management plan and the level of implementation is very rarely complete. Of the IBAs identified for the presence of the species outside the breeding period, only 10% has a management plan

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation:

Estonia: Managed grazing on 2,000 ha is maintaining the habitat for about 400-500 birds. Habitat restoration has been carried out on some 500 ha affecting ca. 100 birds.

Latvia: Restoration of floodplain meadows has been carried out in 18 protected areas. The measures involved cutting of bushes that had invaded the meadows after their abandonment as well as initiation of mowing after being unmanaged for more than 5 years. In other sites water management and renaturalization of the river has re-created habitat potentially suitable for Great Snipe in area where the species has not been present for decades.

Lithuania: At the Svyla Biosphere Poligon trees, bushes and reeds were cut in ca. 5 ha and 10 ha of meadows have been mowed. The same activities are planned in Sausgalviai area management plan (ca. 12 ha area) and water level control is foreseen on 240 ha. Local communities will be engaged during the implementation of Sausgalviai management plan.

Norway: The promotion of agricultural practices (mowing, grazing) is being used as a tool to maintain the breeding habitat of the species.

Sweden: Habitat restoration has been carried out on up to 1,500 ha. It is estimated that more than 50 birds benefit of the new habitat.

Research and Monitoring: In Norway and the Baltic Republics the species is regularly monitored through joint efforts involving protected area staff, NGOs and governmental bodies and /or Universities.

Lithuania: Monitoring will be carried out in the framework of the national Natura 2000 monitoring scheme.

Sweden: Annual monitoring is carried out through volunteers reporting through the Swedish Report system for birds on line.

Research is continuing, coordinated by Dr. Kålås, investigating population dynamics, genetics, habitat selection and limiting factors.

Latest studies in Scandinavia suggest that the population dynamics are affected by conditions influencing reproduction and survival of offspring during the summer, but not by conditions influencing survival at the wintering grounds in Africa.

Awareness raising:

Estonia: A leaflet has been produced and distributed and a website has been created providing information on the species and its conservation needs.

Latvia: Awareness about the species was raised among the communities where protected areas were established for the species. Article in hunting magazine explained how to separate the species from the Common Snipe.

Conclusions

There has been some progress in the implementation of the Action Plan, but there is the need to stimulate action in other important countries such as Russian Federation, Belarus, Poland and Ukraine.

Within the EU tools are in place to protect the habitat (floodplains), and maintain species-friendly management, but it is not clear to which extent and how successfully these tools have been used and it seems more work is needed to guarantee the long term conservation of the species and its habitat. The SSAP has just reached the deadline for its short term targets and they have been reached for the Scandinavian population since it is stable.

The following actions are recommended:

- Establish a specific working group to stimulate interest and actions in countries where the Eastern population occurs, beyond the Baltic Republics;
- Promote a better understanding of the status, trend and threats in the Russian Federation;
- Create new protected areas to increase the percentage of national population breeding in protected sites;
- Develop management plans for protected areas with specific measures for the species.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status Management Plan	complete		partial		none	unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	yes	no	no	no		
Country								
Belarus	2	4			6		12	
Estonia			3	1	4		8	NSAP
Ethiopia					1		1	
Georgia					1		1	
Kenya					2		2	
Latvia	3	1	1	1			6	
Lithuania	1			1			2	
Malawi					1		1	
Mozambique				1			1	
Namibia					1		1	
Norway			3				3	
Poland	1	1	1		2		5	
Russia		4	2	15	11		32	
Sweden				2		1	3	NSAP
Tanzania		1					1	
Uganda		3		1			4	
Ukraine					5	1	6	
Zambia		7		3	4		14	

Slender-billed Curlew *Numenius tenuirostris*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Memorandum of Understanding (1994)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995

Status

Targets: In the short term, to prevent the extinction of the Slender-billed Curlew. In the medium term, to prevent any further decrease of the population. In the long term to secure a significant increase in the numbers of the Slender-billed Curlew.

Status: The population estimate has been reduced to less than 50 individuals and no confirmed records are known since 1999 although several unconfirmed records have been received by the Slender-billed Curlew Working Group from Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Greece, Egypt, etc.

Changes in the number of verified records since the publication of the SSAP in 1996.

Source: Slender-billed Curlew Working Group.

Country	Number of records in SAP	Years	Recent records (1994-2004)	Last record
Albania	2	1992-1993	-	
Algeria	7	1977-1990	-	
Austria		1905-1985		
Bulgaria	19	1903-1993	-	
Croatia	5	1970-1987	-	
Former Yugoslavia	38	1900-1984	-	
Greece	70	1918-1993	13	1999
Hungary	85	1903-1991	3	1998
Iran	6	1963-1973	10	1998
Iraq	3	1917-1979	-	
Italy	76	1900-1993	3	1996
Kazakhstan	4	1921-1991	-	
Morocco	53	1939-1994	3	1995
Romania	16	1966-1989	1	1994
Russia	11	1908-1991	1	1996
Spain	6	1962-1980	-	-
Tunisia	26	1915-1992	-	
Turkey	29	1946-1990	-	
Ukraine	15	1908-1993	-	
United Kingdom	-		1	1998

Changes in the population estimates as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Central Siberia / Mediterranean & SW Asia	50-270 (CSR, 1999)	<50 (CSR 2, 2002)	<50 (CRS 3, 2007)
---	-----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Evaluation: Because of the decline of the confirmed records and the reduced population estimate, it can be concluded that the Action Plan's targets have not been achieved.

Protection Status

The species is legally protected in most of the signatory countries of the MoU (see list below) and Turkey. In the majority also the look-alike species (*Numenius* sp. and *Limosa* sp.) are also protected. In Albania, Croatia, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation the European Curlew (*N. arquata*) and/or the Whimbrel (*N. phaeopus*) are not protected and are even quarry species. In the Islamic countries waders are not hunted, but foreign hunters represent a risk for the species.

International and national species action plans

The Memorandum of Understanding under the CMS is signed by 18 countries.

List of signatories to the MoU. In CAPITAL the Contracting Parties to the CMS

ALBANIA (5.5.95)	ITALY (18.4.2000)
BULGARIA (6.4.95)	Kazakhstan (2.12.94)
CROATIA (2.5.95)	MOROCCO (15.6.95)
CYPRUS (12.12.94)	Oman (21.11.95)
EGYPT (2.12.94)	ROMANIA (2.12.94)
GEORGIA (10.9.94)	SPAIN (15.12.94)
GREECE (29.10.97)	UKRAINE (12.6.95)
HUNGARY (22.9.94, with explanatory note)	UZBEKISTAN (10.9.94)
Islamic Republic of Iran (15.5.95)	Yemen (10.9.97)

Russian Federation, where the only known nests were recorded in the beginning of the XX century, has not signed it yet. The MoU has also been signed by UNEP/CMS Secretariat (15.12.94), BirdLife International (27.2.95) and the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (12.6.95).

There is a national species action plan in place only in Italy. An international Slender-billed Curlew Working Group collects all available records and coordinates the research activities.

Site protection

Site designation: Globally out of the 38 sites with verified records since 1990, 24 (63%) are somewhat protected.

Greece: all 14 IBAs where the species was observed are covered to variable extents by SPAs.

Hungary: All key sites are protected.

Italy: All IBAs where the species has been observed have some level of national or international (Ramsar) protection, although the coverage should be improved.

Morocco: All key sites (including the last known wintering site, Merja Zerga) are protected.

Spain: The only IBA/key site is the Guadalquivir Marshes 25% of which are covered by an SPA and by national protection instruments.

Management plans: At least 18 protected IBAs have some sort of management plan; these are located in Italy (the majority), Greece and Morocco.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation:

Greece: Habitat restoration and habitat creation activities have been carried out at key sites.

Detailed analyses of the habitat selection and recommendations on habitat management have been developed. The species seems to use a fairly wide range of habitats ranging from salt marshes and steppes to mudflats and arable fields.

Hungary: Habitat restoration and habitat creation activities have been carried out at key sites.

Italy: Habitat restoration and habitat creation activities have been carried out at key sites (e.g. Orbetello) and are starting at key sites in Sicily.

Research and Monitoring: All key sites north of the Mediterranean and some sites in Morocco and Tunisia are regularly monitored. Rarities committees evaluate all records. Ornithologists and birders are widely aware of the rarity of the species and the importance to report any possible sighting. Repeated winter surveys in Iran have failed to locate any birds. Surveys in Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Yemen have also been carried out. Over 500 field days have been spent in Southern Russia and Northern Kazakhstan looking for the species in the potential breeding areas.

Satellite tracking has eventually become a suitable tool as the weight of the tags has reached acceptable limits and suitable attachment methods were developed. Tags have been tested on: Whimbrel captured in UK and tracked between Iceland and West Africa; and Sociable Lapwing (*Vanellus gregarius*) between Kazakhstan and Sudan. Plans are in place to activate a task force in case a bird can be located and potentially tagged.

Currently research is under way to identify the breeding areas from the stable isotopes of feathers of juveniles from museum specimens. Preliminary results seem to show that the main breeding area was in Kazakhstan where habitat has suffered enormous changes during the XX century. Historical data are being used to assess the impact on breeding success of cyclic wet/dry weather in the historical breeding areas.

Awareness raising: Awareness raising materials were produced in several countries in the mid 1990s and more recently in Tunisia, but no awareness raising activities have been carried out aimed at the general public or hunters. Awareness among the birding community has been raised through talks at international ornithological conferences and at AEWA MOP, with articles in the CMS and AEWA newsletters and messages sent to several birding e-groups so that virtually all (possible) observations are reported. Still identification skills (to avoid confusion with the eastern subspecies of *N. arquata* and *N. phaeopus*) need to be improved.

Conclusions

The number of confirmed records has declined since the publication of the SAP and the total population estimate is now at less than 50 individuals. No wintering areas are currently known. The last site in Morocco has not been used by the species since the winter of 1995. Technology has eventually met the requirements for locating the breeding grounds and identifying the migration route of the most threatened bird in the Western Palearctic.

Further actions are needed:

- To ensure the appropriate protection and management of all key sites;
- To reduce the risk of hunting-related mortality; improving awareness and identification skills among hunters and strengthening law enforcement on legal protection;
- To improve identification skills of ornithologists and coverage in Central Asia, Middle East and North Africa.
- To maintain the interest and attention of ornithologist to report any record of the species.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status Management Plan	complete		partial		none	unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	yes	no	no	?		
Country								
Albania	1						1	
Azerbaijan					1		1	
Bulgaria			1	3			4	
Greece	3	3	4	4			14	
Hungary			1				1	
Iran, Islamic Republic of				1			1	
Iraq					2		2	
Italy	2	3	4	2	1		12	NSAP
Morocco		1					1	
Oman					1		1	
Russia					1		1	
Saudi Arabia					1		1	
Ukraine	1			1			2	
Uzbekistan						1	1	
Yemen					1		1	

Audouin's Gull *Larus audouinii*

SSAP published	1996	
SSAP endorsed by	CMS	Recommendation 5.1 (1997)
	Bern Convention	Recommendation 48 (1996)
	EU	1995

Status

Targets: In the short term to maintain the current population of Audouin's Gull throughout its range. In the medium to long term, to conserve suitable habitats in order to promote the expansion of the species' range and numbers particularly in smaller colonies.

Status: The species' population has increased from an estimated size of almost 16,000 pairs to over 19,000 (+20%) since the development of the action plan and has colonized Portugal and the species was found to be breeding in also Croatia. The species is still considered localized since over 90% of the pairs nest in less than 10 sites.

Changes in national populations since the SSAP publication (1996)

Country	Population in SAP (pairs)	Year	Current population (pairs)	Year	Source
Cyprus	10–20	1993	15–30	1998-2002	1
Algeria	600	1993	No information		1
France	90	1993	56–92	1998-2001	1
Greece	200–300	1993	750–900	1995-2000	1
Italy	550–650	1993	473 – 1,335	1998-2005	2
Portugal	0	1993	25–30	2002-2003	1
Spain	14,000	1993	17,000	2000	1
Morocco	50	1993	20-60	2000	1
Tunisia	70	1993	No information		
Turkey	70	1993	20-40	1991-2001	1
Croatia	-	1993	53-63	2004-2007	2
Total population	15,620–15,830	1993	19,200	2007	

Sources: 1: BirdLife International (2004); 2: replies to questionnaire

Changes in the estimate of the size of the population of Audouin's Gull as per the AEWA Conservation Status Reports (figures in individuals)

Mediterranean/N & W coasts of Africa	40,000 (CSR 1999)	57,600 (CSR 2, 2002)	57,600 (CSR 3, 2007)
--------------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation: The short, medium and long term targets of the action plan have been achieved. The species has expanded its range and it is expected that new colonies will be found. However, the breeding colonies in North Africa are not regularly monitored. In Spain (holding over 90% of the breeding pairs) the species seems to be dependent on the fisheries in the Ebro Delta, which are regarded as unsustainable and their collapse could result in a rapid decline of the dependent breeding population.

Protection Status

The species is protected in all countries, including those recently colonized.

National and regional species action plans

Italy: A national species action plan has been developed and some actions are being implemented; Italy is the only country where such a document is in place.

Spain: A national strategy has not been developed, as the legal status of the species is only "Of Special Interest" in the National Catalogue. However, a working group for the species has met annually since 1999 coordinated by the Ministry of Environment, with the attendance of the regional governments, conservationists and the Ministry of Environment. A regional Management Plan for the species was approved for the Balearic Islands in 2007.

Site protection

Site designation: The key sites for the species have high coverage of protected areas in most countries. Over 16,000 pairs breed within SPAs. The most important wintering sites in the Mediterranean (Columbretes Islands, Wetlands at South Alicante; Almería coastal wetlands) are also protected.

Croatia: All suitable habitats are covered by the national ecological network and all sites are proposed SPAs; 90% of the birds occur within protected areas.

Italy: All colonies in Tuscany and Apulia are protected, while only 50% of the Sardinian sites are SPAs; on average at least 40% of the national population breeds within protected areas. The development of Marine Protected Areas in Italy will improve the coverage and effectiveness of protection measures to the Italian colonies.

Management plans: Management plans cover only 19 sites.

France and especially Greece have reported difficulties with regulating human access.

Italy: At some colonies, every year, the authorities responsible for the breeding sites (local municipalities or park staff) limit human access and boat berth to the colonies during the tourist season.

Morocco: Management plans are being developed for three of the main sites: Parc national de Souss-Massa, Embouchure de Moulouya, and Lagune de Khnifiss.

Spain: The majority of the population is well protected from human disturbance through specific rules attached to SPA designation.

Other conservation, research and public awareness measures

Habitat conservation:

Fisheries: The effects of fishing policies and regulations on population numbers and breeding biology have been extensively documented in Spain. Measures are being developed to prevent accidental by-catch of seabirds by long-liners. Data were also collected in Greece. No progress has been made in this respect in France, Italy and Portugal.

