



## Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2021-2024

The format for reports on the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) for the period 2021-2024 was approved by the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP8, 26-30 September 2022, Budapest, Hungary) through Resolution 8.3 and modified by the Standing Committee at its 23rd and 24th meetings (June 2023 and July 2024, respectively) as mandated by the MOP. This format has been compiled following the AEWA Annex 3 (Action Plan), the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027 and resolutions of the MOP.

In accordance with article V(c) of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, each Party shall prepare to each ordinary session of the MOP a National Report on its implementation of the Agreement and submit that report to the Agreement Secretariat. Through Resolution 8.3 the deadline for submission of national reports to the 9th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP9) was set at 180 days before the opening of the meeting. MOP9 is scheduled to take place on 10-14 November 2025; therefore, the deadline for submission of National Reports is **13 May 2025**.

As per Resolution 7.1 of the MOP, Chapter 3 of the National Report Format on the numbers and trends of native and non-native species of waterbirds was developed as a stand-alone online reporting module, which is due for submission to every second MOP session. The next submission of this module is scheduled for delivery to MOP10 and will take place in 2026-2027 through a stand-alone reporting process. Therefore, the current Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2021-2024 does not contain Chapter 3.

As per the decision of the 23rd meeting of the Standing Committee (26-27 June 2023), reporting of waterbird harvest data for the period 2019-2023 was undertaken as a stand-alone module of the national report and administered through a separate reporting process in the course of 2024.

The AEWA National Reports 2021-2024 were compiled and submitted through the AEWA Online National Reporting System, which is part of the broader CMS Family Online Reporting System. The CMS Family Online Reporting System was developed by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in close collaboration with and under the guidance of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat.

# 1. General Information

## Name of reporting Contracting Party

>>> Hungary

## Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

>>> 01.03.2003

**List any reservations that the Contracting Party has made (if any) in respect of any population(s) listed in Table 1 of Annex 3 or any specific provision of the AEWA Action Plan - either upon deposition of its instruments of accession (per AEWA, Article XV) or subsequent to any amendment of Table 1 or the AEWA Action Plan, as adopted by a session of the Agreement's Meeting of the Parties (per AEWA, Article X.6).**

**EU member states should list also all reservations entered by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union.**

>>> No reservation has been entered by the Hungary. However, all EU reservations entered by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union could apply to Hungary as well, although all affected populations are fully protected in Hungary. The species: *Anser fabalis fabalis* (Bean Goose, Taiga Bean Goose)- North-east Europe/North-west Europe (Hungary is not a Range State), *Clangula hyemalis* (Long-tailed Duck)- Iceland & Greenland (bre)6 1b- Western Siberia/North Europe (bre), *Melanitta fusca* (Velvet Scoter)- Western Siberia & Northern Europe/NW Europe, *Mergus serrator* (Red-breasted Merganser)- North-west & Central Europe (win)

## 2. Institutional Information

Please update information on the National AEWA Administrative Authority, the National Focal Points, the Designated National Respondent and the other contributors to this report.

### Designated National AEWA Administrative Authority

Full name of the institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Minister for Agriculture

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Apáczai Csere János u. 9.

P.O.Box

>>> 1052 Budapest

Postal code

>>> 1052

City

>>> Budapest

Country

>>> Hungary

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 2532

Fax

>>> +36 1 795 0200

E-mail

>>> info@am.gov.hu

Website

>>> <https://kormany.hu/agrarminiszterium>

### Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Levente Kőrösi, Head of Department

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Department

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Apáczai Csere János u. 9.

Postal code

>>> 1052

City

>>> Budapest

Country

>>> Hungary

Telephone

>>> +3617953753

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> levente.korosi@am.gov.hu

Website

>>> www.termesztvedelem.hu

**Designated National Focal Point for AEWA Technical Committee (TC NFP) matters**

Name and title of the TC NFP

>>> Mr. Andras Schmidt, Head of Unit

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Department for Nature Conservation, Natura 2000 Unit

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Apáczai Csere János u. 9.

P.O.Box

>>> 1860 Budapest

Postal code

>>> 1052

City

>>> Budapest

Country

>>> Hungary

Telephone

>>> +36-1-795-2399

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> andras.schmidt@am.gov.hu

Website

>>> www.termesztvedelem.hu

**Designated National Focal Point for Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA NFP) matters**

Name and title of the CEPA NFP

>>> -

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> -

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> -

P.O.Box

>>> -

Postal code

>>> -

City

>>> -

Country

>>> -

Telephone

>>> -

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> -

Website

>>> -

## **Designated National Respondent (DNR) in charge of the compilation and submission of the AEWA National Report 2021-2024**

Please select from the list below as appropriate.

Another person has been designated as the National Respondent

Name and title of the DNR

>>> Éva Fejes

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Department

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Apáczai Csere János u. 9.

P.O.Box

>>> -

Postal code

>>> 1052

City

>>> Budapest

Country

>>> Hungary

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 2771

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> eva.fejes@am.gov.hu

Website

>>> -

## **Other contributors to the AEWA National Report 2021 - 2024**

Please list the names and affiliations (institution, organisation) of the other contributors to this report. For Contracting Parties in which nature conservation is not an exclusive competence of national/federal government, Designated National Respondents are encouraged to seek input from other relevant levels of government.

>>> Gábor Gergő Nagy, Ministry of Agriculture  
National Park Directorates

# Pressures and Responses

## 4. Species Conservation

### 4.1 Legal Measures

**1. Following MOP8, was a review undertaken in your country of the relevant domestic legislation against the provisions of the latest version of the Agreement text and its annexes, including Table 1 in Annex III, taking into account all amendments adopted by MOP8? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.1 (a), 1.1 (b), 2.2(a) and 2.2(b))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The amendments had no impact on national legislation.

**Field for additional information (optional)**

>>> -

**2. Was your country's national legislation reviewed following the Guidance on Measures in National Legislation for Different Populations of the Same Species, Particularly with Respect to Hunting and Trade (Resolution 6.7)?**

**See Appendix 1 / Appendix 2 / Appendix 3**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The national legislation adequately addresses hunting and trade - and other aspects - of the populations.

**Field for additional information (optional)**

>>> -

**3. Please confirm the protection status under your country's national legislation of each population listed in the Excel file linked below.** This list contains all the AEWA Table 1, Column A populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

Guidance on responding to this question:

1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name.

**(Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)

2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;

3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

I confirm that I have downloaded the Excel file with my country's name, filled it in as necessary and uploaded the completed file as an attachment to this question.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Hungary\\_Q3\\_AEWA\\_NR\\_2021-2024\\_PopColA.xlsx](#)

**4. Please confirm for each population, listed in the Excel file linked below,** whether there is an open hunting season (birds and/or eggs) in your country. This list contains all the AEWA Table 1, Column A, category 2 or 3 with an asterisk or category 4 that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

**Guidance:** Open hunting season in the context of this inquiry means that the waterbird population is allowed to be hunted for a certain period in the year in accordance with the respective domestic legislation of the country. Some populations, even if huntable according to the legislation, in certain circumstances may be subject to a year-round closed season for management reasons.

**Guidance on responding to this question:**

1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name.

**(Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)

2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;

3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

I confirm that I have downloaded the Excel file with my country's name, filled it in as necessary and uploaded the completed file as an attachment to this question.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Hungary\\_Q4\\_AEWA\\_NR\\_2021-2024\\_PopColA-Cat2\\_3\\_4.xlsx](#)

**6. Please indicate which modes of taking are prohibited in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b); AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)**

One or more modes of taking have been prohibited

**Please provide details to each mode of taking in the list below:**

Snares

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Limes

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Hooks

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Tape recorders and other electronic devices

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Electrocuting devices

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Artificial light sources

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Mirrors and other dazzling devices

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Devices for illuminating targets

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Sighting devices for night shooting comprising an electronic image magnifier or image converter

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Explosives

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Nets

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Traps

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Poison

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Poisoned or anaesthetic baits

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Semi-automatic or automatic weapons with a magazine capable of holding more than two rounds of ammunition

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Hunting from aircraft, motor vehicles, or boats driven at a speed exceeding 5 km p/h (18 km p/h on the open sea)

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Act No. LV of 1996 on Game Conservation, Management and Hunting

Other non-selective modes of taking

No

**7. Has your country granted exemptions from any of the above prohibitions in order to accommodate livelihoods uses? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b); AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)**

No

**8. Has a review of enforcement of and compliance with the domestic legislation relevant for AEWA implementation, [in particular the legislation which caters for the obligations under paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan], been undertaken in your country after MOP8? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.1(c) and 2.2(c))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> There has been no formal review, as national legislations (Act No. LIII of 1996 and Act No. LV of 1996) comply with the obligations.

Was a review undertaken before MOP8?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> There has been no formal review, as national legislations (Act No. LIII of 1996 and Act No. LV of 1996) comply with the obligations.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

**9. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> Our national nature conservation and hunting regulations are fully in line with these AEWA Guidelines.

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.1. Legal Measures**

>>> Due to the 2021 amendment of Decree 79/2004 (4 May 2004) on the Rules for the Implementation of Act LV of 1996 on Game Protection, Game Management and Hunting, the hunting season got standardized for the Anser species, as opposed to the previously shortened periods in certain parts of the country (those areas have the highest numbers of these species, and also of LWfG and RbG).

Open season for *A. anser*, *A. fabalis* and *A. albifrons* up to 2021: 1 October - 31 December. Shorter season was determined for the eastern part of Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok county (east of river Tisza), and the entire area of Hajdú-Bihar county: 1-31 December. Daily bag: 6 specimens altogether per person, *A. anser* cannot exceed 2 specimens.

Mallard: 15 August - 31 January, Common Coot: 1 September - 31 January. Daily bag: 8 specimens altogether per person. No bag limit for captive-bred and released Mallard, it can be hunted all year.

Open season for *A. anser*, *A. fabalis* and *A. albifrons* after 2021: 1 October - 31 January in the entire country. Daily bag: 6 specimens altogether per person, *A. fabalis* cannot exceed 2 specimens.

Mallard: 15 August - 31 August, Common Coot: 1 September - 31 January. Daily bag: 8 specimens altogether per person. No bag limit for captive-bred and released Mallard, it can be hunted all year.

**4.2. Species Action and Management Plans**

**10. Please report on the progress of turning the International Single Species Action and Management Plans (ISSAP and ISSMP), as well as International Multi-species Action Plans (IMSAP), listed below, into National Action or Management Plans. If no action or management plan is listed below, this is because your country is not considered to be a Principal Range State for any species currently covered by an AEWA plan. In such a case, please proceed to the next question. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.2; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.2 (d))**

**Please report on all listed ISSAP, ISSMP and IMSAP**

**Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca*  
National Plan for Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca***

NP in place and being implemented

When was the plan approved and published? Please provide a web link or attach a file, if available. Please provide contact details for any person or organisation coordinating its implementation. Please list any activities and/or achievements over the past triennium.

>>> The Action Plan was developed by the Ministry of Agriculture in 2019.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

AYTHYA NYROCA

Please rate the degree of current implementation of the plan taking into account the time schedule of the ISSAP

Full implementation - all actions are underway as per the time schedule of the plan

Please provide details and reasons for the full implementation.

>>> -

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **Great Snipe / Gallinago media National Plan for Great Snipe / Gallinago media**

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> The Great Snipe is a spring and autumn visitor in very small numbers, therefore specific NP is not required. However, the management of this species and its habitats are fully in line with the requirement of ISSAP.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> The species - along with many other waterbird species benefits from wetland restorations throughout the country.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **Black-winged Pratincole / Glareola nordmanni National Plan for Black-winged Pratincole / Glareola nordmanni**

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> The Black-winged Pratincole is a very rare breeding bird in Hungary, therefore specific NP is not required. However, the conservation of this strictly protected species and the management of its habitats are fully in line with the requirement of ISSAP.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Local restrictions on agricultural management in Collared Pratincole breeding sites during breeding season. The occurrence and the occasional breeding of the Black-winged Pratincole are normally associated with the strictly protected Collared Pratincoles.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **Black-tailed Godwit / Limosa limosa National Plan for Black-tailed Godwit / Limosa limosa**

NP in place and being implemented

When was the plan approved and published? Please provide a web link or attach a file, if available. Please provide contact details for any person or organisation coordinating its implementation. Please list any

activities and/or achievements over the past triennium.

>>> This is a brand new National Action Plan, developed by MME/BirdLife Hungary and approved by the Ministry of Agriculture in 2024. The AP covers three species: Black-tailed Godwit, Common Redshank and Northern Lapwing.

Please rate the degree of current implementation of the plan taking into account the time schedule of the ISSAP

Full implementation – all actions are underway as per the time schedule of the plan

Please provide details and reasons for the full implementation.

>>> -

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **White-headed Duck / *Oxyura leucocephala*** **National Plan for White-headed Duck / *Oxyura leucocephala***

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> The species became extinct in 1960s. Since then the White-headed Duck occurs in the country as a very rare vagrant.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **Eurasian Spoonbill / *Platalea leucorodia*** **National Plan for Eurasian Spoonbill / *Platalea leucorodia***

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> There hasn't been capacity to develop a National Action Plan for this strictly protected species. The nesting sites are in protected areas (either by national law or are part of the Natura 2000 network), therefore, they are properly managed. The reedfields host other strictly protected and protected species (mostly Ardeidae).

Please rate the degree of current implementation of the plan taking into account the time schedule of the ISSAP

Full implementation – all actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **11. Has your country provided assistance for the coordination and implementation of International Species Action or Management Plans through funding of AEWA International Species Working and Expert Groups? (Resolution 7.5)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of funds.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **12. Has your country provided financial or in-kind assistance for the development of new International Species Action or Management Plans? (Resolution 7.5)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of funds.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

**13. Has your country been involved in the development and/or implementation of any flyway-scale projects to implement Single or Multi-Species Action Plans? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.2(f))**

Yes

Please provide details on each of the respective projects and the target Species Action Plan

>>> "Providing a climate resilient network of critical sites for the Lesser White-fronted Goose in Europe" - LIFE LWfG CLIMATE (LIFE19 NAT/LT/000898)

The overall goal of the LIFE LWfG CLIMATE project is to contribute to the internationally agreed long-term goal of restoring the Fennoscandian LWfG population to a favourable conservation status as outlined in the LWfG Individual Special Species Action Plan, by delivering a 5% annual average increase.

Results include the increase of the available suitable and protected, climate-resilient habitat for the LWfG by 55 ha in the Evros Delta SPA in Greece, by 304 ha in one SPA in Hungary and 96.2 ha in two SPAs in Lithuania, and the adoption of two new/revised LWfG NAPs by the relevant government authorities in Lithuania and Hungary.

Respective Natura 2000 sites in Hungary:

Hortobágy (HUHN10002) SPA

Bihar (HUHN10003) SPA

Please explain the reasons

>>> -

**14. Has a review and prioritization been undertaken in your country of the resources needed to develop national action plans in response to ISSAPs, implement those plans and coordinate their implementation? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.2(g))**

No

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

**15. Does your country have in place or is your country developing a National Single Species Action Plan for any species/population for which an AEWA ISSAP has not been developed? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.2.2)**

Yes

**Please provide information on each species for which relevant action has been undertaken**

**Hungary**

**Lesser White-fronted Goose / *Anser erythropus***

**National Single Species Action Plan for Lesser White-fronted Goose / *Anser erythropus***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The aim of the Hungarian National Action Plan (NAP) for the Lesser White-fronted Goose is to update the previous NAP and collect all the current knowledge (national and international) about the species, and to describe the actions required to protect the species effectively in Hungary. By implementing the actions described in the NAP, Hungary will substantially contribute to the international conservation target to save the species, and especially the critically endangered Fennoscandian Lesser White-fronted Goose population. The previous NAP was prepared in the framework of an EU LIFE+ Project - coordinating beneficiary: Hellenic Ornithological Society (LIFE10 NAT/GR/000638- „Safeguarding the Lesser White fronted Goose Fennoscandian population in key wintering and staging sites within the European flyway”) - in the cooperation of the Hungarian National Lesser White-fronted Goose working group. The current NAP was also prepared in the framework of an EU LIFE+ Project - coordinating beneficiary: Lithuanian Ornithological Society (LIFE19 NAT/LT/000898 - „Providing a climate resilient network of critical sites for the Lesser White-fronted Goose in Europe”) - in the cooperation of the Hungarian National Lesser White-fronted Goose working group.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

**Common Pochard / *Aythya ferina***

**National Single Species Action Plan for Common Pochard / *Aythya ferina***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The joint National Species Action Plan for the Common Pochard and the Ferruginous Duck was adopted in 2019 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca***

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The joint National Species Action Plan for the Common Pochard and the Ferruginous Duck was adopted in 2019 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **Corncrake / *Crex crex***

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for Corncrake / *Crex crex***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The National Species Action Plan for the Corncrake was adopted in 2024 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **White Stork / *Ciconia ciconia***

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for White Stork / *Ciconia ciconia***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The National Species Action Plan for the White Stork was adopted in 2013 and has been implemented since.