Sea pollution control:

France: New rules have been in place since 2000 in response to the Erika spill. The shipping of hydrocarbons in the strait between Sardinia and Corsica is prohibited since 2002. A number of regulations, including those for shipping of hydrocarbons, are being introduced by Sardinia Region for the surroundings of seabird breeding colonies.

Greece: MARPOL, Barcelona Convention, Biosafety Protocol are all signed but poorly enforced. A National Contingency Plan was compiled by the Ministry of Commercial Shipping (2000) under the MARPOL protocols and Barcelona Convention. However, no regional or local contingency plans exist for specific protected areas (e.g. SPAs, etc). Portugal: There is a legal framework covering oil spills, but enforcement is problematic.

Spain: Increasing efforts are made towards sewage treatment. However, heavy metals accumulated in marine sediments in the past are enough to cause long term pollution of bottom dwelling fish.

Species management:

Culling programmes have been applied to control Yellow-legged Gull *Larus michaellis* numbers in some colonies.

Greece: No significant competition problems were found during specific research. It has been reported that egg collecting is no longer a serious problem.

Spain: A programme for the control of terrestrial mammals (mainly badgers and foxes) is being implemented at the Ebro Delta. A number of campaigns to control Yellow-legged Gull productivity have been undertaken or designed (I. Grossa and Chafarinas). Significant progress has been made and further research is being carried out to establish threshold numbers for Yellow-legged Gull that may allow the coexistence of both species. Recent scientific analysis shows that culling is useless at large spatio-temporal scales, and that sympatric species (included Audouin's Gull) are performing very well in the presence of Yellow-legged Gulls. As a consequence, many control programmes have been stopped.

Nevertheless, colonies are kept under surveillance in Spain, but not in other countries.

Research and Monitoring: Colonies are mostly well monitored in the northern part of the Mediterranean, including Croatia but with the exception of Greece. In North Africa monitoring takes place in the framework of the IWC. In Spain wintering is well monitored by a wide web of amateur observers along the Mediterranean coast.

An intensive colour-banding programme has been implemented since 1988 to understand the dynamics of each colony within a metapopulation frame and to identify wintering areas; birds are marked in Croatia, Greece, France, Italy and Spain.

Progress has been made in understanding breeding biology and colony-site selection at many colonies, but colony-site selection is poorly understood throughout its breeding range. Some studies on habitat requirement have been carried out.

Diet has been well studied and found to be highly dependent on human fisheries all over the western Mediterranean. More research needs to be done in particular in the east and south of the distribution range.

Conclusions

Significant progress has been made on the implementation of the action plan in particular in Spain and Italy. Spain, as the country hosting the vast majority of the breeding population of the species, has taken important steps protecting most of the sites and carried out most of the ecological research. Despite its growth the population is still concentrated in few large colonies exposing the species to vulnerability linked to local events. The implementation of the Action Plan is lagging behind in other countries.

Therefore:

- The species' requirements need to be integrated into wider policies such as fisheries, coastal development and control of sea pollution.
- A new, measurable target needs to be defined for the plan.

Protection status, management plans of IBAs selected for the species and National action plans and working groups

Protection status Management Plan	complete			partial		none		unknown	Total	National Species Action Plan / Working Group
	yes	no	?	yes	no	yes	no	no		
Country										
Algeria							2		2	
Cyprus		1							1	
France		2			1				3	
Gambia		1							1	
Gibraltar (to UK)								2	2	
Greece		4			11		1		16	
Italy		2			7		6	1	16	NSAP
Lebanon			1						1	
Morocco		2		1			5		8	
Senegal					2		2		4	
Spain	4	5		7	3	1	4		24	WG & Sub national SAP
Tunisia		2							2	
Turkey					1		4		5	

Conclusions and recommendations

When compared with previous assessment of the implementations of the same documents (Nagy & Crockford, 2001) the overall level of effectiveness of the SSAPs is lower.

This difference is linked to the different geographical scope, since the 2001 assessment was carried out only for the members of the European Union and the populations targets were calculated for the 25 countries and not for the whole population range as it has been done in the present assessment.

Despite this methodological difference, it is a fact that most of the conservation actions have been carried out within the EU and this for several reasons:

- Strong legislation (e.g. the Council Directive 79/409/EEC);
- Specific funding instrument (e.g. LIFE); and
- Higher priority of biodiversity conservation when compared to countries with different socio-economic conditions.

The Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds (known as the Birds Directive) offers a strong tool for the conservation of birds within the European Union through the protection of sites identified as important for the priority birds.

The Financial instrument of LIFE had been established as a tool to promote biodiversity conservation and the SAPs published in 1996 were developed to provide guidance for LIFE projects.

Governmental agencies and non-governmental organisations, often working together, had access to other EU funding (INTERREG, LEADER, Structural funds, etc.) aimed at local development. Projects addressing biodiversity conservation in the framework of local planning and economic development were possible because of the shared understanding between GOs and NGOs of the need to integrate biodiversity in these policies.

Other EU funds have been used outside the EU for biodiversity conservation (e.g. TACIS, MEDA, LIFE Third Countries), but the concentration of funds (both in terms of net amount and number of projects) used for biodiversity – and more specifically species – conservation are much lower than within the EU.

Other factors have also influenced the level of success of the SSAPs.

Species concentrated in few countries /sites are more likely to be positively affected by a smaller number of targeted project. The recovery of the Dalmatian pelican population in the EU has certainly benefited from the species colonial and social behaviour. Similarly, the promising work on Sociable Lapwing, Northern Bald Ibis and Light – bellied Brent Goose is linked to the limited number of countries/sites in which each species occur. In the same way the decision of the UK government to address the Ruddy duck problem in the country where most of the feral European population occurs is significant (although not final) in removing the main threats to the survival of the White-headed Duck.

The existence of a group of committed persons and organisations has played an important role in delivering solid conservation and research work. The plight for the Lesser White-fronted Goose has gathered a composite group of governmental and non-governmental organisations, often with very different backgrounds, which has improved our knowledge about the species migration, ecology and threats.

Also at national level (e.g. Spain, UK) the presence of working groups with some form of governmental endorsement/recognition has been important in promoting and coordinating

conservation efforts for species such as the Audouin's gull, the White-headed Duck and the Marbled Teal.

The working groups, when composed mainly by researchers, have proved to be particularly effective in steering, promoting and coordinating research, monitoring and surveys, while they have been less effective in policy development and advocacy.

The development of National Action Plans has not proved to be a strong tool as expected. Their effectiveness is more linked to the development of effective cooperation between governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations.

In order to build on the successes and improve the implementation of the SSAPs the following is recommended:

- Ensure that the EU keeps the SSAPs as a reference for LIFE by continuing the engagement with the Ornithological Committee.
- Promote the SSAPs as reference for International donors (bilaterals, multilaterals, private donors) showing the positive experience with the EU funding opportunities.
- Concentrate the efforts in those countries which are most important for the conservation of the species.
- The development of National action plan(s) should be used as an opportunity to build cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations and other stakeholders.
- The International species groups should be structured to facilitate the work of the experts; to coordinate the scientific research and monitoring; to build commitment of the governments and to produce effective policy changes as appropriate.

2 Conservation initiatives which contribute to achieving the aims of the AEWA convention

Since the mid 1990s species action planning has been supported and endorsed by the European Union, the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS, Bonn Convention). Cooperation between these bodies and AEWA on the Species Action Plans is already in place although better coordination is needed for the reporting about the implementation of the plans by national authorities.

The European Union has also developed a number of Management Plans for species in Annex II (hunnable bird species) of the Birds Directive considered in unfavourable conservation status. The species relevant for AEWA are: Northern Pintail *Anas acuta*, Red-crested Pochard *Netta rufina*, Velvet Scoter *Melanitta fusca* and Black-tailed Godwit *Limosa limosa*.

The Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) is the Biodiversity Working Group of the Arctic Council. It has produced, through the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group, the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan. This document covers all Eider species relevant for AEWA: Common Eider *Somateria mollissima*, King Eider *Somateria spectabilis* and Steller's Eider *Polysticta stelleri*.

The Barcelona Convention through its Protocol on specially protected areas and biological diversity in the Mediterranean calls for cooperative measures for the protection and conservation of species. In this framework it has produced an action plan covering all bird species listed in the Annex II of the protocol. The plan covers 10 species relevant for AEWA: Great White Pelican *Pelecanus onocrotalus*, Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*, Pygmy Cormorant *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*, Greater Flamingo *Phoenicopterus roseus*, Little Tern *Sterna albifrons*, Slender-billed Curlew *Numenius tenuirostris*, Audouin's Gull *Larus audouinii*, Lesser Crested Tern *Sterna bengalensis*, Sandwich Tern *Sterna sandvicensis* and Little Tern *Sterna albifrons*.

Alongside the Barcelona Convention, the UNEP's Regional Seas Branch coordinates a number of other Regional Seas Conventions. They follow the same approach as the Mediterranean treaty and are developing protocols on the conservation of biological diversity and the establishment of protected areas. The level of development of these protocols is very different, but all (will) require international cooperation for developing plans and strategies to conserve the species listed in the annexes of the protocols.

Table 3 - Regional seas conventions within the AEWA region

Sea	Convention/programme name	website
Antarctic	The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources	http://www.ccamlr.org
Arctic	Programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)	http://arcticportal.org/en/pame/
Baltic	Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention)	http://www.helcom.fi
Black Sea	The Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution	http://www.blacksea-commission.org
Caspian	Framework Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Caspian Sea	http://www.caspianenvironment.org
Eastern Africa	Nairobi Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention)	http://www.unep.org/nairobiconvention/
Mediterranean	Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution (Barcelona Convention).	http://www.unepmap.org
North-East Atlantic	Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention)	http://www.ospar.org/
Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden	Jeddah Convention	http://www.persga.org
ROPME Sea Area	Kuwait Regional Convention for Co-operation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution	http://www.ropme.com
Western Africa	Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment in the West and Central African Region (Abidjan Convention).	http://www.unep.org/abidjanconvention/index.asp

Cooperation between the conventions and programmes coordinated by the UNEP could have a positive impact on the implementation of the AEWA SSAPs and the conservation of the species they target.

BirdLife International (often through one or more of its national partner organisations) and Wetlands International have taken a leading role in the development and implementation of the international Single Species Action Plans.

The *Wings Over Wetlands* (also known as the UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project), in which both Wetlands International and BirdLife International are involved, is building the capacity of practitioners, taking practical actions and consolidating the knowledge about the sites important for migratory birds. This project will certainly contribute to the implementation of several SSAPs.

An important role, due to their specific expertise, has been played also by the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (UK) and by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (UK).

The WWF and Conservation International need to be mentioned in this chapter.

Both organizations are implementing important programmes within the AEWA region. They do not necessarily promote the development of Species Action Plans, but their work certainly contributes to their implementation and success.

WWF has several regional programmes (e.g. West Africa), ecoregional programmes e.g. Mediterranean) and international programmes (e.g. Freshwater) relevant for AEWA. Their approach does not address the conservation issues of the single bird species but their work on wetlands and climate change is certainly an important contribution toward the aims of AEWA and of many SSAPs. In some cases (e.g. the Caucasus Ecoregional Plan) the development of regional species action plans is among the activities identified to promote the conservation of the region.

Twelve of the 34 Conservation International Biodiversity Hotspots are within the AEWA region. Conservation actions are being taken in 7 of these hotspots through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF).

The Biodiversity Hotspots are selected on the basis of their importance for threatened species (therefore including birds) and the CEPF regional investment strategies aim at improving the conservation status of the globally threatened species.

Recommendations

- Continue the ongoing cooperation with GOs and NGOs which have proven effective;
- Explore potential cooperation with Regional Seas Conventions of the UNEP family;
- Proactively seek to engage WWF and CI in the implementation of the SSAPs.

3 Criteria for the identification of priority species for which Single Species Action Plans (SSAP) should be developed

Species for which a SSAP is required

Paragraph 2 of the AEWA Action Plan calls for the development of Single Species Action Plans for those populations “*listed in Category 1 of Column A of Table 1 as a priority*” and those “*listed with an asterisk in Column A of Table 1.*”

The taxa in column A category 1 meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Category 1: (a) Species which are included in Appendix I to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory species of Wild Animals;
- (b) Species which are listed as threatened in Threatened Birds of the World (BirdLife International 2000¹¹); or
- (c) Populations which number less than around 10,000 individuals¹².

Sixty-eight (68) species represented by ninety-one (91) taxa/populations are under category 1 and three (3) species represented by four (4) taxa/populations are marked by an asterisk.

The Action Plan therefore calls for the development of international SSAPs for a total of 70¹³ species (or 95 taxa/populations)¹⁴

Twenty-seven (27) of those species (54 populations) are the target of (existing or under development) International Single Species Action Plans recognized by AEWA and covering all or most of the species’ range in the agreement area. Table 1 lists the Single Species Action Plans developed and acknowledged by AEWA. The list includes only those documents endorsed by international treaties (i. e. European Union, Bern Convention, Bonn Convention and AEWA) and those under development for AEWA. The full reference of the Action Plans is given in the Reference list.

¹¹ BirdLife International updates yearly the Global Red List of birds as the authority for birds for IUCN. Changes in the threat status of several birds have occurred since Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan was produced. The present report uses the latest available Red List as available on the BirdLife website (www.birdlife.org/datazone) on September 2007.

¹² Data from Delany, S., Scott, D.A., Helmink, T. & Martakis, G. 2007. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. Third Edition. AEWA Technical Series No.13. Bonn, Germany has been used. In this report this document is referred to as CSR (2007)

¹³ The West Africa population of the White-backed Duck *Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus* is classified as 1c, while the Eastern & Southern Africa population is classified as 2*.

¹⁴ The table used in this assessment is the one presented at MOP3 (AEWA/MOP 3.29.Rev.2) taking into account the changes occurred since the preparation of the revised table and in particular: the up-listing to *Vulnerable* of Dalmatian Pelican *Pelecanus crispus*, Shoebill *Balaeniceps rex*, Steller's Eider *Polysticta stelleri* and Madagascar Pratincole *Glareola ocularis* and the down-listing of Corncrake *Crex crex* to *Near Threatened*.

Table 4 – Species and populations covered by existing (or under development) Single Species Action Plans.