### **Kentish Plover / *Charadrius alexandrinus***

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for Kentish Plover / *Charadrius alexandrinus***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The National Species Action Plan for the Kentish Plover was adopted in 2006 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **Eurasian Curlew / *Numenius arquata***

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for Eurasian Curlew / *Numenius arquata***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The National Species Action Plan for the Eurasian Curlew was adopted in 2024 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **Black-tailed Godwit / *Limosa limosa***

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for Black-tailed Godwit / *Limosa limosa***

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> A joint National Species Action Plan for the Northern Lapwing, the Black-tailed Godwit and the Common Redshank was adopted in 2024 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **Common Redshank / Tringa totanus**

#### **National Single Species Action Plan for Common Redshank / Tringa totanus**

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> The joint National Species Action plan for the Northern Lapwing, the Eurasian Curlew and the Common Redshank was adopted in 2024 and has been implemented since.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Species Action Plans in Hungary](#) - Link to all of the National Species Action Plans in Hungary

### **16. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines for the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans for migratory waterbirds?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing **the Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The AEWA Conservation Guidelines has been considered during the preparation of NSSAPs. Hungary developed a unified structure for NSSAPs in 2017.

### **4.3 Emergency Measures**

#### **18. Please report on any emergency situation that has occurred in your country over the past triennium and has threatened waterbirds. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.3)**

Please indicate whether an emergency situation threatening waterbirds, such as botulism, chemical pollution, earthquake, extreme weather, fire, harmful algal bloom, infectious disease, introduction of alien species, lead poisoning, nuclear accident, oil spill, predation, volcanic activity, war or other emergency (please specify), has occurred in the country over the past triennium.

Emergency situation has occurred

#### **Please provide information on each emergency situation which occurred**

##### **Infectious disease**

Indicate when the emergency situation took place

>>> HPAI H5N1 outbreak in 2023

Indicate where the emergency situation took place (including geographical coordinates)

>>> The entire country was affected.

#### **Indicate which species were affected by the emergency situation and the estimated magnitude of the impact**

#### **Indicate which species were affected by the emergency situation and the estimated magnitude of the impact:**

##### **For each affected species:**

Number of individuals affected (all individuals exposed to the emergency situation)

>>> The breeding population in the western and central parts of the country was affected. The eastern population (about 1/3 of the national population) showed no symptoms.

What proportion of the national (breeding, passage, wintering/nonbreeding, whichever is applicable) population does this number represent?

51 - 90%

If mortality has been recorded, indicate number of individuals

>>> About 2/3 of the breeding population, cca 2000 birds died.

What proportion of the national (breeding, passage, wintering/nonbreeding, whichever is applicable) population does this number represent?

51 - 90%

**Indicate which species were affected by the emergency situation and the estimated magnitude of the impact:**

**For each affected species:**

Number of individuals affected (all individuals exposed to the emergency situation)

>>> The entire breeding population was affected.

What proportion of the national (breeding, passage, wintering/nonbreeding, whichever is applicable) population does this number represent?

> 90%

If mortality has been recorded, indicate number of individuals

>>> At least 2/3 of the breeding population - 180 pairs in 2023 - died.

What proportion of the national (breeding, passage, wintering/nonbreeding, whichever is applicable) population does this number represent?

51 - 90%

**Indicate which species were affected by the emergency situation and the estimated magnitude of the impact:**

**For each affected species:**

Number of individuals affected (all individuals exposed to the emergency situation)

>>> About half of the breeding population, 300-350 pairs, was affected.

What proportion of the national (breeding, passage, wintering/nonbreeding, whichever is applicable) population does this number represent?

51 - 90%

If mortality has been recorded, indicate number of individuals

>>> About 600 birds died.

What proportion of the national (breeding, passage, wintering/nonbreeding, whichever is applicable) population does this number represent?

51 - 90%

Have emergency response measures been implemented?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Please see Section 11.

Field for additional information (optionally, you can provide additional information on the emergency case)

>>> -

**19. Are there any other emergency response measures, different from the ones applied in response to the emergency situations reported above, that were developed and are in place in your country so that they can be used in future in emergency cases?**

No

**20. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Not applicable

#### 4.4 Re-establishments

**21. Is your country maintaining a national register of re-establishment projects occurring or planned to occur wholly or partly within your country? (Resolution 4.4)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No re-establishment has taken place since Hungary's accession to AEWA.

**22. Is there a regulatory framework for re-establishments of species, including waterbirds, in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.4)?**

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Article 14 (2) of the Act on nature conservation No. 53 of 1996: "... the re-establishment of any wild species requires permission from the nature conservation authority."

**23. Has your country considered, developed or implemented re-establishment projects for any species/population listed on AEWA Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.4)**

No

**24. Has your country used the AEWA conservation Guidelines on the translocation of waterbirds for conservation purposes?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Not applicable

#### 4.5 Introductions

**25. Does your country have legislation in place, which prohibits the introduction into the environment of non-native species of animals and plants which may be detrimental to migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.1)**

Yes, and being enforced

Please provide the following details: title of legislation, year of adoption, institution that adopted it, institution that enforces it. Please clarify whether legislation applies to/is consistent throughout the entire country or only to particular states/provinces.

>>> The government offices are the responsible authorities. Regarding the Act on nature conservation No. 53 of 1996. since 2015: The range of the non-native invasive species that pose threat to Hungary determined by the Minister responsible for the nature conservation. Importing, transferring, exporting, keeping, propagating, cultivating, breeding, cross-breeding, releasing into nature, utilising and inspecting of a nonnative invasive species' are regulated by the 1143/2014/EU regulation. Permits, inspection, obligation, sanctioning task of any other invasive species regulation are performed by authorities that concerned by alien species or by nature conservation authorities. No place for appeal.

**26. Does your country impose legislative requirements on zoos, private collections, etc. in order to avoid the accidental escape of captive animals belonging to non-native species which may be detrimental to migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.2)**

Yes, and being enforced

Please provide the following details: title of the document, year of adoption, institution that adopted it, institution that enforces it. Please clarify whether legislation applies to/is consistent throughout the entire country or only to particular states/provinces.

>>> 3/2001 joint Decree No. 3 of February, 2001 of KöM-FVM-NKÖM-BM on the detailed rules of establishment, operation and maintenance of Zoos and establishment for care of animals. The rules are enforced by nature conservation authorities.

**27. Has your country considered, developed or implemented programmes to control or eradicate non-native species of waterbird so as to prevent negative impacts on indigenous species? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.3)**

Yes

**Please provide information on each non-native species for which relevant action has been undertaken**

## **Canada Goose / *Branta canadensis***

### **For Canada Goose / *Branta canadensis***

Control or eradication programme developed and being implemented

## **Egyptian Goose / *Alopochen aegyptiaca***

### **For Egyptian Goose / *Alopochen aegyptiaca***

Control or eradication programme developed and being implemented

## **28. Has your country considered, developed or implemented programmes to control or eradicate other non-native species (in particular aquatic weeds and terrestrial predators) so as to prevent negative impacts on migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraphs 2.5.3 and 4.3.10 and Resolution 5.15)**

Yes

Please list the non-native species for which relevant action has been undertaken

>>> The hunting authority prescribes regulation of Coypu at certain hotspots. There have been successful and moderately successful interventions to eradicate the *Rattus norvegicus*, the non-native rat species whose presence can be detrimental in nesting colonies (e.g. LARMEL). *Ondatra zibethicus* can also predate eggs of waterbirds, its regulation takes place in wetlands.

As part of the programme "RACOON CONTROL - 2024: Activities to Control Invasive Alien Species", racoon control was carried out using both firearms and live traps within the area managed by the Ócsa Nature Protection and Hunting Association, in collaboration with the association itself. In addition to control efforts, one captured racoon was tagged with a telemetry device to facilitate monitoring. The condition and reproductive status of captured individuals were also examined.

To support the assessment of population trends, game cameras were deployed in the field to collect data on changes in the spatial distribution and abundance of racoons.

The operational area of the Ócsa Nature Protection and Hunting Association spans 6,600 hectares and is located in Pest County, approximately 35 km from Budapest. It features a diverse landscape mosaic including floodplain forests, shrublands, reedbeds, wet meadows, and agricultural fields.

Control activities, primarily undertaken by the hunting association, involved both live trapping and shooting. During the control period (30 May - 10 October 2024), a total of 23 racoons were captured using traps and firearms. Trapping proved to be particularly effective, achieving a capture rate of 5.03 individuals per 100 trap nights. Compared to 2023, there was a 155% increase in area coverage by the end of the national control period.