Species	Year of publication	Population covered by the SSAP	Table 1 column A	Global Threat Status (2007)
Dalmatian Pelican <i>Pelecanus crispus</i>	1996	Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)	1a 1c	VU
		Southwest Asia & South Asia (win)	1a 1c	
Pygmy Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax pygmeus</i>	1996	Black Sea & Mediterranean		LC
		Southwest Asia		
Great Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris stellaris</i>	2001	W Europe, NW Africa (bre)	1c	LC
		C & E Europe, Black Sea & E Mediterranean (bre)		
Madagascar Pond-Heron <i>Ardeola idae</i>	Under development	Madagascar & Aldabra/Central & Eastern Africa	1b 1c	EN
Waldrapp (Northern Bald Ibis) <i>Geronticus eremita</i>	2006	Morocco	1a 1b 1c	CR
		Southwest Asia	1a 1b 1c	
Eurasian Spoonbill <i>Platalea leucorodia leucorodia</i> <i>Platalea leucorodia archeri</i> <i>Platalea leucorodia balsaci</i> <i>Platalea leucorodia major</i>	Under development	West Europe/West Mediterranean & West Africa	2	LC
		Cent. & SE Europe/Mediterranean & Tropical Africa	2	
		Red Sea & Somalia	1c	
		Coastal West Africa (Mauritania)	1c	
		Western Asia/Southwest & South Asia	2	
Lesser Flamingo <i>Phoenicopterus minor</i>	Under development	West Africa	2	NT
		Eastern Africa	-	
		Southern Africa (to Madagascar)	3a	
Whooper Swan <i>Cygnus cygnus</i>	Under development	Iceland/UK & Ireland	2	LC
		Northwest Mainland Europe		
		N Europe & W Siberia/Black Sea & E Mediterranean	2	
		West & Central Siberia/Caspian	2	
White-headed Duck <i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	2006	West Mediterranean (Spain & Morocco)	1a 1b 1c	EN
		Algeria & Tunisia	1a 1b 1c	
		East Mediterranean, Turkey & Southwest Asia	1a 1b 1c	
Maccoa Duck <i>Oxyura maccoa</i>	2007	East Africa	1c	NT
		Ethiopian Highlands	1	
		Southern Africa	1c	
Lesser White-fronted Goose <i>Anser erythropus</i>	1996	N Europe & W Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian	1a 1b 1c	VU
Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	2006	Canada & Greenland/Ireland	2	LC
Red-breasted Goose <i>Branta ruficollis</i>	1996	Northern Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian	1a 1b 3c	EN
Marbled Teal <i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	1996	West Mediterranean/West Medit. & West Africa	1a 1b 1c	VU
		East Mediterranean	1a 1b 1c	
		Southwest Asia	1a 1b 2	
Ferruginous Pochard <i>Aythya nyroca</i>	2006	West Mediterranean/North & West Africa	1a 1c	NT
		Eastern Europe/E Mediterranean & Sahelian Africa	1a 3c	
		Western Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa	1a 3c	
Steller's Eider <i>Polysticta stelleri</i>	2001	Western Siberia/Northeast Europe	1a 2	VU
Siberian Crane <i>Grus leucogeranus</i>	2001 ¹⁵	Iran (win)	1a 1b 1c	CR
White-winged Flufftail <i>Sarothrura ayresi</i>	Under development	Ethiopia	1a 1b 1c	EN
		Southern Africa	1a 1b 1c	
Corncrake <i>Crex crex</i>	2006	Europe & Western Asia/SubSaharan Africa	1b	NT
Red-knobbed Coot <i>Fulica cristata</i>	2001	Spain & Morocco	1c	LC
Black-winged Pratincole <i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	2006	SE Europe & Western Asia/Southern Africa	3b 3c	NT
Sociable Plover <i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	2006	SE Europe & Western Asia/Northeast Africa	1a 1b 1c	CR
		Central Asian Republics/NW India	1a 1b 1c	
Great Snipe <i>Gallinago media</i>	2006	Scandinavia/probably West Africa	-	NT
		Western Siberia & NE Europe/Southeast Africa	-	
Black-tailed Godwit <i>Limosa limosa limosa</i> <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i>	Under development	Western Europe/NW & West Africa	-	NT
		Eastern Europe/Central & Eastern Africa	-	
		Westcentral Asia/SW Asia & Eastern Africa	-	
		Iceland/Western Europe	3 a*	
Slender-billed Curlew <i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	1996 ¹⁶	Central Siberia/Mediterranean & SW Asia	1a 1b 1c	CR
Audouin's Gull <i>Larus audouinii</i>	1996	Mediterranean/N & W coasts of Africa	1a 3a	NT
Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii dougallii</i>	2001	Europe (bre)	1c	LC

¹⁵ The species is covered by a Memorandum of Understanding under CMS and has a Conservation Plan updated in 2001.

¹⁶ The species is covered by a Memorandum of Understanding under CMS and a revised plan is being circulated among signatory parties.

This leaves fifty-one (51)¹⁷ species (63 taxa/populations) for which a SSAP is requested. There is therefore a clear need to identify the priority species in order to focus AEWA's attention to the most urgently needed documents.

Proposed criteria for new action plans

Global threat status (criteria 1b), population trend and population size can be used to rank the species within the AEWA range.

The global threat status refers to the whole species with no reference to subspecies or populations; it is nevertheless relevant for AEWA because the list of taxa in Annex 2 of the Agreement includes the migratory species (or populations) whose distribution range is concentrated within the AEWA geographical range. This criterion is used in the Table 1 to identify species for which a SSAP should be developed. In this report the 2007 global threat status of the species has been used.

The Conservation Status Report provides the populations trends for most of the taxa covered by AEWA. The latest available information is used. No attempt was made to use as an indicator the trend-over-time based on the three Reports so far produced (Wetlands International 1999, Scott D.A. 2002, Delany S. *et al.* 2007) since the authors acknowledge that many of the changes are due to improved knowledge rather than actual changes.

Population sizes are also taken from the last Conservation Status Report (2007). Where a coded range (A, B, C, D or E) is given in the reference document their corresponding figures have been used.

Ranking of the species

Priority should be given according to the threat status of each species and between species belonging to the same category to those with a declining trend and then with a smaller population size within the AEWA region.

All *Critically endangered* species have a SSAP.

Among the species classified as *Endangered* only one does not have a SSAP. There are 8 species (9 populations) listed as *Vulnerable* still without a SSAP; only two populations are not declining.

¹⁷ Species and populations covered by existing SSAPs do not overlap completely with the populations for which a SSAP is requested by the AEWA Action Plan.

Table 5 – *Threatened* species for which a SSAP should be developed. The species are ranked according to Global Threat Status, trend and population size.

Species and subspecies	Population	Global Threat Status (2007)	Trend	Population size (ind.)	Sum of AEWA population(s) (ind.)
Bank Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax neglectus</i>	Coastal Southwest Africa	EN	Declining	11,100	11,100
Slaty Egret <i>Egretta vinaceigula</i>	Southcentral Africa	VU	Declining	3,000-5,000	3,000-5,000
Shoebill <i>Balaeniceps rex</i> ¹⁸	Central Tropical Africa	VU	Declining	5,000-8,000	5,000-8,000
Wattled Crane <i>Grus carunculatus</i>	Central & Southern Africa	VU	Declining	<7,550	<7,550
Madagascar Pratincole <i>Glareola ocularis</i> ¹⁸	Madagascar/East Africa	VU	Declining	5,000-10,000	5,000-10,000
African Penguin <i>Spheniscus demersus</i> ¹⁹	Southern Africa	VU	Declining	180,000	180,000
Socotra Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax nigrogularis</i>	Arabian Coast	VU	Declining	270,000	330,000
	Gulf of Aden, Socotra, Arabian Sea		Stable / Incr.	60,000	
Cape Gannet <i>Sula (Morus) capensis</i>	Southern Africa	VU	Declining	346,000	346,000
Blue Crane <i>Grus paradisea</i>	Extreme Southern Africa	VU	Stable	>25,500	>25,500

Criterion 1b refers only to *threatened* species (i.e. those classified as Critically Endangered, Endangered and Vulnerable in the IUCN red list).

The next step in the prioritization process offers three alternatives:

- (1) To proceed taking into consideration the *Near Threatened* species and finally the *Least Concern* species;
- (2) To take into consideration the populations' size (criterion 1c) and rank the populations accordingly regardless of their Global Threats Status (*Near Threatened* or *Least Concern*); or
- (3) To take into consideration the populations' trend and size (criterion 1c) and rank the populations accordingly regardless of their Global Threats Status (*Near Threatened* or *Least Concern*).

The advantage of the first approach is that it uses widely accepted information (global threat status assessed by BirdLife International, as the official authority for birds for the IUCN Red List) and represents an extension of the criteria 1b. Furthermore since the list of the AEWA species has been developed to target species limited to or concentrated in the geographical limits of the Agreement, the assessment at species level in most cases is relevant and represents the actual status of the populations targeted by the agreement. The disadvantage is that it loses the taxa/population details which are a characteristic of AEWA.

The second approach follows the AEWA prioritization process (criteria c, population size) therefore is consistent with the original Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan; furthermore focusing on taxa/populations, maintains an important characteristic of AEWA approach. Unfortunately the population size alone is not a sufficiently accurate indicator of the conservation needs.

The third approach adds to the population size the information about population trends. Despite the uncertainties regarding the time-scale and accuracy of the data, the Conservation Status Report provides the decision makers with the best and most up-to-date available information. The advantage of linking the population size to its trend is that it better identifies the taxa most likely to become extinct in the near future.

¹⁸ Species not listed as 1b but classified as Vulnerable since the 2004 revision of the IUCN Red List.

¹⁹ A Species Action Plan for South Africa has been developed in 1998 (Ellis S., Croxall J. P. & Cooper J., 1998) but it does not cover the whole distribution range and population occurring within the AEWA range

Near threatened species (option 1)

Criterion 1b used to compile the column A of Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan refers only to *Threatened* species. The IUCN category *Near Threatened* identifies species that are most likely to become threatened in the future and therefore in need of cooperative international actions for their conservation in the future.

Among the species classified as *Near Threatened* there are seven (7) species (9 taxa / populations) without SSAPs. Further thirty-five (35) species (104 taxa / populations) in the list are *Least Concern*. All species are ranked according to their population size within the AEWA region. The population of Roseate Tern (*Europe*) and Great Bittern (*W Europe, NW Africa*) and (*C & E Europe, Black Sea & E Mediterranean*) are covered by existing action plans. Population sizes are given as the geometric mean of the range given in Conservation Status Report (2007). The list includes all species classified as *Near Threatened* and as *Least Concern* for which at least one population meets the requirement for a SSAP (below 10,000 individuals, or marked with an asterisk in Column A of Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan). The results of the ranking exercise are given in Table 6.

Table 6 – *Near Threatened* and *Least Concern* species ranked according to the population size of the AEWA species (sum of the size of the populations covered by AEWA).

Species and subspecies	Population	Global Threat status	Population size (ind.)	Sum of population(s) covered by AEWA (ind.)	SSAP required according to the AEWA AP
African Black Oystercatcher <i>Haematopus moquini</i>	Coastal Southern Africa	NT	5,500	5,500	Y
Crowned Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax coronatus</i>	Coastal Southern Africa	NT	8,700	8,700	Y
Damara Tern <i>Sterna balaenarum</i>	Namibia & S Africa/Atlantic to Ghana	NT	14,000	14,000	
African Skimmer <i>Rynchops flavirostris</i>	Central & coastal West Africa	NT	9,539	19,337	
	Eastern & Southern Africa		9,798		
White-eyed Gull <i>Larus leucophthalmus</i>	Red Sea & nearby coasts	NT	40,500	40,500	Y
Black Crowned Crane <i>Baelearica pavonina pavonina</i>	West Africa (Senegal to Chad)	NT	15,000	54,243	
	<i>Baelearica pavonina ceciliae</i> Eastern Africa (Sudan to Uganda)		39,243		
Cape Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax capensis</i>	Coastal Southern Africa	NT	300,000	300,000	
Black-winged Lapwing <i>Vanellus melanopterus minor</i>	Southern Africa	LC	2,500	2,500	Y
Great Knot <i>Calidris tenuirostris</i>	Eastern Siberia/SW Asia & W Southern Asia	LC	3,500	3,500	Y
Great Northern Diver <i>Gavia immer</i>	Europe (win)	LC	5,000	5,000	Y
Streaky-breasted Flufftail <i>Sarothrura boehmi</i>	Central Africa	LC	5,001	5,001	Y
White-billed Diver <i>Gavia adamsii</i>	Northern Europe (win)	LC	5,001	5,001	Y
Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata vittata</i>	P. Edward, Marion, Crozet & Kerguelen/South Africa	LC	3,351	6,801	Y
	<i>Sterna vittata tristanensis</i> Tristan da Cunha & Gough/South Africa		3,450		Y
Black Stork <i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Southwest Europe/West Africa	LC	1,335	15,290	Y
	Southern Africa		2,805		Y

Species and subspecies	Population	Global Threat status	Population size (ind.)	Sum of population(s) covered by AEWA (ind.)	SSAP required according to the AEWA AP
	Central & Eastern Europe/SubSaharan Africa		11,150		
Chestnut-banded Plover <i>Charadrius pallidus venustus</i>	Eastern Africa	LC	4,500	15,700	Y
	Southern Africa		11,200		
White-backed Duck <i>Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus</i>	West Africa	LC	251	17,751	Y
	Eastern & Southern Africa		17,500		
Bewick's Swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i>	Northern Siberia/Caspian	LC	1,000	21,000	Y
	Western Siberia & NE Europe/Northwest Europe		20,000		
Slavonian Grebe <i>Podiceps auritus auritus</i>	Northwest Europe (largebilled)	LC	5,700	43,300	Y
	Caspian & South Asia (win)		17,500		
	Northeast Europe (smallbilled)		20,100		
Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii bangsi</i>	North Arabian Sea (Oman)	LC	301	45,616	Y
	Southern Africa		765		
<i>Sterna dougallii dougallii</i>	East Africa		25,500		
	Europe (bre)		5,550		Developed
<i>Sterna dougallii arideensis</i>	Madagascar, Seychelles & Mascarenes		13,500		
Grey Crowned Crane <i>Balearica regulorum regulorum</i> <i>Balearica regulorum gibbericeps</i>	Southern Africa (N to Angola & S Zimbabwe)	LC	8,000	57,000	Y
	Eastern Africa (Kenya to Mozambique)		49,000		
Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Turkey (bre)	LC	45	68,220	Y
	Black Sea (Ukraine)/Northeast Africa		675		
	Kalmykia/Northeast Africa		67,500		
Ruddy Shelduck <i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>	Northwest Africa	LC	3,000	73,000	Y
	East Mediterranean & Black Sea/Northeast Africa		20,000		
	Western Asia & Caspian/Iraq		50,000		
Caspian Tern <i>Sterna caspia caspia</i>	Southern Africa (bre)	LC	2,000	76,750	Y
	Europe (bre)		9,500		Y
	Caspian (bre)		12,750		
	West Africa (bre)		52,500		
Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii thalassina</i> <i>Sterna bergii enigma</i> <i>Sterna bergii bergii</i> <i>Sterna bergii velox</i>	Eastern Africa & Seychelles	LC	1,500	92,750	Y
	Madagascar & Mozambique/S. Africa		8,750		Y
	Southern Africa (Angola – Mozambique)		20,000		
	Red Sea & Northeast Africa		62,500		
Greater Sandplover <i>Charadrius leschenaultii columbinus</i> <i>Charadrius leschenaultii leschenaultii</i> <i>Charadrius leschenaultii crassirostris</i>	Turkey & SW Asia/E. Mediterranean & Red Sea	LC	5,001	105,001	Y
	Central Asia/Eastern & Southern Africa		37,500		
	Caspian & SW Asia/Arabia & NE Africa		62,500		
Hottentot Teal <i>Anas hottentota</i>	Lake Chad Basin	LC	3,000	128,000	Y
	Eastern Africa (south to N Zambia)		62,500		
	Southern Africa (north to S Zambia)		62,500		
Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons guineae</i>	West Africa (bre)	LC	2,500	157,000	Y