Overall, the results indicate that the control programme was successful. Trapping methods were highly effective and provided a substantial additional benefit to racoon population management alongside firearm-based control. The program is continued through 2025.

## **29. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on avoidance of introductions of non-native waterbird species?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What was used instead as a basis for dealing with the issue?

>>> Article 9 (4) of the Act No. 53 of 1996 on nature conservation: "The introduction of any living organism that is new to the flora or fauna of the country can only be permitted if their establishment does not change natural processes harmfully to native species."

No introduction of non-native waterbird species took place in the triennium. The permitting procedure in the case of introduction of non-native species is the nature conservation authority (except in the case of huntable species, where it is the hunting authority).

## **Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.5. Introductions**

>>> -

## **4.6 Seabirds**

**The country has maritime territories and the AEWA seabird conservation priorities are relevant for the country:**

No

# Pressures and Responses

## 5. Habitat Conservation

### 5.1 Habitat Inventories

**40. Has your country identified the network of all sites of international and national importance for the migratory waterbird species/populations listed on Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 3.1.2)**

Yes

Please provide full reference, e.g. title, year, authors, etc. or a web link

>>> SPAs were designated by the Government in October 2004 for all Birds Directive Annex I. species, as well as a selection of migratory birds.

**41. If your country has identified or is currently identifying the networks of sites of international and national importance, were the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on the preparation of site inventories for migratory waterbirds used?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The SPA network was identified in line with guidance from the European Commission and the provisions of the Birds Directive. Nationally protected areas were also designated much before the guidelines were approved.

**42. Has your country reviewed and confirmed to the AEWA Secretariat its inventory of the known nationally and internationally important sites through the process developed by the Technical Committee and launched by the Secretariat in August 2020? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.1(a))**

NO, but the review of the inventory is being undertaken

Please indicate when it is expected to be submitted to the Secretariat

>>> The network of SPAs was elaborated based on the advice of MME/BirdLife Hungary and the data of the Hungarian national park directorates, as well as guidance from the European Commission and the criteria of the Birds Directive.

Standard Data Forms of Special Protection Areas within the EU Natura 2000 network have been completed. They are regularly reviewed, either the entire list of species or a selected few. At the time of writing, the NPD are reviewing the SDFs to either include, or update the information on LARRID colonies, as the species is intended to be designated as indicator species. The European Commission approved of all current SDFs.

### 5.2. Conservation of Areas and Habitats

**43. Has your country assessed the future implications of climate change for protected areas and other sites important for waterbirds (i.e. resilience of sites to climate change)? (Resolution 5.13)**

**For one or more single sites**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of capacity.

**For the national protected area network**

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Lack of capacity.

**44. Which sites that were identified as important, either internationally or nationally, for Table 1 migratory waterbird species/populations have been designated as protected areas under the national legislation and have management plans that are being implemented, including with the aim to increase resilience to the effects of climate change? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 3.2.1, AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.3)**

Please report separately on internationally important sites, nationally important sites and buffer zones.

Reporting on designation and management of internationally important sites

Reporting on designation and management of nationally important sites. (Sites of national importance excludes the sites already reported above as internationally important)

Reporting on establishing buffer zones around waterbird sites (as an approach for maintaining or increasing resilience of ecological networks, including resilience to climate change)

### **All sites of international importance**

(sites recognized as having international importance for migratory waterbirds following criteria of, for instance, the AEWA Critical Site Network, the Ramsar Convention, the EU Birds Directive (SPAs), the Bern Convention Emerald Network, the BirdLife International's Important Bird Areas)

Total number

>>> 56

Total area (ha)

>>> 1374600

Number of internationally important sites under national protection designation

>>> 56

Please rate the effectiveness of the national protection designation

High

Please provide details and reasons for the high level of effectiveness.

>>> SPAs were designated by the Government in 2004, followed by further sites in 2010. The network is considered complete.

Internationally important protected sites with a management plan in place which is being implemented

Number of sites

>>> 56

Area (in ha)

>>> 1374600

Please rate the effectiveness of the management measures

Moderate

Internationally important sites with a management plan in place which is being implemented and includes management objectives related to maintaining or increasing the resilience of existing ecological networks, including resilience to climate change

Number of sites

>>> 0

Area (in ha)

>>> 0

Please rate the effectiveness of the climate resilience measures

Low

### **All sites of national importance**

Total number

>>> 20

Number of nationally important sites under national protection designation

>>> 20

Area of national importance under national protection area designation

>>> 378175.3

Nationally important protected sites with a management plan in place which is being implemented

Number of sites

>>> 10

Area (in ha)

>>> 232874

Nationally important sites with a management plan in place which is being implemented and includes management objectives related to maintaining or increasing the resilience of existing ecological networks, including resilience to climate change

Number of sites

>>> 0

Area (in ha)

>>> 0

Has your country identified around which nationally or internationally important sites the establishment of buffer zones is needed to maintain or increase resilience?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Designation of some nationally and internationally important sites include the buffer zones of wetland habitats.

### **Examples of best practice (optional)**

If any site, in your opinion, represents an outstanding process of management planning or implementation, please highlight it as an example of best practice (alternatively provide a web link or attach a file)

>>> Hortobágy: series of landscape-scale wetland restoration projects have taken place for decades.

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Almost all internationally and nationally important sites have been designated.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

MANAGEMENT GAP FILING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> All internationally and nationally important sites are designated.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

### **46. Is the network of nationally and internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds integrated into your country's water- and land-use policies and planning and decision-making processes? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.4)**

Yes, partially

Please provide details and reasons for partial integration

>>> The network of nationally and internationally important sites for waterbirds are taken into consideration during the river basin management planning, for example, but not every aspect is identified fully in line with nature conservation.

### **47. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on the management of key sites for migratory waterbirds?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The main elements of the guidelines have been incorporated into the management practice of the national park directorates responsible for the management of these sites.

### **48. Has the Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool for the AEWA area been accessed and used in your**

## country? (Resolution 7.9)

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The network of SPAs was elaborated based on the advice of MME/BirdLife Hungary and the data of the Hungarian national park directorates, as well as guidance from the European Commission and the criteria of the Birds Directive.

## 49. Has your country identified priority measures required to maintain or increase the extent and quality of waterbird habitats in the wider environment? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 4.3(a))

Yes

Please provide details, alternatively attach a file or a link to a resource presenting the outcomes of the prioritisation

>>> National Biodiversity Strategy

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[National Biodiversity Strategy of Hungary](#)

## 50. Following MOP7, has your country been involved in the establishment of innovative, international, multi-stakeholder partnerships to guide the development and implementation of habitat management, creation and restoration projects in the wider environment? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 4.4(a))

Yes

Please provide details on each partnership arrangement your country has been involved in (add links to relevant online resources or attach other available materials)

>>> Preserving and restoring floodplain forest habitats along the Mura-Drava-Danube rivers (LIFE22-NAT-AT-LIFE RESTORE for MDD) focuses on the conservation and restoration of the largest contiguous riparian forest system in the Danube River Basin. For five years, 17 partners from Austria, Croatia, Hungary, Slovenia, and Serbia will collaborate to stem the degradation of the priority floodplain forest habitat type 91E0\* and 91F0. With over 5 000 animal species including 70 different varieties of fish, and more than 1 500 plant species, the stretch is one of Europe's biodiversity hotspots. Such rich natural diversity is protected by 17 Natura 2000 sites which line the rivers.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[LIFE RESTORE for MDD](#)

Please indicate which other countries have been involved in each of the partnership arrangements

>>> Austria, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia

## Optionally you can provide additional information on section 5.2. Conservation of Areas and Habitats

>>> Internationally important sites (Special Protection Areas that overlap with Ramsar sites which are of international importance for waterbirds): Balaton, Balatoni-berkek, Kis-Balaton, Bodrogzug - Kopasz-hegy - Taktaköz, Borsodi-sík, Béda-Karapanca, Gemenc, Pacsmagi-tavak, Sárvíz völgye, Tatai Öreg-tó, Velencei-tó és Dinnyési-fertő, Fertő, Hortobágy, KisSárrét, Alsó-Tisza-völgy, Csongrád-bokrosi Sóstó, Felső-kiskunsági szikes puszták és turjánvidék, Gátéri Fehértó, Izsáki Kolon-tó, Kiskunsági szikes tavak és az őrjegi turjánvidék, Ócsa (not an SPA, but an SAC and is nationally protected), Ipoly völgye, Hanság, Felső-Tisza, Cserebökényi-puszták, Tisza Alpár-Bokrosi ártéri öblözete