Species and subspecies	Population	Global Threat status	Population size (ind.)	Sum of population(s) covered by AEWA (ind.)	SSAP required according to the AEWA AP
<i>Sterna albifrons albifrons</i>	Caspian (bre)		17,500		
	Eastern Atlantic (bre)		49,000		
	Black Sea & East Mediterranean (bre)		88,000		
Great Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris capensis</i>	Southern Africa	LC	5,000	162,805	Y
<i>Botaurus stellaris stellaris</i>	W Europe, NW Africa (bre)		6,305		Developed
	Southwest Asia (win)		62,500		
	C & E Europe, Black Sea & E Mediterranean (bre)		89,000		Developed
African Pygmy-goose <i>Nettapus auritus</i>	West Africa	LC	5,001	180,001	Y
	Southern & Eastern Africa		175,000		
Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Lake Chad basin ²	LC	251	181,626	Y
	Eastern Africa (Rift Valley)		6,375		Y
	Southern Africa (N to Angola & Zambia)		175,000		
Lesser Crested Tern <i>Sterna bengalensis emigrate</i>	S Mediterranean/NW & West Africa coasts	LC	4,000	212,500	Y
<i>Sterna bengalensis par</i>	Red Sea/Eastern Africa		43,500		
<i>Sterna bengalensis bengalensis</i>	Gulf/Southern Asia		165,000		
Red-breasted Merganser <i>Mergus serrator serrator</i>	Western Siberia/Southwest & Central Asia	LC	5,001	225,001	Y
	Northeast Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean		50,000		
	Northwest & Central Europe (win)		170,000		
Great White Pelican <i>Pelecanus onocrotalus</i>	Europe & Western Asia (bre)	LC	26,500	256,500	Y
	Southern Africa		30,000		
	West Africa		60,000		
	Eastern Africa		140,000		
Goosander <i>Mergus merganser merganser</i>	Northeast Europe/Black Sea	LC	10,000	296,100	Y
	Western Siberia/Caspian		20,000		
	Northwest & Central Europe (win)		266,100		Y
Sacred Ibis <i>Threskiornis aethiopicus aethiopicus</i>	Iraq & Iran	LC	200	325,200	Y
	SubSaharan Africa		325,000		
Common Crane <i>Grus grus</i>	Turkey & Georgia (bre)	LC	350	345,350	Y
	Eastern Europe/Turkey, Middle East & NE Africa		35,000		
	Western Siberia/South Asia		70,000		
	Northeast & Central Europe/North Africa		90,000		
	Northwest Europe/Iberia & Morocco		150,000		
White Stork <i>Ciconia ciconia ciconia</i>	Southern Africa	LC	20	505,520	Y
	Western Asia/Southwest Asia		17,500		
	Iberia & Northwest Africa/SubSaharan Africa		93,000		
	Central & Eastern Europe/SubSaharan Africa		395,000		
Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus infuscatus</i>	Eastern Africa (Ethiopia to N Zambia)	LC	501	885,501	Y
	Southern Africa		5,001		Y
<i>Podiceps cristatus cristatus</i>	Caspian & Southwest Asia (win)	LC	10,000		
	Northwest & Western Europe		290,000		

Species and subspecies	Population	Global Threat status	Population size (ind.)	Sum of population(s) covered by AEWA (ind.)	SSAP required according to the AEWA AP
	Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)		580,000		
Velvet Scoter <i>Melanitta fusca fusca</i>	Black Sea & Caspian	LC	1,500	1,001,500	Y
	Western Siberia & Northern Europe/NW Europe		1,000,000		
Whimbrel <i>Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris</i> <i>Numenius phaeopus phaeopus</i> <i>Numenius phaeopus islandicus</i>	Southwest Asia/Eastern Africa	LC	5,001	1,495,001	Y
	Northern Europe/West Africa		265,000		
	West Siberia/Southern & Eastern Africa		550,000		
	Iceland, Faroes & Scotland/West Africa		675,000		
Greater White-fronted Goose <i>Anser albifrons albifrons</i> <i>Anser albifrons flavirostris</i>	Northern Siberia/Caspian & Iraq	LC	15,000	1,592,000	
	Western Siberia/Central Europe		25,000		Y
	Western Siberia/Black Sea & Turkey		525,000		
	NW Siberia & NE Europe/Northwest Europe		1,000,000		
	Greenland/Ireland & UK		27,000		Y
Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina schinzii</i> <i>Calidris alpina arctica</i> <i>Calidris alpina centralis</i> <i>Calidris alpina schinzii</i> <i>Calidris alpina alpina</i>	Baltic/SW Europe & NW Africa	LC	3,700	2,841,200	Y
	Britain & Ireland/SW Europe & NW Africa		24,500		
	NE Greenland/West Africa		33,000		
	Central Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa		500,000		
	Iceland & Greenland/NW and West Africa		950,000		
	NE Europe & NW Siberia/W Europe & NW Africa		1,330,000		

Population size (option 2)

Using the most up-to-date figures available in Conservation Status Report 2007, including changes in the delimitations of certain populations, the taxa/populations have been ranked according to their average number of individuals. There are 51 taxa/populations (covering 41 species) in this category. The results of the ranking exercise are given in Table 7.

Table 7 – Taxa/populations (marked as 1a, 1c or * in column A of the Table 1 of the Action Plan) ranked according to their size. Population size is given as average of the range given in Conservation Status Report (2007)

Species and subspecies	Population	Population size (average, ind.)	Global Threat Status (2007)
White Stork <i>Ciconia ciconia ciconia</i>	Southern Africa	20	
Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Turkey (bre)	45	
Sacred Ibis <i>Threskiornis aethiopicus aethiopicus</i>	Iraq & Iran	200	
White-backed Duck <i>Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus</i>	West Africa	250	
Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Lake Chad basin ²	250	
Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii bangsi</i>	North Arabian Sea (Oman)	300	
Common Crane <i>Grus grus</i>	Turkey & Georgia (bre)	350	
Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus infuscatus</i>	Eastern Africa (Ethiopia to N Zambia)	500	
Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Black Sea (Ukraine)/Northeast Africa	675	
Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii dougallii</i>	Southern Africa	765	
Bewick's Swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i>	Northern Siberia/Caspian	1,000	
Black Stork <i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Southwest Europe/West Africa	1,335	
Velvet Scoter <i>Melanitta fusca fusca</i>	Black Sea & Caspian	1,500	
Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii thalassina</i>	Eastern Africa & Seychelles	1,500	
Caspian Tern <i>Sterna caspia caspia</i>	Southern Africa (bre)	2,000	
Black-winged Lapwing <i>Vanellus melanopterus minor</i>	Southern Africa	2,500	
Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons guineae</i>	West Africa (bre)	2,500	
Black Stork <i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Southern Africa	2,805	
Hottentot Teal <i>Anas hottentota</i>	Lake Chad Basin	3,000	
Ruddy Shelduck <i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>	Northwest Africa	3,000	
African Spoonbill <i>Platalea alba</i>	Madagascar	3,000	
Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata vittata</i>	P. Edward, Marion, Crozet & Kerguelen/S. Africa	3,350	
Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata tristanensis</i>	Tristan da Cunha & Gough/South Africa	3,450	
Great Knot <i>Calidris tenuirostris</i>	Eastern Siberia/SW Asia & W Southern Asia	3,500	
Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina schinzii</i>	Baltic/SW Europe & NW Africa	3,700	
Red-knobbed Coot <i>Fulica cristata</i>	Madagascar	4,000	
Lesser Crested Tern <i>Sterna bengalensis emigrata</i>	S Mediterranean/NW & West Africa coasts	4,000	
Squacco Heron <i>Ardeola ralloides ralloides</i>	SW Europe, NW Africa (bre)	4,150	
Chestnut-banded Plover <i>Charadrius pallidus venustus</i>	Eastern Africa	4,500	
Great Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris capensis</i>	Southern Africa	5,000	
Great Northern Diver <i>Gavia immer</i>	Europe (win)	5,000	
African Pygmy-goose <i>Nettapus auritus</i>	West Africa	5,000	

Species and subspecies	Population	Population size (average, ind.)	Global Threat Status (2007)
Greater Sandplover <i>Charadrius leschenaultii columbinus</i>	Turkey & SW Asia/E. Mediterranean & Red Sea	5,000	
Red-breasted Merganser <i>Mergus serrator serrator</i>	Western Siberia/Southwest & Central Asia	5,000	
Streaky-breasted Flufftail <i>Sarothrura boehmi</i>	Central Africa	5,000	
Whimbrel <i>Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris</i>	Southwest Asia/Eastern Africa	5,000	
White-billed Diver <i>Gavia adamsii</i>	Northern Europe (win)	5,000	
Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus infuscatus</i>	Southern Africa	5,000	
African Black Oystercatcher <i>Haematopus moquini</i>	Coastal Southern Africa	5,500	NT
Slavonian Grebe <i>Podiceps auritus auritus</i>	Northwest Europe (largebilled)	5,700	
Baillon's Crake <i>Porzana pusilla intermedia</i>	Europe (bre)	6,000	
Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Eastern Africa (Rift Valley)	6,375	
Egyptian Goose <i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>	West Africa	7,500	
Grey Crowned Crane <i>Balearica regulorum regulorum</i>	Southern Africa (N to Angola & S Zimbabwe)	8,000	
Crowned Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax coronatus</i>	Coastal Southwest Africa	8,700	NT
Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii enigma</i>	Madagascar & Mozambique/Southern Africa	8,750	
Caspian Tern <i>Sterna caspia caspia</i>	Europe (bre)	9,500	
Goosander <i>Mergus merganser merganser</i>	Northeast Europe/Black Sea	10,000	
White-backed Duck <i>Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus</i>	Eastern & Southern Africa	17,500	
Greater White-fronted Goose <i>Anser albifrons albifrons</i>	Western Siberia/Central Europe	25,000	
Great White Pelican <i>Pelecanus onocrotalus</i>	Europe & Western Asia (bre)	26,500	
Greater White-fronted Goose <i>Anser albifrons flavirostris</i>	Greenland/Ireland & UK	27,000	
White-eyed Gull <i>Larus leucophthalmus</i>	Red Sea & nearby coasts	40,600	NT

Population trend and size (option 3)

Populations smaller than 10,000 individuals and declining (DEC) have been ranked according to their size (using the average between minimum and maximum estimates). There are 15 populations (15 species) in this category.

Populations classified as stable (STA) or for which trend information is not available (?) have been added. They have been ranked according to their size and added after the largest declining population in the list. There are 26 populations (23 species) that are stable or without trend information. The results of the ranking exercise are given in Table 8. With this approach 41 populations (37 species) are listed. The only *Near Threatened* species in this list is the Crowned Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax coronatus*).

Table 8 – Populations smaller than 10,000 individuals ranked according to their trend. The average of the range given in Conservation Status Report (2007) has been used for ranking.

Species and subspecies	Population	Population size (inds)	Trend
Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Turkey (bre)	30-60	DEC
Sacred Ibis <i>Threskiornis aethiopicus aethiopicus</i>	Iraq & Iran	200	DEC
White-backed Duck <i>Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus</i>	West Africa	<500	DEC
Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Lake Chad basin ²	<500	DEC
Common Crane <i>Grus grus</i>	Turkey & Georgia (bre)	200-500	DEC
Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus infuscatus</i>	Eastern Africa (Ethiopia to N Zambia)	<1,000	DEC
Yellow-billed Stork <i>Mycteria ibis</i>	Madagascar	<1,000	DEC
Black-winged Lapwing <i>Vanellus melanopterus minor</i>	Southern Africa	2,000-3,000	DEC
Ruddy Shelduck <i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>	Northwest Africa	3,000	DEC
Hottentot Teal <i>Anas hottentota</i>	Lake Chad Basin	1,000-5,000	DEC
Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina schinzii</i>	Baltic/SW Europe & NW Africa	3,300-4,100	DEC
Red-knobbed Coot <i>Fulica cristata</i>	Madagascar	2,000-6,000	DEC
Great Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris capensis</i>	Southern Africa	5,000	DEC
African Pygmy-goose <i>Nettapus auritus</i>	West Africa	<10,000	DEC
Streaky-breasted Flufftail <i>Sarothrura boehmi</i>	Central Africa	<10,000	DEC
Whimbrel <i>Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris</i>	Southwest Asia/Eastern Africa	<10,000	DEC
Egyptian Goose <i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>	West Africa	5,000-10,000	DEC
White Stork <i>Ciconia ciconia ciconia</i>	Southern Africa	20	STA
Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii bangsi</i>	North Arabian Sea (Oman)	<600	?
Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Black Sea (Ukraine)/Northeast Africa	600-750	STA
Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii dougallii</i>	Southern Africa	750-780	?
Bewick's Swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i>	Northern Siberia/Caspian	1,000	?
Velvet Scoter <i>Melanitta fusca fusca</i>	Black Sea & Caspian	1,500	?
Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii thalassina</i>	Eastern Africa & Seychelles	1,300-1,700	?
Caspian Tern <i>Sterna caspia caspia</i>	Southern Africa (bre)	2,000	STA
Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons guineae</i>	West Africa (bre)	2,000-3,000	?
Black Stork <i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Southern Africa	1,560-4,050	STA
African Spoonbill <i>Platalea alba</i>	Madagascar	1,000-5,000	?
Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata vittata</i>	P.Edward, Marion, Crozet & Kerguelen/South Africa	>6,700	?