Nationally important sites (Special Protection Areas designated for waterbirds but not Ramsar sites plus 5 nationally important areas outside the SPA network) SPAs: Mórchelyi-halastavak, Hevesi-sík, Kesznyéten, Belső-Somogy, Nyugat-Dráva, Jászkarajenői puszták, Zámolyi medence, Szigetköz, Bihar, Jászság, Közép-Tisza, Szatmár-Bereg, Dévaványai-sík, Kígyósi-puszták, Vásárhelyi és Csanádi-puszták Plus 5 nationally important areas: Pellérdi-halastavak, Sumonyi-halastavak, Baláta-tó TT, Sárosfői-halastavak TT, Tiszavasvári Fehér-szik TT Sites with management plans in place: Balatoni berkek, Kis-Balaton, Pacsmagi-tavak, Velencei-tó és Dinnyési-fertő, Fertő, Kis-Sárrét, Felső-kiskunsági szikes puszták és turjánvidék, Gátéri Fehér-tó, Izsáki Kolon-tó, Kiskunsági szikes tavak és az őrjegi turjánvidék, Cserebökényi-puszták, Tisza Alpár-bokrosi ártéri öblözete, Borsodi-sík, Hanság;Szigetköz, Kesznyéten, Bihar, Tiszavasvári fehér-szik

# Pressures and Responses

## 6. Management of Human Activities

### 6.1. Hunting

**51. Does the legislation of your country implement the principle of sustainable use of waterbirds, as envisaged in the AEWA Action Plan, taking into account the full geographical range of the waterbird populations concerned and their life history characteristics? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.2)**

Yes

Please provide details on how this is achieved and reference to the relevant legislation

>>> Act No. 55 of 1996 on game protection, game management and hunting complies with the principle of sustainable use of waterbirds.

**52. Has your country phased out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.4; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.2(d))**

Fully

When was lead shot use in wetlands banned?

>>> Ministerial Decree No. 56/2005 (VI.25.) FVM amended the implementation decree of the Act on game protection, game management and hunting. As a result, the use of leadshot is forbidden in wetlands since 15th August 2005.

What legislation is in place?

>>> Ministerial Decree No. 56/2005 (VI.25.) FVM, amending decree No. 79/2004 (V.3) FVM

Who enforces this legislation?

>>> The rules are enforced by hunting authorities.

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

No

If appropriate, please explain the reasons for not doing this.

>>> There has been no capacity for such an assessment.

Has measurement of impact of the legislation been undertaken i.e. where there was a problem of lead poisoning in waterbirds, has this been reduced?

No

If appropriate, please explain the reasons for not doing this.

>>> There is no known case of lead poisoning in waterbirds.

**53. Are there measures in your country to reduce/eliminate illegal taking? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.6; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.2(e))**

Yes

How would you rate the effectiveness of the measures?

High

Please provide details and reasons for the high level of effectiveness.

>>> Pursuant to Act No. 55 of 1996 on Game Protection, Game Management and Hunting, hunting organisations must notify the regional nature conservation authority in advance of any small game hunting (including wildfowl) by foreign hunters. This allows nature conservation inspectors to verify the legality of the hunt.

**54. Is legally binding proficiency testing for hunters, including amongst other things bird identification, in place in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.8; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.2)**

Yes

Please provide details and reference to the relevant legislation

>>> 19/2022 (VII. 29.) AM Decree on the pre-hunting training course, the hunting examination, and the supplementary examinations for hunting

with bows, birds of prey, and Hungarian greyhounds

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Link to Ministerial Decree 19/2022 \(VII. 29.\)](#)

**55. Are best practice codes and standards for hunting in place in your country in support of enforcement of hunting laws and regulations? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.7; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.3)**

Yes

What do these cover?

Emergency closure of hunting in cases of exceptionally unfavourable or endangering conditions

**56. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The system of no or reduced waterfowl hunting zones (core areas) is incorporated in the Hungarian legislation on hunting. The harvest data system is in line with AEWA guidelines.

## 6.2. Ecotourism

**57. Is wetland- and waterbird-related ecotourism integrated into your country's national tourism development strategies or other relevant national strategies? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.2.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.5(c))**

Yes

Please describe and provide details

>>> Ecotourism activities organized by national park directorates are included in the national tourism strategy. One of the ecotourism services provided by NPD staff is birdwatching tours, often in wetlands.

**58. Are there existing ecotourism initiatives in your country specifically based on migratory waterbirds and their habitats? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.5)**

Yes

Please describe how many initiatives are in place and provide details for each of them (add links to relevant online resources or attach other available materials)

>>> Ecotourism opportunities, such as birdwatching tours and programmes in migratory waterbird hotspots, are provided by the national park directorates and a few private businesses.

Were any of the initiatives described above launched after 2018?

No

Please rank the degree to which these initiatives are designed to deliver both conservation and community benefits:

Medium

Please provide details

>>> One of the reasons ecotourism is carried out at all is that it is incorporated in the national legislation on nature conservation (Act No. 53 of 1996) as one of the duties of national parks to demonstrate natural values and to educate visitors. When practised correctly, visitors can explore natural habitats under control, thereby gaining knowledge and experience, which leads to developing interest in and responsibility for nature. However, human presence always means some form of disturbance, thus tourism activities should always be thoroughly planned and controlled to keep it sustainable.

Please rank the degree to which these dual benefits are being delivered in practice:

Medium

Do you consider that any of these initiatives can serve as a strong model or an example for developing future ecotourism initiatives that beneficial for both waterbirds and local communities?

No

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> There are no "local communities" that benefit from these activities in Hungary. Local people are employed by NPDs, but local communities in Central Europe are not the same as - often traditional - local communities in an African country.

### 6.3. Other human activities

**59. Have restrictions on use of lead fishing weights been introduced in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12). When answering this question please also consider question 80 in chapter 7 - Research and monitoring.**

No

If appropriate, please provide further details.

>>> Although currently no restrictions on use of lead fishing weights, there are bans on angling in several important areas for migratory waterbirds.

**60. Does your country have legislation in place, which provides for Strategic Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Assessment (SEA/EIA) of activities potentially negatively affecting natural habitats or wildlife? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.5)**

Yes and being implemented

Does this legislation apply to the entire country or only to particular states/provinces thereof?

Entire country

Please provide details

>>> Overall regulation of environmental protection is ensured by the Act No. 53 of 1995. 314/2005 Governmental Decree lays down the detailed rules on Environmental Impact Assessment in Hungary.

Do the SEA/EIA processes consider waterbirds and habitats on which they depend?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Certain activities which may negatively affect migratory waterbird species are subject to obligatory detailed EIA, like the construction of motorways, highways, railways, public roads longer than 10 km, 220 kV power lines longer than 15 km. Other activities, such as redistribution of land property in case of protected areas, ecological corridors or lands larger than 300 hectares, alteration of intensive agricultural land-use, meliorization, establishment of animal husbandry facilities in certain cases, construction of 120 kV power lines and 2 MW wind turbines.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include cumulative impact assessment?

Yes

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The public is involved in line with the EIA Directive of the EU.

**61. Are there any other legal and/or administrative measures in your country to avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts of development activities on the sites of national and international importance for migratory birds? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.5)**

No

**62. In the last three years, has your country used SEA/EIA for all relevant projects, including energy sector projects such as renewable energy developments and power lines installation, to assess the impact of proposed projects on migratory waterbird species listed on Table 1 and/or habitats/sites on which they depend? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.1, Resolution 5.11 and Resolution 5.16; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.5(b))**

Partially (some projects only)

Where an SEA/EIA has identified a likelihood of significant negative impacts on migratory waterbirds, have steps been taken to avoid these impacts, including avoidance of protected areas and other sites of

importance for migratory waterbirds?

Yes

**63. Do you maintain a record of the cases of adverse impacts of development activities and other pressures on sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.5(a))**

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Records on EIAs carried out are not collected nationally but at county level.

**64. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on how to avoid, minimize or mitigate impact of infrastructural developments and related disturbance affecting waterbirds?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The relevant EU legislation includes the main elements of the AEWA guidelines.

**65. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 5.11 on Power Lines and Migratory Waterbirds.**

65.1. Are relevant stakeholders, including government agencies, scientific bodies, nongovernmental organisations and the energy sector, being regularly consulted in order to monitor jointly the impacts of power lines on waterbirds and to agree on a common policy of action?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The relevant stakeholders are consulted annually in the frame of the Accessible Sky programme (national scheme for the bird-friendly conversion of the power line system in Hungary), running since 2008.

65.2. Has a baseline of waterbird distribution, population sizes, migrations and movements (including those between breeding, resting and feeding areas) been established as early as possible in the planning of any power line project, over a period of at least five years, and with particular emphasis on those species known to be vulnerable to electrocution or collision?

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> In most cases, the five-year period is too long for the developers who have strong lobbying power. Shorter timeframes are available for baseline surveys.

65.3 If such studies, as described in the question above, have identified any risks, has every effort been made to ensure these are avoided?

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> Most of the important waterbird sites are Special Protection Areas under the EU Birds Directive, where Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive applies, and according to that, risks have to be avoided and mitigated.

65.4. Have the location, route and direction of new power lines been designated on the basis of national zoning maps?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Protected areas, SPAs, etc. are taken into consideration by the authorities under legislation when deciding about consenting to a new power line.

65.5. Has, wherever possible, the construction of power lines along major migration flyways and in habitats of conservation importance\* been avoided, where such construction is likely to have significant effects on waterbirds?

\* such as Special Protection Areas under the EU Birds Directive, Important Bird Areas, protected areas, Ramsar sites, the West/Central Asian Site Network for Siberian Crane and other waterbirds and other critical sites as identified by the Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool for the African-Eurasian region.

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> No power line construction in important waterbird habitats is known to have taken place in the reporting period.

65.6. Are bird-safe designs in the construction of new power infrastructure, including measures designed to reduce electrocution and collisions being used in your country?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In the frame of the Accessible Sky programme, bird-safe designs are jointly planned by conservationists and electric engineers.

65.7. Have those sections of existing power lines that are causing relatively high levels of waterbird injury and/or mortality due to electrocution and/or collision been identified?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In the frame of the Accessible Sky programme, a number of priority power lines have been retrofitted (e.g. marked) from EU co-financing. Some power lines are presently buried underground or will be buried in the near future.

65.8. Where sections of existing power lines have been identified to cause relatively high levels of waterbird injury and/or mortality due to electrocution and/or collision, have they been modified as a matter of priority?

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> In the frame of the Accessible Sky programme, a number of priority power lines have been retrofitted or marked, using EU co-financing. Some MVPL sections have been buried underground, and some will be buried in the near future.

65.9. Is there in your country regular monitoring and evaluation of the impact of power lines on waterbird populations at the national scale?

Partial

Please provide details.

>>> There is no capacity for regular nationwide monitoring.

65.10. Is there in your country regular monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of mitigation measures put in place to minimise the impact of power lines on waterbird populations?

Partial

Please provide details.

>>> The effectiveness of some mitigation measures are checked on an irregular basis by NPD staff or civilians.

65.11. Have the measures contained in Resolution 5.11. been included in your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and relevant legislation?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> It is not included in the National Biodiversity Strategy, however, it is included in the National Nature Conservation Master Plan.

**66. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on how to avoid or mitigate impact of electricity power grids on migratory birds in the African-Eurasian region?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The guidelines have been incorporated in the implementation of the Accessible Sky programme.

**67. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 5.16 on Renewable Energy and**

## Migratory Waterbirds.

67.1. Has a national sensitivity and zoning mapping to avoid overlap of renewable energy developments with areas of importance for migratory waterbirds been developed in your country?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> A national sensitivity and zoning map of protected areas, Natura 2000 network etc. was first produced in 2007 for wind farms. As the long-standing national ban for establishing wind farms was lifted in 2023, new maps were developed, which include raptor nests, foraging sites, waterbird flyways, and bat habitats.

67.2. Have any international environmental guidelines, recommendations and criteria been followed in your country for impact assessment of renewable energy developments and the utilization of renewable energy sources?

Yes

Please describe which guidelines, recommendations and criteria have been followed.

>>> Guidance document on Wind Energy Developments and Natura 2000 by the European Commission.

67.3. Is post-construction monitoring being undertaken of the renewable energy installations and associated infrastructure in your country?

Yes

Please share information and lessons learnt from the post-construction monitoring (attach files or add weblinks, if available)

>>> Post-construction monitoring is usually prescribed in permits, but results are not known to have been published.

Has adverse effect on migratory waterbirds and their habitats been identified?

No

67.4. Where damage cannot be avoided or mitigated, has compensation for damages to biodiversity been provided?

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> The regulation provides for avoidance and mitigation of damage, but no such case occurred in the reporting period.

Operate wind farms in ways that minimise bird mortality, for example by introducing shortterm shutdowns during peak migration and minimising lighting in wind farms.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> By placing wind farms outside SPAs.

Dismantling of wind turbines in existing installations, should waterbird mortality have an effect on the population status of a species and other mitigation measures have proved insufficient.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Data collection on the effects of wind turbines on waterbirds has not been carried out due to lack of capacity.

Focusing research efforts on alleviating the negative effects on waterbirds from wind farms, such as the mapping of the main migration corridors and migration crossings for waterbirds also allowing the optimising of wind farm layouts.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Wind farms are known to be conflicting with terrestrial birds in Hungary, such as raptors or the Great Bustard, but their effect on waterbirds has not been studied due to lack of capacity.

67.6. Have any specific measures been put in place to assess, identify and reduce potential negative impacts of biofuel production on migratory waterbirds and their habitats?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> Lack of capacity

67.7. Have the measures contained in Resolution 5.16. been included in your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and relevant legislation?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> It is not included in the National Biodiversity Strategy, however, it is included in the National Nature Conservation Master Plan.

**68. Has your country used the following AEWA Conservation Guidelines - Renewable Energy Technologies and Migratory Species: Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment (Resolution 6.11)?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What other guidance has been used instead?

>>> EU guidance is used.

**69. Is by-catch of waterbirds in fishing gear taking place in your country? (Resolution 3.8) (Please respond to this question only with respect to species, which are NOT considered seabirds. Seabird by-catch is dealt with in section 4.6 Seabirds)**

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> Hungary is a landlocked country, so marine fishing is not relevant. However, angling has a negative effect on especially mute swans (*Cygnus olor*), as several specimens get injured regularly by getting entangled in lines and/or swallowing hooks. It is a consistently occurring problem; unless getting help, the specimens weaken and eventually die of either starvation or infections.

**71. Has any project / initiative been implemented in your country that promotes the integration of cultural and provisioning ecosystem services of migratory waterbirds into policy and decision-making affecting them or their habitats? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.6)**

No

# Pressures and Responses

## 7. Research and Monitoring

### 72. Does your country have in place waterbird monitoring schemes for the AEWA species? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.4(a) and 1.4(b))

Yes

#### Covering the breeding period

Guidance: Including pre- and post-breeding sites of concentration, such as moulting sites close to breeding areas

Fully [Guidance: Coverage is full when all waterbird species are covered by monitoring schemes that yield statistically robust estimates of breeding population size and trend at least once in every triennium.]

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected? (Resolution 8.5; ref. document AEWA/MOP 8.27)

Yes

Are demographic data (age and sex classes) also being collected? (Resolution 8.5; ref. document AEWA/MOP 8.27)

Yes

#### Covering the passage period

Partially

Please provide details. (incl. list the species covered OR not covered (whichever list is shorter))

>>> Monitoring schemes are in place but there is no capacity to cover each wetland. At most of the wetlands, all AEWA species are covered. Monitoring is carried out by national park staff, NGOs and volunteers.

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?(Resolution 8.5; ref. document AEWA/MOP 8.27)

No

#### Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

Partially

Please provide details. (incl. list the species covered OR not covered (whichever list is shorter))

>>> In Hungary there is a monitoring program for waterfowl, called "Hungarian Waterfowl Censuses". Monitoring is carried out 8 months a year (from August to April) aiming to detect the dynamics of breeding birds and migratory birds and carrying out synchronic censuses on Ramsar and important migratory sites. In the frame of this program 51 species are monitored. The program covers the most important wetlands, fishponds and lakes in Hungary, 23 main areas in total. Almost all of them are Ramsar sites and these are internationally and nationally important non-breeding/wintering sites. There is also a goose census carried out in November to record all of the goose species, native and migratory, present in the country. Key species are Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) and Red-breasted Goose (*Branta ruficollis*).

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected? (Resolution 8.5; ref. document AEWA/MOP 8.27)

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The national waterfowl monitoring program includes protected and strictly protected waterbird species. It is carried out by national park directorates and other participants 8 months a year aiming to detect the dynamics of breeding and migratory birds and carrying out synchronic censuses on Ramsar and other important migratory sites, monitoring of the effectiveness of nature conservation programs, monitoring nature conservation activities.

### 73. Have you undertaken after MOP8 a brief assessment of existing monitoring activities in your country against the priorities set out in document AEWA/MOP 8.27 in order to help identify ways in which they can best implement those recommendations? (Resolution 8.5)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The monitoring of waterbirds can be considered thorough, considering the circumstances (not enough

capacity).