Species and subspecies	Population	Population size (inds)	Trend
Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata tristanensis</i>	Tristan da Cunha & Gough/South Africa	2,400-4,500	?
Great Knot <i>Calidris tenuirostris</i>	Eastern Siberia/SW Asia & W Southern Asia	2,000-5,000	?
Lesser Crested Tern <i>Sterna bengalensis emigrata</i>	S Mediterranean/NW & West Africa coasts	4,000	STA
Chestnut-banded Plover <i>Charadrius pallidus venustus</i>	Eastern Africa	4,000-5,000	?
Great Northern Diver <i>Gavia immer</i>	Europe (win)	5,000	?
White-billed Diver <i>Gavia adamsii</i>	Northern Europe (win)	<10,000	?
Red-breasted Merganser <i>Mergus serrator serrator</i>	Western Siberia/Southwest & Central Asia	<10,000	?
Greater Sandplover <i>Charadrius leschenaultii columbinus</i>	Turkey & SW Asia/E. Mediterranean & Red Sea	<10,000	?
Slavonian Grebe <i>Podiceps auritus auritus</i>	Northwest Europe (largebilled)	4,600-6,800	STA
Baillon's Crak <i>Porzana pusilla intermedia</i>	Europe (bre)	2,000-10,000	?
Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Eastern Africa (Rift Valley)	5,750-7,000	STA
Grey Crowned Crane <i>Balearica regulorum regulorum</i>	Southern Africa (N to Angola & S Zimbabwe)	7,000-9,000	STA
Crowned Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax coronatus</i>	Coastal Southwest Africa	8,700	STA
Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii enigma</i>	Madagascar & Mozambique/Southern Africa	7,500-10,000	?
Goosander <i>Mergus merganser merganser</i>	Northeast Europe/Black Sea	10,000	?

Conclusions and recommendations

The highest priority should be given to the development of SSAPs for the 9 Globally Threatened species (*Endangered* and *Vulnerable*) in the AEWA list.

More difficult is to prioritize among the several dozen other taxa that Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan identifies as in need for a SSAP.

The Red List criteria assess the risk of extinction using different parameters, including population size and trend at species level. Only few regional applications of the red listing process exist for birds and no such attempt has been done for the entire AEWA region and its migratory populations. The three approaches presented above do not represent an attempt to develop a Red List for the AEWA region.

The trend information available from the three Conservation Status Reports so far published (1999, 2002 and 2007) could have been used as a trend-over-time indicator, but the authors acknowledge that the trend stated in the source has been used regardless of the time base. The most recent trend has been chosen if more than one was available. There are also no recommended standards regarding the magnitude of change necessary before a population trend can be stated as increasing or decreasing.

Nevertheless ignoring trend information can be very misleading. Using only the population size risks prioritising small populations that are stable or increasing in favour of larger populations that may be declining rapidly.

Two examples can be given here:

1. The Baltic population of Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*) is declining so fast that it may go extinct very soon. The taxa only ranks 42nd in Table 6 and 24th in Table 4 (10th in Table 8).
2. The SW European population of Black Stork (*Ciconia nigra*) ranks pretty high in both tables (14th in Table 6 and 12th in Table 7) but it is increasing in size and therefore not a priority for a SSAP.

The third option seems to correct the situation and *Calidris alpina schinzii* ranks 10th and the SW European population of *Ciconia nigra* is not in the list.

It is therefore recommended to use as a reference for the development of future Single Species Action Plans the list below (table 9) which ranks first the Endangered, then the Vulnerable species, according to their population size and finally the taxa listed and ranked in Table 8.

Table 9 – Priority list for the development of SSAPs.

Rank	Species and subspecies	Population
1	Bank Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax neglectus</i>	Coastal Southwest Africa
2	Slaty Egret <i>Egretta vinaceigula</i>	Southcentral Africa
3	Shoebill <i>Balaeniceps rex</i>	Central Tropical Africa
4	Wattled Crane <i>Grus carunculatus</i>	Central & Southern Africa
5	Madagascar Pratincole <i>Glareola ocularis</i>	Madagascar/East Africa
6	African Penguin <i>Spheniscus demersus</i>	Southern Africa
7	Socotra Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax nigrogularis</i>	Arabian Coast
8		Gulf of Aden, Socotra, Arabian Sea
9	Cape Gannet <i>Sula (Morus) capensis</i>	Southern Africa
10	Blue Crane <i>Grus paradisea</i>	Extreme Southern Africa
11	Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Turkey (bre)
12	Sacred Ibis <i>Threskiornis aethiopicus aethiopicus</i>	Iraq & Iran
13	White-backed Duck <i>Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus</i>	West Africa
14	Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Lake Chad basin ²
15	Common Crane <i>Grus grus</i>	Turkey & Georgia (bre)
16	Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus infuscatus</i>	Eastern Africa (Ethiopia to N Zambia)
17	Yellow-billed Stork <i>Mycteria ibis</i>	Madagascar
18	Black-winged Lapwing <i>Vanellus melanopterus minor</i>	Southern Africa
19	Ruddy Shelduck <i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>	Northwest Africa
20	Hottentot Teal <i>Anas hottentota</i>	Lake Chad Basin
21	Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina schinzii</i>	Baltic/SW Europe & NW Africa
22	Red-knobbed Coot <i>Fulica cristata</i>	Madagascar
23	Great Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris capensis</i>	Southern Africa
24	African Pygmy-goose <i>Nettapus auritus</i>	West Africa
25	Streaky-breasted Flufftail <i>Sarothrura boehmi</i>	Central Africa
26	Whimbrel <i>Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris</i>	Southwest Asia/Eastern Africa
27	Egyptian Goose <i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>	West Africa
28	White Stork <i>Ciconia ciconia ciconia</i>	Southern Africa
29	Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii bangsi</i>	North Arabian Sea (Oman)
30	Demoiselle Crane <i>Grus virgo</i>	Black Sea (Ukraine)/Northeast Africa
31	Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii dougallii</i>	Southern Africa
32	Bewick's Swan <i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i>	Northern Siberia/Caspian
33	Velvet Scoter <i>Melanitta fusca fusca</i>	Black Sea & Caspian
34	Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii thalassina</i>	Eastern Africa & Seychelles
35	Caspian Tern <i>Sterna caspia caspia</i>	Southern Africa (bre)
36	Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons guineae</i>	West Africa (bre)
37	Black Stork <i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Southern Africa
38	African Spoonbill <i>Platalea alba</i>	Madagascar
39	Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata vittata</i>	P.Edward, Marion, Crozet & Kerguelen/South Africa
40	Antarctic Tern <i>Sterna vittata tristanensis</i>	Tristan da Cunha & Gough/South Africa
41	Great Knot <i>Calidris tenuirostris</i>	Eastern Siberia/SW Asia & W Southern Asia
42	Lesser Crested Tern <i>Sterna bengalensis emigrata</i>	S Mediterranean/NW & West Africa coasts
43	Chestnut-banded Plover <i>Charadrius pallidus venustus</i>	Eastern Africa
44	Great Northern Diver <i>Gavia immer</i>	Europe (win)
45	White-billed Diver <i>Gavia adamsii</i>	Northern Europe (win)
46	Red-breasted Merganser <i>Mergus serrator serrator</i>	Western Siberia/Southwest & Central Asia

Rank	Species and subspecies	Population
47	Greater Sandplover <i>Charadrius leschenaultii columbinus</i>	Turkey & SW Asia/E. Mediterranean & Red Sea
48	Slavonian Grebe <i>Podiceps auritus auritus</i>	Northwest Europe (largebilled)
49	Baillon's Crak <i>Porzana pusilla intermedia</i>	Europe (bre)
50	Cape Teal <i>Anas capensis</i>	Eastern Africa (Rift Valley)
51	Grey Crowned Crane <i>Balearica regulorum regulorum</i>	Southern Africa (N to Angola & S Zimbabwe)
52	Crowned Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax coronatus</i>	Coastal Southwest Africa
53	Great Crested Tern <i>Sterna bergii enigma</i>	Madagascar & Mozambique/Southern Africa
54	Goosander <i>Mergus merganser merganser</i>	Northeast Europe/Black Sea

4 Species/populations for which action plans should be updated / revised.

The proposed criteria for the identification of priority species for which to develop Single Species Action Plans are given in a separate document.

Concerning the existing action plans endorsed by international treaties (i.e. European Commission, Bern and Bonn Conventions and AEWA) the priority should be given to those action plans that have reached their deadlines but have not yet achieved their aims. In particular:

Slender-billed Curlew (CR): The existing draft developed for the CMS MoU needs to be finalised and work should start in order to keep the interest awake and train personnel in Central Asia and the Middle East

Red-breasted Goose (EN): The existing Red Breasted Goose Working Group need to be asked to develop a revised action plan to address the dramatic decline recorded in the last few years.

Dalmatian Pelican (VU): The action plan has been a success in Europe (in particular in Greece) where the species has increased and a new colony was established. There is still a need to work in the Balkan Peninsula and further east since the population wintering in Southwest Asia & South Asia is still declining.

Lesser White-fronted Goose (VU): The process of updating the action plan has already started and should be completed soon.

Marbled Teal (VU): The experience gathered in Spain should be exported to North Africa and further east to extend the current work into Central and East Asia.

Audouin's Gull (NT): The experience gathered in the northern shores of the Mediterranean should be used in the Asian and African range of the species.

The list largely overlaps with what was proposed by BirdLife International to the Ornis Committee (EU). The only differences are the Dalmatian Pelican and the Audouin's Gull since their populations occurring in the EU are increasing and are no longer considered a priority in the EU.

5 Lessons Learnt

Need to improve the data flow

The rate of replies received from the National AEWA Focal Points (FP) has been lower than expected. There are probably several reasons for this. Several similar questionnaires circulated recently to the FPs all competed for the limited time the civil servants had for reporting to AEWA. The limited amount of time is a common and widespread problem and despite the production of a simplified questionnaire, only a quarter of the countries replied with information.

A better level of engagement of the national authorities can be reached if their reporting duties (or request for information) are better distributed over time and if the same information could be used, with no or limited further work, to fulfil the reporting requirements of different international treaties (e.g. EU, CMS, Bern Convention, Regional Sea conventions, etc).

BirdLife International is working on an on-line data collection / reporting facility that could contribute to sharing information and reporting.

The existence of a working group with committed members appointed by the Contracting Parties could be a way to simplify the data collection process at national level and an international coordinator could be charged with the task of keeping the information flow in place and up-to-date.

The existence of a well functioning working group is important

Species which have a working group have performed better than species without a core group of conservationists/researchers committed to the species.

The Threatened Steppe-breeding Waders Working Group (TSBWVG), for example, is behind the excellent work carried out on both the Black-winged Pratincole and the Sociable Lapwing and the International Advisory Group on the Northern Bald Ibis (IAGNBI) significantly contributes to the coordination of the work on this *Critically Endangered* species. It is important that the coordinator of the TSBWVG is replaced as soon as possible.

The sudden decline of the Red-breasted Goose has been recorded because there was an internationally coordinated monitoring scheme in place, despite the fact that the targets set in the existing (but outdated) species action plan were met.

Each working group needs to have a clear Terms of Reference, endorsed by AEWA, and a coordinator in the position to allocate enough time and resources to promote the SSAP and contribute to the fund-raising efforts.

Most of the conservation activities are taking place in Europe

The geographical distribution of the SSAPs is biased towards Europe. Also for the species migrating long distances, most of the conservation efforts have been concentrated in Europe and more precisely in the EU. This is particularly true for the SSAPs developed in 1996. The number and list of priority species in Africa is quite different and longer than the list in Europe. It is unlikely that the conservation efforts in Africa will be directed towards species which are not Globally Threatened.

The history of action planning in Europe is, on the other hand, longer than in Africa where the existing action plans targeting African bird species have been developed in the last 2 years.

The priorities in Central Asia are not that different from Europe, but the local conservation capacity has been improving only in the last few years. All of the species for which the Action Plan failed to meet the targets the reason included (and often as the main cause) their decline in Asia. The Dalmatian Pelican work in Europe, for example, has been successful, but the decline in the Asian part of the population has not been addressed yet.

The speed of habitat loss in the Asian part of the AEWA range is very high and has increased in the last few years following the political changes, but also exacerbated by a drought which is affecting all the wetlands.

The impact of the new EU Budget is still unclear

The changes in the EU budget and its financial instruments are likely to have an impact on the conservation of species and habitats occurring in EU, but also on the resources available for conservation in the countries outside the EU.

The impact, of the recent changes in the Common Agricultural Policy, is still not clear. The degree to which opportunities were taken to influence land use and agriculture practices through the Regional Development Plans (RDP) is unclear. These changes will have an impact on most of the bird populations covered by the AEWA SSAPs and in particular on Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*, Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota* (East Canadian High Arctic population), Red breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis*, Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*, Corncrake *Crex crex* and Great Snipe *Gallinago media*.

The European Union had a number of programmes (MEDA, TACIS, etc.) some of which were specifically aimed at providing financial support for conservation actions carried out by NGOs. In 2007 they have been replaced by a single instrument - the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). It seems that the focus has shifted toward direct structural support to the government through twinning agreements between governments and somewhat reduced the involvement of the NGOs.

Need to explore further cooperation

There are a number of international organisations whose work is likely to be in line with that of AEWA on SSAPs.

The Regional Seas conventions, all under the coordination of UNEP - as AEWA is - are developing protocols for the protections of species which call for cooperative actions and plans. Cooperation can result in improved implementation of the SSAPs in particular in those regions where AEWA is less represented.

The conservation programmes of WWF and of Conservation International are certainly contributing to the conservation of birds species within the AEWA geographical range. Their approach does not directly include the use of the SSAPs. Engaging them in the action planning work and encouraging them to see their work as a way to contribute to the aims of AEWA may create another win-win opportunity.

References

- BirdLife International. 2004. *Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation status*. Wageningen, The Netherlands: BirdLife International. BirdLife Conservation Series No. 12.
- BirdLife International. 2007. Species factsheets (several) Downloaded from <http://www.birdlife.org> in September and October 2007.
- Boehm C., Bowden C.G.R., Jordan M. & King C. (eds). 2007. *Proceedings of the International Advisory Group for the Northern Bald Ibis (IAGNBI) meeting in Vejer, Spain September 2006* RSPB The Lodge, Sandy Bedfordshire, UK.
- Delany S., Scott D.A., Helmink T. & Martakis G. 2007. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. Third Edition. AEWA Technical Series No.13. Bonn, Germany.
- Dereliev S.G. 2006. The Red-breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis* in the new millennium: a thriving species or a species on the brink of extinction? In: G.C. Boere, C.A. Galbraith & D.A. Stroud (eds). *Waterbirds around the world*. The Stationery Office, Edinburgh, UK. pp. 619-623.
- Gallo-Orsi U. 2001. *Saving Europe's most threatened birds: progress in implementing European Species Action Plans*. BirdLife International: Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Heredia B., Rose L. & Painter M. (eds.) 1996. *Globally threatened birds in Europe: Action plans*. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, France. 408pp.
- Nagy S. & Crockford N. 2004. *Implementation in the European Union of species action plans for 23 of Europe's most threatened birds*, BirdLife International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Scott D.A. 2002. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. Second Edition. Information document to the MOP2 (Inf 2.14), Bonn Germany.
- Wetlands International. 1999. Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area. AEWA Technical Series No. 1, Bonn, Germany.
- Wetlands International. 2006. *Waterbird Population Estimates – Fourth Edition*. Wetlands International, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Action Plans endorsed by international treaties

- Belik V. P. & Lebedeva E. A. 2004. International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Black winged Pratincole (*Glareola nordmanni*). AEWA Technical Series No. 4. Bonn, Germany.
- Berruti A., Baker N., Buijs D., Colahan B.D., Davies C., Dellegn Y., Eksteen J., Kolberg H., Marchant A., Mpofu Z., Nantongo-Kalundu P., Nnyiti P., Pienaar K., Shaw K., Tyali T., van Niekerk J., Wheeler M.J. & Evans S.W. 2007. International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Maccoa Duck *Oxyura maccoa*. AEWA Technical Series No. 14. Bonn, Germany.
- Crivelli A. J. 1996. Action plan for the Dalmatian Pelican (*Pelecanus crispus*) in Europe. In: B. Heredia *et al.* (eds) 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France.

- Crivelli a. J., Nazirides T. & Jerrentrup H. 1996. Action plan for the Pygmy Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax pygmeus*) in Europe. In: B. Heredia *et al.* 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France
- Green A. 1996. International action plan for the Marbled Teal (*Marmaronetta angustirostris*). In: B. Heredia *et al.* (eds) 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France.
- Gretton A. 1996. International action plan for the Slender-billed Curlew (*Numenius tenuirostris*). In: B. Heredia *et al.* (eds) 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France.
- Hughes, B., Robinson, J. A., Green, A. J., Li, Z. W. D. and Mundkur. T. 2006. International single species action plan for the conservation of the White-headed Duck. CMS Technical Series No. 13 & AEW Technical Series No. 8. Bonn, Germany.
- Hunter J. M. & Black J. M. 1996. International action plan for the Red-breasted Goose (*Branta ruficollis*) In: B. Heredia *et al.* (eds) 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France.
- Jimenez Armesto M. J., Boehm C. & Bowden C. 2006. International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*. AEW Technical Series No. 10. Bonn, Germany.
- Kålås J. A. 2004. International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Great snipe (*Gallinago media*). AEW Technical Series No. 5. Bonn, Germany.
- Koffijberg K. and Schaffer N. 2006. International single species action plan for the conservation of the Corncrake *Crex crex*. CMS Technical Series No. 14 & AEW Technical Series No. 9. Bonn, Germany
- Lambertini M. 1996. International action plan for Audouin's Gull (*Larus audouinii*) In: B. Heredia *et al.* (eds) 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France.
- Madsen J. 1996. International action plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) In: B. Heredia *et al.* (eds) 1996. *Globally Threatened Birds in Europe. Action Plans*. Council of Europe Strasbourg, France.
- Newbery P. 1999. International (East Atlantic) Action Plan for Roseate Tern *Sterna dougallii*. European Commission
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/sterna_dougalli.pdf
- Newbery P., Schäffer N. & Smith K. 2001. European Union Action Plan for Bittern (*Botaurus stellaris*) In: Schäffer N. & Gallo Orsi U. (eds) 2001. *European Union action plans for eight priority bird species*. European Communities, Luxembourg.
- Pihl S. 2001. European Species Action Plan for Steller's Eider (*Polysticta stelleri*). In: Schäffer N. & Gallo Orsi U. (eds) 2001. *European Union action plans for eight priority bird species*. European Communities, Luxembourg.
- Raya Gómez C. 1999. International Species Action Plan for Crested Coot (*Fulica cristata*). European Commission.
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/fulica_cristata.pdf
- Robinson J. A. and Hughes B. 2006. International single species action plan for the conservation of the Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*. CMS Technical Series No. 12 & AEW Technical Series No. 7. Bonn, Germany.

- Robinson J.A. & Colhoun K. 2006. International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Light-bellied Brent Goose (East Canadian High Arctic population) *Branta bernicla hrota*. AEWA Technical Series No. 11. Bonn, Germany.
- Tomkovich P. S. & Lebedeva E. A. 2004. International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius*. AEWA Technical Series No. 2. Bonn, Germany.
- UNEP MAP RAC/SPA. 2003. Action Plan for the Conservation of bird species listed in Annex II of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas (SPAs), and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean. Ed. RAC/SPA, Tunis. 80pp

Other Action Plans

- Burke A., 1996. Status, survey and conservation action plan for the Wattled Crane (*Bucconas carunculatus*) by in: Meine CD, Archibald GW. 1996. *The cranes: status survey and conservation action plan*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN
- Ellis S., Croxall J. P. & Cooper J. (eds). 1998. PENGUIN Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (PENGUIN CAMP) in: Ellis, S., Croxall, J.P. and Cooper, J. 1998. *Penguin Conservation Assessment and Management Plan*. Report. IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, Apple Valley, MN 55124 USA. http://www.unep-aewa.org/meetings/en/mop/mop3_docs/national_reports/pdf/south_africa_nat_rep_appendix1_2.pdf
- Meine C.D., Archibald G. W. 1996 Status, Survey and Conservation Action Plan for the Blue Crane (*Anthropoides paradisea*). In Meine CD, Archibald GW. 1996. *The cranes: status survey and conservation action plan*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN
- Meine, Curt D. and George W. Archibald (Eds). 1996. *The cranes: - Status survey and conservation action plan*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, and Cambridge, U.K. 294pp. Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Online. <http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/birds/cranes/index.htm> (Version 02MAR98).

ANNEXES

Annex 1 Sample questionnaire



 **AEWA**

Common name

(*Scientific name*)

Year of publication

Questionnaire on the implementation of the Single Species Action Plan for the

.....

.....

.....



The activities listed in the questionnaire may not be relevant for all species. We recommend you to familiarize yourself with the relevant Single Species Action Plan before compiling the questionnaire.

Please return the filled in questionnaire(s)

Preferably by email SAPreview@rubiconfoundation.org

If necessary by post: Rubicon Foundation, Roghorst 117, 6708 KE Wageningen, NL

by 31st October 2007

Compiled by

Organization
and address

Date

A. Species Protection

A.1. The species: (tick as appropriate)

- is protected in all national territory
- is protected only in certain administrative regions

A.1.2. Please provide details of the difference among administrative regions regarding the protection status. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- is protected year round
- is protected only in during the period (dates).....
- can be killed under license or by derogations

A.1.3. Please provide details about the conditions under which derogations or licenses are granted. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- can be legally hunted year round
- can be legally hunted during the period
- can be hunted and the annual bag is estimated as: (number)..... individuals

A.2. The protection includes the killing, taking or destruction of: (tick as appropriate)

- Adults and chicks
- Nests and eggs during breeding season
- Nest at any time of the year
- Nesting sites (i.e. colonies) during breeding season
- Nesting sites (i.e. colonies) at any time of the year

A.3. The penalty for illegally killing/taking the species is: (amount).....

B. Species Action Plans

B.1. A National action plan:

(tick as appropriate)

- is requested by law
- is in the planning stage
- is being developed
- has been developed
- is being implemented
- is publicly available

by
by
by
at

Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text boxes if you are using the electronic format

(contact details).....
(contact details).....
(contact details).....
(indicate URL or contact person)

B.2. A Regional action plan:

(tick as appropriate)

- is requested by law
- is in the planning stage
- is being developed
- has been developed
- is being implemented

in
in
in
in
in

Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text boxes if you are using the electronic format

(region).....

B.2.1 Please provide details for the regional action plans regarding who/which organization is developing/implementing the regional action plans and relevant contact details and web links. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

B.3 National Species Working Group

B.3.1 A National Species Working Group has been established in year:

B.3.1. The current coordinator of the NSWG is

(name and contact details)

.....

.....

B.3. Copy of the action plan(s) is/are enclosed

C. Habitat Conservation

Please refer to the action plan (included in the CD) and describe what actions have been taken in your country, the amount of land (in hectares) covered by these actions and the likely number of birds that have been positively affected.

C.1 Prevention of habitat loss by:

	(tick as appropriate)				
Management of grazing	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text" value="(number)....."/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text" value="(number)....."/> birds.
Reed cutting / harvesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Promotion of proper farming practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Promotion of proper fishing practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Management of forestry	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Removal of introduced animals (e.g. Carps)	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
.....					

C.1.1. Please provide details on the actions undertaken indicating level of effectiveness and engagement of local communities. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

C.2 Creation / restoration of suitable habitat:

	(tick as appropriate)				
Habitat restoration	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text" value="(number)....."/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text" value="(number)....."/> birds.
Habitat recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Reintroduction of wild ungulates	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Disturbance removed	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	on	<input type="text"/>	Ha and affecting	<input type="text"/> birds.
.....					

C.2.1. Please provide details on the actions undertaken, indicating who is responsible, the level of effectiveness and the engagement of local communities. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

D. Direct causes of mortality

Please refer to the action plan (included in the CD) and describe what actions have been taken in your country. Tick as appropriate

D.1. Dangerous power lines:

- (tick as appropriate)
- have been identified
 - have been marked
 - have been removed / buried on Km

D.1.1. Please provide details on the actions undertaken to remove this cause of mortality and the engagement with stakeholders. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

D.2. Lead shots use:

- (tick as appropriate)
- is prohibited in the entire country
 - is prohibited in wetlands
 - is being phased out
 - will be prohibited by the year

D.2.1. Please provide details on the actions undertaken toward the prohibition of the use of lead shots and the engagement with stakeholders. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

D.3. Persecution and illegal killing, etc.

Please provide details on the actions undertaken to address persecution and illegal killings and any other activities aimed at reducing direct mortality and their effectiveness. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

E. Research

Please refer to the action plan (included in the CD) and describe what research has been undertaken in your country. Tick as appropriate in the table below indicating the status of the research. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the table if you are using the electronic format.

Subject	Status			
	planned	ongoing	completed	published
Distribution and occurrence of the species				
Breeding success				
Food availability/needs				
Threats				
Migration routes				
Survival / recruitment				
Annual hunting bag				
Suitable habitat distribution				
Other (please specify)				

E.1. Please provide details on the research carried out, indicating also where the results are or will be available. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

F. Public awareness

Please refer to the action plan (included in the CD) and describe what public awareness activities have been undertaken in your country. Tick as appropriate in the table below indicating the target group(s), the number of people reached, the message delivered, and the kinds of materials produced. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the table if you are using the electronic format.

Target groups	No. of people reached	Message delivered (e.g. "The species needs protection", "How to help the species", "how to identify it", etc...)	Material produced / means (posters, leaflets, radio/TV programmes...)
General public			
Farmers			
Local communities			
Hunters			
Fishermen			
Wildlife wardens/ rangers / protected areas staff			
Tourists			
Others (please specify).....			

G. Population management

G.1. A reintroduction programme: (tick as appropriate)

- is in the planning stage	<input type="checkbox"/>		
- is being developed	<input type="checkbox"/>	by	(contact details)
- is being implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	by	(contact details)

G.2. Control of feral population of competing species (tick as appropriate)

- is in the planning stage	<input type="checkbox"/>		
- is being developed	<input type="checkbox"/>	by	(contact details)
- is being implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	by	(contact details)

G.2.1. Please provide details on reintroduction and or population control activates carried out in your country.. Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

H. Population monitoring

H.1. The species is regularly monitored in the country Yes No

H.1.1. The monitoring is carried out by:

	(tick as appropriate)		Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.
- Governmental agency(ies)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Name:
- Non Governmental Organization(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Name:
- University(ies)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Name:
- Protected areas staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	Name:
- Others	<input type="checkbox"/>	Name:

H.1.2. The monitoring is carried out as a cooperative action:

H.1.3. Please provide additional information on the cooperation (which organisations working with each other). Please feel free to add further information in a separate sheet or simply add lines to the text box if you are using the electronic format.

.....

.....

.....

.....

H.2. Please provide the latest population data for the species in the table below

Period	Year(s)	Unit (individuals or pairs)	Minimum	Maximum	Type of estimate see below for definitions	Derivation see below for definitions	Reliability see below for definitions
Breeding							
Wintering							
Non Breeding							
Migrating							

H.3. Please provide the percentage of the species' national population occurring within protected areas

.....%

DEFINITIONS

Type of estimate

- 1 Complete count – a full or near-full census;
- 2 Expert estimate – the best estimate in the opinion of experts studying the population of the species concerned;
- 3 Compilation – an estimate derived from a number of sources;
- 4 Extrapolation based on sample surveys.

Derivation

- A Best estimate: the best available single figure or range.
- B Five-year mean: the average minimum–maximum the period or the five-year peak mean for non-breeding birds.
- C Best estimate with 95% confidence limits: estimates derived from sample surveys in which confidence limits could be calculated.
- D Minimum: for estimates where insufficient data exist to provide an accurate estimate, but where that given is known to be a considerable underestimate.

Reliability

- 1 Poorly known, with no quantitative data available.
- 2 Generally well known, but only poor or incomplete quantitative data available.
- 3 Reliable quantitative data available (e.g. atlas, survey or monitoring data) for the whole period and country.

I. Establishment and management of protected areas

I.1. Please refer to the list of sites listed in the Action Plan or IBA - Important Bird Areas Data provided by BirdLife International in June 2007) in the excell file (*[species name].xls*) in the CD and indicate for each site:

- whether the sites are protected,
- the size of the protected area,
- the year of establishment of the protected area
- under which IUCN category they are classified
- whether the site has a management plan
- if the management plan includes specific management for the species
- Level of implementation of the management plan (0 not implemented; 5 implementation ongoing and effective).

The list may be incomplete, please add sites not listed and their relevant information.



Questionnaire sur la mise en œuvre du Plan d'Action par Espèce (SSAP) pour :



Nom commun
Nom Scientifique
Année de publication

Veillez remplir un questionnaire pour chaque espèce importante de votre pays.
Référez-vous au fichier: *distribution.doc* pour consulter la liste des espèces présentes dans votre pays. La liste a été établie en prenant en compte l'étendue géographique du Plan d'Action par Espèce. Si une espèce est présente dans votre pays mais n'apparaît pas dans la liste du fichier, veuillez remplir un questionnaire pour cette espèce.

Les activités listées dans le questionnaire pourraient ne pas être pertinentes pour toutes les espèces. Nous vous recommandons de vous familiariser avec le SSAP le plus pertinent en remplissant le questionnaire. Merci de votre coopération.

Retournez le(s) questionnaire(s) complété(s)
Préférez-vous par courrier électronique: SAPreview@rubiconfoundation.org
Si nécessaire par courrier postal, à l'adresse suivante: Fondation Rubicon, Roghorst 117, 6708 KE Wageningen, Pays-Bas.

Avant le 30 Septembre 2007.

Complété par	<input type="text"/>
Organisation et adresse	<input type="text"/>
Date	<input type="text"/>

A. Protection de l'espèce

A.1. L'espèce: (cochez la case appropriée)

- est protégée sur tout le territoire national

- est protégée dans certaines régions administratives

A.1.2. Détaillez les différences existantes entre les régions administratives en relation avec le statut de protection. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- est protégée toute l'année

- n'est protégée que pendant cette période: (dates).....

- peut être chassée par dérogation ou permis

A.1.3. Détaillez les conditions de délivrance des dérogations et permis. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- peut être chassée toute l'année

- peut être chassée légalement durant la période (dates).....