**74. Are data collected through the International Waterbird Census or other relevant monitoring schemes being actively used in your country to inform national-level implementation of AEWA? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.5(a))**

Yes

**75. Has your country supported, technically or financially, through bilateral or multilateral initiatives, other Parties or Range States requiring assistance and support in designing appropriate monitoring schemes, developing their capacity and overall strengthening of waterbird monitoring and population data collection? (Resolutions 5.2 and 8.5)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> There was a successful joint project, including monitoring activities, with Austria. Currently no such programs take place, but we are open to them as opportunity arises.

**76. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on waterbird monitoring?**

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The monitoring system is fully in line with the AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol.

**77. Has your government provided over the past triennium funds and/or logistical support for the International Waterbird Census and/or other waterbird monitoring scheme at international or national level? (Resolution 6.3)**

Yes

**Nationally**

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The census is partially carried out by NPD staff. (NPDs are governed and partially financed by the government.)

**Internationally**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of capacity.

**78. Has your country donated funds to the African-Eurasian Waterbird Fund in the past triennium (Resolution 6.3, 7.7 and 8.5)?**

**Notice:** Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reason

>>> Lack of financial resources.

**80. Has the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbirds been investigated in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12). When answering this question please also consider question 59 in chapter 6. Management of human activities.**

No

Are there plans to investigate the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbirds in your country?

No

Please provide reason(s)

>>> Lack of financial resources.

**81. Has your country established partnerships and initiated joint research programmes at any**

**level, with clear timeframes for delivery, to fill priority knowledge gaps as identified in document AEWA/MOP 8.30? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.1(a)).**

No

**82. In this reporting period, have results of conservation and management interventions, whether successful or unsuccessful, been published in your country so as to inform future conservation and management actions? (Article III.2(k), Resolution 8.7)**

No

# Pressures and Responses

## 8. Education and Information

### 8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

#### **83. Has your country developed and implemented programmes for raising awareness and understanding on waterbird conservation and about AEWA specifically? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 4, Target 4.3 and AEWA Action Plan, paragraphs 6.1-6.4, Resolution 3.10, Resolution 5.5; Resolution 6.10)**

Guidance: Such programmes should consist of a series of established, long-term communication activities, which are guided by clearly defined goals, target audiences and communication channels. A programme does not constitute a single, one-off communication activity, product or event. In other words, an established national programme to raise awareness and understanding on waterbird conservation and about AEWA would ideally be a number of targeted communication activities which are guided by a communication plan and are backed by sufficient human and financial resources.

Yes, being implemented

Please describe the awareness programmes which have been developed. Please upload any relevant sample materials which have been developed and add contact details of a contact person for each programme.

>>> Awareness-raising is a long-practised activity in the country: its elements are partly in the acts on the media, on public education, on environmental protection and nature conservation, in concepts on public health, family policy and youth policy and are applied in connection with our accession to international conventions (Aarhus Convention) on the access to information. CEPA was incorporated into some sectoral policies (e.g. National Environmental Programme, Vásárhelyi plan, National River Basin Management Plan under the Water Framework Directive) aiming at raising awareness of natural values and services and integrating their protection. "Forest school network": educational institutions that provide nature conservation training and education. Visitor centres operate in the territory of each national park directorate. No special support for biodiversity awareness raising but the theme is included into environmental education programmes and activities supported by the government and local governments and main organisers are visitor centres of national parks, NGOs, schools.

Does the programme specifically focus on AEWA and the provisions of its Action Plan?

No

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The programmes don't focus on them, however, they are fully in line with them.

#### **84. Has a National AEWA Focal Point for Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) been designated by your country? (Resolution 5.5; Resolution 6.10)**

No

#### **85. Have measures been taken by your country to implement the provisions related to "Education and Information" in the AEWA Action Plan over the last triennium? (AEWA Action Plan, Paragraphs 6.1-6.4)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Education and communication are carried out by NPD staff and MME BirdLife/Hungary. The activities are not based on the AP, but are in line with it.

#### **86. Have World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) activities been carried out in your country during this reporting cycle? (Resolution 5.5)**

No

#### **87. Has your country provided funding and/or other support, as appropriate (e.g. expertise, network, skills and resources) towards the implementation of the AEWA Communication Strategy and/or towards priority CEPA activities in the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027? Please consider both national and international funding and different types of support provided. (Resolution 6.10)**

Yes

Has this funding or support been on the national or international level?

Please provide details in the corresponding box below

National Level Funding and Support

>>> EU co-financing sources have been allocated for the support of, for example, the establishment of visitor centres (including at wetlands), nature trails, educational programs.

## Pressures and Responses

### 9. Implementation

**88. Have you undertaken a national assessment of the resources needed for the delivery of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.6.(b))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of capacity

**89. Has your country provided resources to address the resource needs as identified in document AEWA/MOP 8.43, for enabling and strengthening the international-level coordination and delivery of the Strategic Plan? (Resolution 8.3)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financial resources.

**90. Has your country approached non-contracting party range states to encourage them to accede to the Agreement? (Resolution 3.10; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 5.2)**

Report only on activities over the past triennium

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> -

**91. Does your country have in place a national coordination mechanism for implementation of AEWA, possibly linking to national coordination mechanisms for other biodiversity Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)? (Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.3(b))**

**Guidance:** Such mechanism can be a dedicated cross-institutional working group, involving representatives of the civil society and other relevant stakeholders, aimed at planning, coordinating and reporting the implementation of the Agreement in the country. Alternatively, the implementation of AEWA at national level can be coordinated as an extension of larger national coordination mechanisms for other MEAs, such as National Ramsar Committees or CBD NBSAPs coordination.

Yes, it is operational on a regular basis

Please provide details

>>> National coordination takes place for numerous activities covered by AEWA.

- development and implementation of Species Action Plans
- development and implementation of HPAI protocol
- drafting of legislation on waterbird hunting
- establishment and coordination of working groups (LWfG, and Laridae and Sternidae) which include government employees (ministry and NPD staff) and experts from the civil society.

Are priority capacity gaps addressed by the coordination mechanism?

No

Please rank the effectiveness of the national coordination mechanism for AEWA implementation:

High

**92. Have you undertaken a national assessment of the capacity needs for AEWA implementation? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.3.(e))**

No

93.1. Cooperate in launching regional initiatives, particularly in Africa, to address the implementation of capacity priorities, linking to the African Initiative, including scientific collaboration as well as a “younger generations” component, and including provision for actions to be further informed through country-specific needs assessments.

No

93.2. Establish procedures for ensuring continuity of succession and transfer of knowledge and skills, when

there are changes in personnel responsible for AEWA national implementation.

No

93.3. Hold regional or sub-regional preparatory meetings before each ordinary session of the MOP, in particular for African Range States, and for such meetings to include an enhanced capacity-building component targeting priority needs identified by the Parties concerned.

No

93.4. (For AEWA National Focal Points in the European Union (EU) only)

To cooperate with African National Focal Points, partner organisations and other stakeholders to explore opportunities for incorporating aspects of AEWA implementation capacity support in relevant existing projects and programmes in Africa, including the EU-funded NaturAfrica initiative and the Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial/EU-funded RESSOURCE sub-Saharan Africa project, as well as projects under the auspices of the wider CMS Family, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and UNEP.

No

**94. Has your country concluded, or considered concluding, twinning schemes between sites with other countries, the sites of which share common migratory waterbirds or conservation issues? (Resolution 5.20)**

Yes

Please provide details on each twinning arrangement

>>> Hungary has four transboundary Ramsar sites:

- Lake Fertő/Neusiedl with Austria,
- Ipoly/Ipel with Slovakia
- Baradla Cave system with Slovakia
- Upper Tisza with Slovakia

The transboundary Mura-Dráva-Duna Biosphere Reserve

**95. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation coordinated and engaged with national processes contributing towards the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))**

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Department is responsible for both AEWA and CBD.

**96. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation coordinated and engaged with national processes contributing towards the relevant Sustainable Development Goals and the assessment of achieving these goals? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))**

Yes

**97. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation coordinated and engaged with national processes to implementation and assess the delivery of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))**

Yes

**98. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation coordinated and engaged with national processes contributing towards the Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))**

Yes

**99. Are the AEWA priorities integrated into your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) and/or other similar national implementation mechanisms/processes for other international strategic plans and policies (Resolution 6.3; AEWA Strategic Plan, Targets 5.4 and 5.5)?**

99.1 The new generation of NBSAPs related to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (as adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in December 2022)

Yes

99.2 The relevant Sustainable Development Goals

No

99.3 The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032

No

99.4 The Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024

No

99.5 Other international strategic plans and policies

Yes

Please name the other strategic planning processes

>>> National Nature Conservation Master Plan (An annex of the National Environmental Programme).

Please provide details on which specific AEWA priorities, as per document AEWA/MOP 8.36, were incorporated

>>> Among a number of other tasks laid down by the "National Nature Conservation Master Plan", the following "main line of actions" specifically refers to AEWA: Implementation of the tasks defined in the species protection plans approved by the AEWA in relation to Hungary and preservation of major water world habitats. Continuation of the ban on the use of lead shots in wet habitats."

Sustainable Development Goals

No

Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Yes

Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032

Yes

Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024

Yes

**101. How would your country suggest promoting further links between the biodiversity MEAs to which your country is a Contracting Party, so as to make your work more efficient and effective?**

>>> Increased harmonisation of reporting obligations would help our work.

**102. Has your country donated funds to the AEWA Small Grants Fund over the past triennium? (Resolutions 7.1 and 8.3)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financial resources.

**103. Has your country donated other funding or provided in-kind support to activities coordinated by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat?**

No

**104. Has your country prioritised and allocated a Junior Professional Officer (JPO) to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for Technical Committee support or for any other area of work? (Resolutions 7.11, 7.12, 8.11 and 8.12)**

Not Applicable: the country has no arrangement with the UN to provide JPOs

**105. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 6.21 on Resource mobilization for the implementation of AEWA.**

105.1 Did your country's government provide in the last triennium financial and/or in-kind resources to support national activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Agreement, particularly those in line with the AEWA Strategic Plan including the AEWA Plan of Action for Africa, and in accordance with your national plans, priorities and programmes?

Yes

Please describe the resources provided

>>> Conservation activities are mostly carried out by NPDs.

105.2 Does your country's government have unpaid dues to the AEWA Trust Fund (annual assessed contributions to the Agreement's budget as approved by each session of the Meeting of the Parties)?

No

105.3 Has your country's government provided funding to support developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, to meet their obligations under AEWA, and the implementation of the AEWA Plan of Action for Africa 2019-2027? Under this question please report for support provided outside of formal and established intergovernmental cooperation. For the latter, please refer to the next question 105.4.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financing

105.4 Does your country's government participate in any South-South, North-South or triangular cooperation to enhance financial and technical support for the successful implementation of AEWA activities?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of capacity

105.5 Does your country's government use innovative financing mechanisms for implementing the AEWA Strategic Plan such as a (national) Migratory Waterbirds Fund?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of capacity.

105.6 Does the implementation of AEWA in your country benefit from synergies between biodiversity-related conventions at national level, amongst others, through information sharing on potential funding opportunities and sharing of financial resources such as the Desertification Fund, Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Fund, and the Global Environmental Facility?

No

## Pressures and Responses

### 10. Climate Change

**106. Please outline relevant climate change research, assessments and/or adaptation measures that are relevant to migratory waterbirds and which have been undertaken or planned in your country. (Resolution 5.13)**

a. Research and studies of climate change impacts on waterbirds

Undertaken

b. Assessment of the potential vulnerability to climate change of key habitats used by waterbird species (including those outside protected area networks) (Please note that the question asks about habitats, rather than sites. Question 43 in Section 5, sub-section 5.2 investigates vulnerability of sites to climate change)

No relevant activities

c. Assessment of the potential vulnerability of waterbird species to climate change.

Planned

d. Review of relevant national conservation policies relevant to waterbirds and climate change.

No relevant activities

e. National Action Plan for helping waterbirds adapt to climate change (as a separate implementation process or as part of a larger national framework for biodiversity adaptation to climate change. Please note that Question 44 in Section 5, sub-section 5.2 investigates national measures for increasing resilience of the ecological network for waterbirds to climate change).

No relevant activities

f. Other undertaken or planned relevant activities.

No

**107. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds to adapt to climate change?**

**Notice:** Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

**108. Has your country used the complementary Guidelines on climate change adaptation measures for waterbirds?**

No

# Pressures and Responses

## 11. Avian Influenza

### 109. What issues have proved challenging in responding nationally to the spread of the Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) in the last triennium and what further guidance or information would be useful in this respect?

List challenges

>>> 2023 spring: Laridae (*C. ridibundus*, *I. melanocephalus*) and Sternidae (*S. hirundo*) were severely affected.  
- slow or no response from the lab responsible for evaluation of HPAI tests  
2023 fall: *Grus grus* was severely affected.  
- large amount of dead birds at inaccessible places: collection of carcasses was impossible (e.g. swamps)  
- large amount of dead birds at accessible places: storage and destruction (burial or incineration) of carcasses was difficult

List required further guidance or information

>>> -

### 110. Does your country have in place surveillance and rapid testing programmes for HPAI of dead birds so as to inform: any enhancements to monitoring of the species populations (Resolutions 8.2 and 8.7) and site-related management and biosecurity measures as needed (Resolution 8.15)?

Yes

Please provide more information

>>> Both live and dead birds are tested on a regular basis. The samples (swabs) are delivered to and evaluated by the lab(s) of the National Food Chain Safety Office. The sender is informed about the result. The senders are mostly national park staff or veterinarians.

Has this information been submitted to international databases, e.g. the WOAAH WAHIS system <https://wahis.woah.org/#/home>, which strive to improve understanding of the epidemiology of the disease and its impacts across borders (as called for by the CMS/FAO Co-convened Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds: see paragraph 2.3.1.6 of the 2023 statement of the Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds on H5N1 high pathogenicity avian influenza in wild birds - unprecedented conservation impacts and urgent needs (available here)?

Yes (please clarify)

### 111. Has your country adapted/changed in the last triennium monitoring and assessment of those species affected by avian influenza, particularly HPAI H5N1 outbreaks, as well as other diseases, as the basis for potentially implementing emergency measures envisaged by paragraph 2.3 of the AEWA Action Plan? (Resolutions 8.2 and 8.7)

Yes

Please provide more information

>>> As a response to the serious outbreak of HPAI H5N1 affecting Laridae and Sternidae in May/June 2023, the monitoring of these species became more organized and thorough through coordinated activities by both national park staff and volunteers. Testing of live birds (chicks) is carried out during ringing sessions, mostly at the colonies in June. In addition to that, the adult and immature birds caught at dumps (including large-bodied gulls) are also tested.

Swans (*C. cygnus*) and geese (*A. anser*), Ardeidae species, storks (*C. ciconia*, *C. nigra*) and waders, breeding and non-breeding alike, are tested during ringing sessions. The National Food Chain Safety Office provides incentive by paying for each sample.

Raptors are also tested whenever they are caught. There have been H5N1 positive raptors, too (e.g. *F. cherrug*).

Did you report these data to the AEWA Secretariat or Wetlands International to allow population assessments for MOP9 to be made on the basis of most recent information on status?

Yes (Please provide details)

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> We've been asked by and provided information on the 2023 fall outbreak (*G. grus*) to CMS, which must have reached the Avian Influenza Task Force. The 2023 spring outbreak (Laridae, Sternidae) was included in the regional report for the StC meeting in 2023. A summary on the 2023 spring and fall outbreak is attached.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[HPAI outbreaks in Hungary 2023.docx](#)

**112. Have you established HPAI contingency plans nationally and at sites of significant importance to waterbirds, including coastal seabirds? (Resolution 8.15)**

Yes, nationally

Please provide details and reference to the plan or attach a copy

>>> Guidance was provided by the Ministry of Agriculture to national park staff, and specific instructions were sent to bird ringers. The guidance was based on guidelines issued by CMS, AEWA, and RSPB.

Samples were taken from dead birds by NPD staff, and from live birds by ringers.

The National Food Chain Safety Office also provided guidance in line with that of nature conservation.

Is the plan being implemented?

Yes (please provide details)

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Testing has been continuous, no outbreak has been detected since 2023.

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 11. Avian Influenza**

>>> The devastating effects of the 2023 outbreak on the breeding populations of the Black-headed Gull and the other species catalyzed the establishment of the first national working group on Laridae and Sternidae, aiming for systematic monitoring, the identification of threats and the conservation actions to take to halt the decline of the breeding population. The BHG is currently protected, whereas the Mediterranean Gull and the Common Tern (and all of our Sternidae species) are strictly protected. Laridae and Sternidae species need special attention directed to their nesting sites and the food supply (insects and small fish) available to them, especially in the chick-rearing period, May and June.

## **12. Confirmation**

### **Confirmation of information verification and approval for submission**

#### **Please confirm:**

In addition a scanned copy of an official letter from the relevant state institution, approving the report for submission, can be attached.

I declare that the information provided in the Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2021-2024 has been verified and the report has been approved for submission by the appropriate state institution in the country.

#### **Date of submission**

>>> 29 June 2025