- la chasse est limitée à: (nombre)..... d'individus

A.2. La protection inclut l'abattage, la prise ou la destruction des: (cochez la case appropriée)

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Adultes et oisillons | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Nids et œufs pendant la saison de reproduction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Nids pendant toute l'année | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites de ponte (c.-à-d. les colonies) pendant la saison de reproduction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites de ponte (c.-à-d. les colonies) pendant toute l'année | <input type="checkbox"/> |

A.3. La sanction pour prise/abattage illégal de l'espèce s'élève à: (montant (€)).....

B. Plan d'Action par Espèce

B.1. Plan d'Action National:

(cochez la case appropriée)

- est exigé par la Loi
- est en phase de planification
- est en train d'être développé
- a été développé
- est en phase de mise en œuvre
- est disponible au public

Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

par	(contact)
par	(contact)
par	(contact)
sur	(adresse URL ou personne à contacter)

B.2. Plan d'Action Régional:

(cochez la case appropriée)

- est exigé par la Loi
- est en phase de planification
- est en train d'être développé
- a été développé
- est en phase de mise en œuvre

Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

à	(région)

B.2.1 Indiquez pour les Plans d'Action Régionaux quelle organisation les développe/met en œuvre et les contacts respectifs ainsi que les liens Internet.

Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

B.3 Groupe de Travail National sur les Espèces (NSWG)

B.3.1 Un Groupe de Travail National sur les Espèces a été établi en (année):

B.3.1. Le coordinateur du NSWG est

B.3. Une copie du ou des Plan (s) d'Action est/sont jointe(s)

C. Conservation des habitats

En vous référant au Plan d'Action (inclus dans le CD), décrivez quels Plans d'Actions ont été considérés dans votre pays, la surface (en hectare) d'application et le nombre probable d'oiseaux qui ont bénéficié positivement du Plan d'Action.

C.1 Prévention de la perte d'habitat:

(cochez la case appropriée)

Gestion du pâturage	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text" value="(nombre)....."/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text" value="(nombre)....."/>	d'oiseaux.
Coupe de roseaux/récolte	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Promotion de pratiques agricoles appropriées	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Promotion de pratiques de pêche appropriées	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Gestion de la foresterie	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Exclusion des animaux introduits (ex: carpes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Autres mesures :	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.

C.1.1. Détaillez les actions entreprises en indiquant le degré d'efficacité et la participation des communautés locales. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....

.....

.....

C.2 Création/restauration des habitats:

(cochez la case appropriée)

Restauration d'habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text" value="(nombre)....."/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text" value="(nombre)....."/>	d'oiseaux.
Création d'habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Réintroduction d'ongulés sauvages	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Suppression de perturbation	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.
Autres actions:	<input type="checkbox"/>	sur	<input type="text"/>	ha et touchant	<input type="text"/>	d'oiseaux.

C.2.1. Détaillez les actions entreprises en indiquant les responsables, le degré d'efficacité et la participation des communautés locales. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....
.....

D. Causes directes de mortalité

En vous référant au Plan d'Action (inclus dans le CD), décrivez quels Plans d'Actions ont été considérés dans votre pays.

D.1. Lignes haute tension dangereuses:

(Cochez la case appropriée)

- ont été identifiées
- ont été marquées
- ont été enlevées/enterrées sur Km

D.1.1. Détaillez les actions entreprises pour supprimer cette cause de mortalité et le degré de participation des parties prenantes. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....

D.2. Utilisation de grenaille de plomb:

(Cochez la case appropriée)

- est interdite dans le pays entier
- est interdite dans les zones humides
- est en train d'être éliminée
- sera interdite avant l'année

D.2.1. Détaillez les actions entreprises pour éliminer l'utilisation de grenaille de plomb et le degré de participation des parties prenantes. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....

D.3. Persécution et abattage illégal, etc.

Détaillez les actions entreprises pour résoudre le problème des persécutions et de l'abattage illégal des oiseaux ou toutes autres activités ayant pour but de réduire ces causes directes de mortalité et leur degré d'efficacité. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....

E. Recherche

En vous référant au Plan d'Action (inclus dans le CD), décrivez quelle recherche a été entreprise dans votre pays. Cochez les cases appropriées dans le tableau ci-dessous en indiquant l'avancement des recherches. Vous pouvez ajouter des informations dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

Sujet	Avancement			
	planifiée	en cours	terminée	Publiée
Distribution et présence de l'espèce				
Succès de reproduction				
Disponibilité alimentaire/besoins				
Menaces				
Routes de migration				
Survie/repeuplement				
Permis de chasse annuels				
Distribution des habitats				
Autres sujets de recherche:.....				

E.1. Détaillez les sujets de recherche en indiquant aussi où les résultats sont ou seront disponibles. Vous pouvez ajouter des informations dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

F. Information publique

En vous référant au Plan d'Action (inclus dans le CD), décrivez quelle démarche d'information publique a été entreprise dans votre pays. Cochez les cases appropriées dans le tableau ci-dessous en indiquant le ou les groupe(s) ciblé(s), le nombre de personnes touchées, le contenu du message et le type de matériel informatif produit. Vous pouvez ajouter des informations dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

Groupe ciblé	Nombre de personnes touchées	Contenu du message (ex: "L'espèce a besoin d'être protégée", "Comment aider l'espèce", "Comment l'identifier", etc....)	Matériel informatif/moyens (posters, brochures, radio/TV...)
Public général			
Agriculteurs			
Communautés locales			
Chasseurs			
Pêcheurs			
Guides Faune et Flore/rangers/équipe de zone protégée			
Touristes			
Autres groupes:.....			

G. Gestion de la population

G.1. Programme de réintroduction (cochez les cases appropriées)

- est en phase de planification	<input type="checkbox"/>			
- est en train d'être développé	<input type="checkbox"/>	par <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>(contact)</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>	(contact)
(contact)				
.....				
- est en train d'être mis en œuvre	<input type="checkbox"/>	par <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>(contact)</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>	(contact)
(contact)				
.....				

G.2. Contrôle des populations féroces ou des espèces compétitives (cochez les cases appropriées)

- est en phase de planification	<input type="checkbox"/>			
- est en train d'être développé	<input type="checkbox"/>	par <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>(contact)</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>	(contact)
(contact)				
.....				
- est en train d'être mis en œuvre	<input type="checkbox"/>	par <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>(contact)</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>	(contact)
(contact)				
.....				

G.2.1. Détaillez les activités de réintroduction et/ou de contrôle de population entreprises dans votre pays. Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....

H. Surveillance de la population

H.1. L'espèce est surveillée régulièrement dans votre pays Oui Non

H.1.1. La surveillance est effectuée par:

(cochez les cases appropriées) Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

- Agence(s) gouvernementale(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nom:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>.....</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>
.....					
.....					
- Organisation(s) Non Gouvernementale(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nom:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>.....</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>
.....					
.....					
- Université(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nom:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>.....</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>
.....					
.....					
- Equipe des aires protégées	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nom:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>.....</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>
.....					
.....					
- Autres institutions:.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nom:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td>.....</td></tr><tr><td>.....</td></tr></table>
.....					
.....					

H.1.2. la surveillance est effectuée en action concertée:

H.1.3. Donnez des détails sur la coopération entre organisations (noms des organisations et nature du travail). Vous pouvez ajouter des information dans un document joint ou bien en ajoutant des lignes dans la zone de texte si vous utilisez la version électronique.

.....
.....
.....

H.2. Donnez les informations les plus récentes sur la population de l'espèce dans le tableau ci-dessous

Période	Année(s)	Unité (individus ou couples)	Minimum	Maximum	Type d'estimation Voir les définitions	Dérivation Voir les définitions	Fiabilité Voir les définitions
Reproduisant							
Hivernant							
Non reproduisant							
Migrant							

H.3. Indiquez le pourcentage de la population nationale de l'espèce présente au sein des aires protégées

.....%

DEFINITIONS

Type d'estimation

- 1 Comptage complet – le recensement complet ou Presque complet de la population;
- 2 Estimation d'expert – la meilleure estimation selon l'opinion des experts étudiant l'espèce concernée;
- 3 Compilation – une estimation obtenues à partir de plusieurs sources;
- 4 Extrapolation basée sur un échantillon d'études.

Dérivation

- A Meilleure estimation: la meilleure "fourchette" ou chiffre disponible.
- B Moyenne quinquennale: la moyenne minimum–maximum pour les oiseaux non nichant.
- C Meilleure estimation avec une limite de confiance de 95%: estimation obtenue d'un échantillon de comptage.
- D Minimum: lorsque les données ne sont pas suffisamment disponibles, et si celles-ci peuvent être considérées come des sous-estimations.

Fiabilité

- 1 Mal connue, pas de données quantitatives disponibles.
- 2 Plutôt bien connue, mais des données quantitatives en faible nombre ou incomplètes.
- 3 Données quantitatives fiables disponibles (ex: atlas, étude ou données de recensement) pour toutes les périodes et sur la totalité du territoire du pays.

I. Mise en place et gestion des aires protégées

I.1. En vous referent à la liste des sites du Plan d'Action ou des ZICO (IBA, en anglais) – données sur les Zones Importantes pour la Conservation des Oiseaux fournies par BirdLife International en Juin 2007) dans le fichier Excel (*[nom du pays].xls*) du CD et indiquez pour chaque site:

- la protection ou non du site,
- la taille de l'aire protégée,
- l'année de mise en place de l'aire protégée,
- la catégorie IUCN (Union mondiale pour la nature (UICN)) de l'aire protégée,
- l'existence d'un plan de gestion du site,
- si le plan de gestion comporte une gestion spécifique pour l'espèce,
- le niveau de mise en œuvre du plan de gestion (0 pas encore mis en œuvre; 5 mise en œuvre du plan de gestion établie).

La liste peut être incomplète, s'il vous plait, ajoutez les sites manquant et les informations pertinentes y afférant.

Annex 2 Overview of level of replies

Questionnaires sent by post	Questionnaire sent by e-mail	AEWA Contracting Party	Country	<i>Anser erythropus</i>	<i>Aythya nyroca</i>	<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	<i>Branta ruficollis</i>	<i>Crex crex</i>	<i>Gallinago media</i>	<i>Geronticus eremita</i>	<i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	<i>Larus audouinii</i>	<i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	<i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	<i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	<i>Pelecanus crispus</i>	<i>Phalacrocorax pygmaeus</i>	<i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	Number species	
✓	✓	Y	Albania		X			X	X					X	X	X	X			7
✓	✓	Y	Algeria		Y			X	Y			Y	Y	X	Y					7
✓	✓		Angola						X		X									2
✓	✓		Austria		X			X						X	X					4
✓	✓		Azerbaijan	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X				X	9
✓	✓		Barhain								X								X	2
✓	✓		Belarus		X			X	X		X									4
✓	✓	Y	Belgium		X			X	X						X					4
✓		Y	Benin						X											1
✓	✓	Y	Bulgaria	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	Y	X			10
✓	✓		Burkina Faso						X											1
✓	✓		Burundi						X		X									2
✓			Cameroon		X				X											2
✓	✓		Canada			Y														1
✓	✓	Y	Congo (Brazzaville)					Y	Y											2
✓	✓		Cote D'Ivoire						X		X									2
✓	✓	Y	Croatia		Y			Y	Y			Y		X				Y		6
✓	✓		Cyprus		Y			Y	X		X	Y		Y						6
✓	✓	Y	Czech Republic		X			Y	X											3
✓	✓	Y	Denmark					Y							Y					2
✓		Y	Equatorial Guinea						X											1
✓	✓		Eritrea		X				X		X								X	4
✓	✓		Estonia					Y	Y											2
✓			Ethiopia		X				X		X									3
✓	✓	Y	EU	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	13
✓	✓	Y	Finland	X				X							X					3
✓	✓	Y	France		X	X		X	X		X	X			X					7
✓			Gabon						X		X									2
✓	✓	Y	Gambia		X				X											2
✓	✓	Y	Georgia		X			X	X				X	X	X					6
✓	✓	Y	Germany	X	X			X			X				X					5
✓	✓	Y	Ghana						X		X									2
✓	✓		Greenland			X														1
✓	✓	Y	Guinea						X											1
✓	✓	Y	Guinea-Bissau						X											1
✓	✓	Y	Hungary	Y	Y			Y	Y					Y	Y					6
✓	✓		Iceland			Y									Y					2
R			Iran (Islamic Republic)		X			X	X		X		X	X	X				X	8

Questionnaires sent by post	Questionnaire sent by e-mail	AEWA Contracting Party	Country	<i>Anser erythropus</i>	<i>Aythya nyroca</i>	<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	<i>Branta ruficollis</i>	<i>Crex crex</i>	<i>Gallinago media</i>	<i>Geronticus eremita</i>	<i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	<i>Larus audouinii</i>	<i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	<i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	<i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	<i>Pelecanus crispus</i>	<i>Phalacrocorax pygmeus</i>	<i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	Number species
✓	✓	Y	Ireland			Y		Y							X				3
✓	✓	Y	Israel		X			X	X		X		X		X			X	7
✓	✓	Y	Italy		Y			Y	X			Y	Y	Y	Y				7
✓	✓	Y	Jordan		X			X	X		X								4
✓			Kazakhstan	X	X			X	X		X			X	X			X	8
✓	✓	Y	Kenya		X			X	X		X								4
R	✓		Kuwait					X	X									X	3
✓	✓	Y	Latvia		X			X	Y										3
✓	✓	Y	Lebanon		X			X	X		X	X	X						6
✓			Lesotho					X											1
✓	✓		Liberia						X										1
✓		Y	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		X				X										2
✓	✓		Liechtenstein					X	X										2
✓	✓	Y	Lithuania	Y	Y			Y	Y										4
✓	✓	Y	Luxembourg					Y	Y										2
✓	✓	Y	Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic)		X			X	X					X			X		5
✓			Malawi					X	X										2
✓	✓	Y	Mali		Y				X		X								3
✓	✓	Y	Moldova		X			X	X		X						X		5
✓	✓	Y	Monaco						X										1
✓	✓	Y	Morocco		Y			Y	X	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y				8
✓	✓		Mozambique					X	X										2
✓			Namibia						X		X								2
✓	✓	Y	Netherlands		X			X	X						X				4
✓	✓	Y	Niger		X				X										2
✓	✓	Y	Nigeria		X				X		X								3
✓	✓		Norway	Y				Y	Y						X				4
✓			Oman		X			X			X			X				X	5
✓	✓		Poland		X			X	X										3
R	✓	Y	Portugal		X			X	X						X				4
✓	✓	Y	Romania	X	X		Y	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		10
✓			Russian Federation	X	X		Y	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	12
✓			Rwanda					X	X		X								3
✓	✓		Sao Tome & Principe								X								1
✓	✓		Saudi Arabia		X			X	X									X	4
✓	✓	Y	Senegal		X				X			X							3
✓	✓		Serbia		X			X	X					X		X	X		6
✓	✓		Seychelles								X								1
✓	✓		Sierra Leone						X										1
✓	✓	Y	Slovakia		X			X	X										3

Questionnaires sent by post	Questionnaire sent by e-mail	AEWA Contracting Party	Country	<i>Anser erythropus</i>	<i>Aythya nyroca</i>	<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	<i>Branta ruficollis</i>	<i>Crex crex</i>	<i>Gallinago media</i>	<i>Geronticus eremita</i>	<i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	<i>Larus audouinii</i>	<i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	<i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	<i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	<i>Pelecanus crispus</i>	<i>Phalacrocorax pygmeus</i>	<i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	Number species	
✓	✓	Y	Slovenia		Y			Y	X						X					4
✓	✓	Y	South Africa					X	X		X									3
✓	✓	Y	Spain		X	X		X	X			X	Y	X	X					8
✓	✓	Y	Sudan		X			X	X		X									4
✓	✓	Y	Sweden	X				Y	Y						X					4
✓	✓	Y	Switzerland		X			Y	X						X					4
✓	✓	Y	Syria (Arab Republic Of)		X			X	X	X	X		X		X			X		8
✓		Y	Tanzania					X	X		X									3
✓	✓	Y	Togo						X		X									2
✓	✓	Y	Tunisia		X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X				7
✓	✓		Turkey	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	14
✓			Turkmenistan		X			X	X					X	X				X	6
✓	✓	Y	Uganda					X	X		X									3
✓		Y	Ukraine	X	X		Y	X	X		X			X	X	X	X			10
✓	✓		United Arab Emirates		X			X						X					X	4
✓	✓	Y	United Kingdom			Y		Y	X						X					4
✓		Y	Uzbekistan		X			X	X		X			X	X				X	7
✓	✓		Yemen		X			X	X		X			X						5
✓	✓		Zambia					X	X		X									3
✓	✓		Zimbabwe					X	X											2
95	78	58	Totals																	

- ✓ Questionnaire sent, no returned mail/ error message received
- R Mail returned to sender
- X Species present (according to the SSAP)
- Y Reply received

Species	Total questionnaires sent	Total questionnaires received by Focal Points	Total questionnaires filled	Percentage of filled questionnaires of those received by Focal Points
Anser erythropus	14	14	3	21%
Aythya nyroca	57	56	10	17%
Branta bernicla hrota	8	8	4	50%
Branta ruficollis	6	6	3	50%
Crex crex	68	67	17	25%
Gallinago media	84	83	10	12%
Geronticus eremita	4	4	1	25%
Glareola nordmanni	42	41	0	0%
Larus audouinii	12	12	5	42%
Marmaronetta angustirostris	14	13	5	38%
Numenius tenuirostris	26	25	4	16%
Oxyura leucocephala	35	34	7	20%
Pelecanus crispus	8	8	1	13%
Phalacrocorax pygmeus	11	11	2	18%
Vanellus gregarius	16	15	0	0%
Total	405	397	72	18%

Annex 3 List of contributors

Country	Name	Organization	Species / subject
Algeria	Melle Saifouni Aida	Direction Générale des Forêts, Bureau des zones humide, 11 chemin Doudou Mokhtar Ben Aknoun –Alger-Algerie Adresse postale: 16000	Oxyura leucocephala, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Gallinago media, Larus audouinii
Belgium	Boris Barov	BirdLife International, European Division Avenue de la Toison d'Or 67, B-1060 Brussels, Belgium	Taxa prioritization
Bulgaria	Valeri Georgiev	Ministry of Environment and Water, 22, Maria Luisa Blvd., Sofia 1000, Bulgaria	Pelecanus crispus
Canada	Kathryn M. Dickson	Canadian Wildlife Service, 351 Blvd. St-Joseph, Gatineau, Québec, Canada K1A 0H3	Branta bernicla hrota
Congo Brazzaville	Jérôme Mokoko Ikonga	WCS Programme Congo BP 14537 Brazzaville République du Congo	Crex crex, Gallinago media
Croatia	Ana Kobaslic	Ministry of Culture, Nature Protection Directorate, Runjaninova 2, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Gallinago media, Larus audouinii
Croatia	Ivana Jelenic	Ministry of Culture, Nature Protection Directorate, Runjaninova 2, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Gallinago media, Larus audouinii
Croatia	Jelena Kralj	Institute for the Ornithology to the Croatian Academy of Science. Gundulićeva 24, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Crex crex, Gallinago media, Larus audouinii, Aythya nyroca
Cyprus	Nicolaos Kassinis	The game fund , Ministry of Interior, Nicosia 1453, Cyprus	Pelecanus crispus, Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Anser erythropus, Branta ruficollis, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii
Czech Republic	Jiri Pykal	Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection of the Czech Republic, regional office Ceske Budejovice, nam. Premysla Otakara II. 34, 370 01 Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic	Crex crex
Denmark	Sten Asbirk	Danish Forest and Nature Agency , Haraldsgade 53, 2100 Copenhagen Ø , Denmark	Oxyura leucocephala, Crex crex
Estonia	Agu Leivits	Nature Conservation Centre (SNCC) Aia 22-18 EE-86305 Kilingi-Nõmme, Estonia	Crex crex, Gallinago media
Estonia	Jaanus Elts	Estonian Ornithological Society	Crex crex
Finland	Petteri Tolvanen	WWF Finland	Anser erythropus

Country	Name	Organization	Species / subject
France (international)	Alain Crivelli	Tour du Valat, France	Pelecanus cristpus
Hungary	Andras Schmidt	Ministry of Environment and Water, H-1011 Budapest, Fő u. 44-50, Hungary	Pelicanus crispus, Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Oxyura leucocephala, Anser erythropus, Branta ruficollis, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris
Hungary	Zoltan Czirak	Ministry of Environment and Water, H-1011 Budapest, Fő u. 44-50, Hungary	Pelicanus crispus, Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Oxyura leucocephala, Anser erythropus, Branta ruficollis, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris
Iceland	Aevar Petersen	Icelandic Institute of Natural History (IINH)	Branta bernicla hrota, Crex crex
Israel	Ohad Hatzofe	Division of Science & Conservation, Israel Nature & Parks Authority, 3 Am Veolamo st., Jerusalem, 95463, Israel	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Oxyura leucocephala, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca.
Italy	Alessandro Andreotti	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii
Italy	Barbara Amadesi	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Marmaronetta angustirostris, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii, Aythya nyroca
Italy	F. Florit	Autonomous Region of Friuli Venezia Giulia, Dept. of agricultural, natural, forest resources and mountain, Office of Faunal studies, Via di Troppo 40, 33100 Udine, Italy	Crex crex
Italy	Fabrizio Borghesi	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Crex crex
Italy	G. Rassati	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Crex crex
Italy	Marco Zenatello	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii
Italy	Nicola Baccetti	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Crex crex, Larus audouinii
Italy	Paolo Pedrini	Museo Tridentino di Scienze Naturali, Via Calepina, 14, I 38100 TRENTO - Italy	Crex crex
Italy	Stefano Volponi	Italian Wildlife Institute (INFS - Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica) Via Ca' Fornacetta 9 40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO) - Italy	Phalacrocorax pygmeus
Jordan	Sharif Al-Jbour	BirdLife International, Middle East and Central Asia Division	Vanellus gregarius, Geronticus eremita

Country	Name	Organization	Species / subject
Kenya	Jane Gaithuma	BirdLife International, African Partnership Secretariat, Nairobi, Kenya	
Kenya	Paul Kariuki Nding'ang'a	BirdLife International, African Partnership Secretariat, Nairobi, Kenya	BirdLife African Species Programme
Latvia	Ainars Aunins	Latvian Fund for Nature, Raina bulv. 31 – 6, LV-1050	Gallinago media
Lithuania	Dziugas Anuskevicius	Ministry of Environment of Republic of Lithuania, A. Jakšto St. 4/9, Vilnius, Lithuania	Anser erythropus, Crex crex, Gallinago media, Aythya nyroca
Lithuania	Sigute Alisauskiene	Ministry of Environment of Republic of Lithuania, A. Jakšto St. 4/9, Vilnius, Lithuania	Anser erythropus, Crex crex, Gallinago media, Aythya nyroca
Luxembourg	Patric Lorgé	LNVL – BirdLife Luxembourg	Crex crex
Luxembourg	Sandra Cellina	Ministère de l'Environnement 18, montée de la Pétrusse L-2918 Luxembourg	Crex crex, Gallinago media
Mali	M. Alfousseini Semega	OPNBB/DNCN/Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Assainissement. Parc Biologique de Bamako Rte de Koulouba, B.P. 275 Bamako (Mali)	Aythya nyroca
Morocco	Abdeljebbar Qninba	Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification. Direction de la Lutte Contre la Désertification et de la Protection de la Nature. Division des Parcs et Réserves Naturelles. 3 Rue Haroun Errachid, Agdal, Rabat, Maroc	Oxyura leucocephala, Aythya nyroca, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii
Morocco	Mohamed Aziz El Agbani	Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification. Direction de la Lutte Contre la Désertification et de la Protection de la Nature. Division des Parcs et Réserves Naturelles. 3 Rue Haroun Errachid, Agdal, Rabat, Maroc	Oxyura leucocephala Aythya nyroca, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Numenius tenuirostris
Morocco	Mohamed Noaman	Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification, Direction de la Lutte Contre la Désertification et de la Protection de la Nature, Division des Parcs et Réserves Naturelles, 3 Rue Haroun Errachid, Agdal, Rabat, Maroc	Geronticus eremite, Oxyura leucocephala, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii
Morocco	Mohammed Ribí	Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification, Direction de la Lutte Contre la Désertification et de la Protection de la Nature, Division des Parcs et Réserves Naturelles, 3 Rue Haroun Errachid, Agdal, Rabat, Maroc	Geronticus eremite, Oxyura leucocephala, Marmaronetta angustirostris, Aythya nyroca, Crex crex, Numenius tenuirostris, Larus audouinii
Morocco	Ouidad Oubrou	Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification, Direction de la Lutte Contre la Désertification et de la Protection de la Nature, Division des Parcs et Réserves Naturelles, 3 Rue Haroun Errachid, Agdal, Rabat, Maroc	Geronticus eremita
Netherlands	Kees Koffijberg	SOVON, Rijksweg 178, 6573 DG Beek-Ubbergen, The Netherlands	Crex crex

Country	Name	Organization	Species / subject
Netherlands	Nicky Petkov	Wetlands International	Aythya nyroca
Netherlands	Simon Delany	Wetlands International	Population estimates
Netherlands	Szabolcs Nagy	Wetlands International	Anser erythropus, taxa prioritization, Questionnaire development
Norway	Øystein Størkersen	Directorate for Nature Management, N-7485 Trondheim, Norway	Anser erythropus, Crex crex, Gallinago media
Poland	Bogumila Olech	Kampiski National Park, Tetmajeraq 38, 05-080 Izabelin (Warsaw) Poland.	Crex crex
Poland	Marek Jobda	OTOP (birdlife Poland) I. Odrowaza 24, 05-270 Marki k. Warszawy, Poland	Crex crex
Romania	Lavinia Raducescu	Romanian Ornithological Society	Branta ruficollis
Romania	Petrescu Eugen	Romanian Ornithological Society	Branta ruficollis
Russian Federation	Alexander Mischenko	Russian Bird Conservation Union .	Crex crex
Russian Federation	SophiaRozenfeld	Institute of the problems of evolution and ecology, Russian Academy of Sciences Russia, Moscow, Leninsky prt., 33, Russian Federation	Branta ruficollis
Slovenia	Andrej Bibič	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, Directorate for the Environment, Sector for Nature Conservation PolicyDunajska 48, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia	Aythya nyroca, Crex crex
Spain	Andy J. Green	Doñana Biological Station-CSIC, Avda. María Luisa s/n. Pabellón del Perú, 41013 Sevilla, Spain	Marmaronetta angustirostris
Spain	Concha Raya Gomez	Junta de Andalucia, Spain	Marmaronetta angustirostris
Spain	Daniel Oro	Institut Mediterrani d'Estudis Avançats IMEDEA CSIC-UIB Miquel Marques 21 07190 Esporles, Spain	Larus audouinii
Spain	Jordi Muntaner	Servei de Protecció d'Espècies, Direcció Gral. De Caça, Protecció d'Espècies I E.A. Conselleria de Medi Ambient. Govern de les Illes Balears C/. Manuel Guasp, 10. 07006 Palma, Spain	
Sweden	Per Johansson	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, SE-106 48 Stockholm, Sweden	Crex crex, Gallinago media
Switzerland	Eva Inderwildi	BirdLife Switzerland, Wiedingstrasse 78, P.O. Box, CH- 8036 Zurich, CH	Crex crex
Togo	Kotchikpa Okoumassou	Direction de la Faune et de la Chasse (Ministère de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestières, Togo	Phalacrocorax pygmeus, Numenius tenuirostris
Ukraine	A. Atevasov	Ukrainian Society for the Protection of Birds	Crex crex
Ukraine	Oksana Osadcha,	Ukrainian Society for the Protection of Birds	Branta ruficollis

Country	Name	Organization	Species / subject
United Kingdom	Baz Hughes	The Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, Slimbridge, Glos. GL2 7BT, UK.	
United Kingdom	Chris Bowden	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom	Geronticus eremita
United Kingdom	Ian Burfield	BirdLife International, Wellbrook Court, Girton Road Cambridge CB3 ONA, United Kingdom	Taxa prioritization and data analysis
United Kingdom	Ian Fisher	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom	Crex crex
United Kingdom	Ken Smith	RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom	Numenius tenuirostris
United Kingdom	Kendrew Colhoun	ECHA Light-bellied Brent Goose Research Programme, WWT, Castle Espie, Comber, Co. Down BT23 6EA, United Kingdom	Branta bernicla hrota
United Kingdom	Mike Evans	BirdLife International, Wellbrook Court, Girton Road Cambridge CB3 ONA, United Kingdom	Data analysis
United Kingdom	Norbert Schäffer	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom	Crex crex
United Kingdom	Paul Walton	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom	Crex crex

Annex 4 List of all IBAs selected for the SSAP species and their protection status.

The list of IBAs selected for the SSAP species, the population size, the protection status and the presence of a management plan was provided by BirdLife International in June 2007. The list of sites, the information on protection status and on the presence of a management plan has been updated in the basis of the replies to the SSAP implementation questionnaires received and the single species action Plans.

If you wish to use this data in other analyses or publications please discuss with the authors of this report and BirdLife International prior to doing so to obtain the most up to date information available.

See excel file “IBAs SSAP.xcl”

Annex 5 Returned questionnaires

See Files Replies.zip

Annex 6 Updated Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan with reference to international SAPs and population figures and trends

See file 'AEWA_Table1.xcl'