



## 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**

>>> Iceland

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

>>> 1 June 2013

**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.**

>>> Iceland made a reservation to a number of species at the time of accession to the agreement and also following the seventh Meeting of the Parties in 2018.

## 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

>>> Natural Science Institute of Iceland

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Eydís Lindal Finnbogadóttir

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Urriðaholtsstræti 6-8

Postal code

>>> IS-210

City

>>> Gardabær

Country

>>> Iceland

Telephone

>>> +354 430 9000

E-mail

>>> eydis.l.finnbogadottir@natt.is

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

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Sunna Bjork Ragnarsdottir

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Natural Science Institute of Iceland

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Urridaholtsstræti 6-8

Postal code

>>> IS-210

City

>>> Gardabær

Country

>>> Iceland

Telephone

>>> +354 430 9043

E-mail

>>> sunna.b.ragnarsdottir@natt.is

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

Name and title of the TC NFP

>>> Snorri Sigurdsson, Head of Department

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Natural Science Institute of Iceland

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Urridaholtsstræti 6-8

Postal code

>>> IS-210

City

>>> Gardabær

Country

>>> Iceland

Telephone

>>> +354 430 9000

E-mail

>>> snorri.sigurdsson@natt.is

Website

>>> <http://en.natt.is/>

### **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.

The National Focal Point (NFP) has been designated as the National Respondent

### **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.

>>> Sigurdur Á. Thrainsson and Snorri Sigurðsson both at the Natural Science Institute of Iceland and Bjarni Jonasson at the Icelandic Nature Conservation Institute.

# 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))**

Yes

**Please indicate the outcome of this review**

Relevant national legislation was not fully in line with the Agreement text and its annexes

Please describe the discrepancies that were identified.

>>> Considering the reservation Iceland entered following MOP7 the legislation and implementation is considered to be in line with the convention and the modifications at MOP7.

**Please indicate whether the relevant domestic legislation was subsequently adjusted to be in line with the Agreement text and its annexes**

Relevant national legislation was adjusted and is now in line with the Agreement text and its annexes. Please describe what piece(s) of legislation was adjusted.

>>> With regulation no. 858/2023 the following sentence is added to the first paragraph of Article 10 of the Regulation no. 456/1994:

It is also prohibited to export, offer for sale, or sell the greylag goose and its products; however, the sale of taxidermied greylag geese is permitted.

Regulation no. 858/2023 remains in effect.

**Field for additional information (optional)**

>>> The legislation has been revised in line with the agreement with amendments of the relevant regulations. A revision of the legislation has been under consideration by the Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate for some time and the new government is evaluating the situation.

**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

>>> A bill for a new legislation was submitted to the Parliament by the former Government to adjust among other things management plans which could address these issues. The bill was not adopted at the time.

**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.

[Iceland\\_Q3\\_AEWA\\_NR\\_2021-2024\\_PopCoIA \(1\).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.

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

**5. Please confirm for each population, listed in the Excel file linked below, whether taking is regulated in your country. This list contains all the AEWA Table 1, Column B populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2; 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.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Iceland\\_Q5\\_AEWA\\_NR\\_2021-2024\\_PopColB.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 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Limes

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Hooks

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

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 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Tape recorders and other electronic devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Electrocuting devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Artificial light sources

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Mirrors and other dazzling devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Devices for illuminating targets

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

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 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Explosives

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Nets

Yes, partially

Please clarify whether the partial prohibition is temporal or spatial or both and indicate to which time periods and/or areas of your country it applies; provide further details, including the relevant legislation in place

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals, see also question 7.

Traps

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Poison

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

Poisoned or anaesthetic baits

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

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 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

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 64/1994 on conservation, protection and hunting of wild birds and wild mammals

**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)**

Yes

Please select from the list below those prohibited means of taking for which your country has granted exemptions:

Nets

Please provide further details on the exemption(s) granted from the prohibition of nets, including measures taken to ensure that use is sustainable.

>>> In accordance with Act no. 64/1994 hand nets mounted on long poles may be used in traditional hunting of puffins, auks, and murrets.

How is take under this exemption(s) tracked nationally and how is compliance with provisions of exemption monitored?

>>> Monitored through the catch reporting system.

**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))**

Yes

When was the review completed? Please attach a copy or provide a weblink, if available.

>>> While a formal and comprehensive legislative review has not been carried out since MOP8, Iceland has taken concrete regulatory steps that reflect strengthened implementation of AEWA obligations.

Two new regulations have been adopted to reduce hunting pressure on key migratory waterbird species: Regulation No. 858/2023 prohibits the sale of products derived from Greylag Goose (*Anser anser*), including eggs.

Regulation No. 983/2024 prohibits the sale of products from Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*).

These regulations aim to support the sustainable use and conservation of these species, in line with the obligations under paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan. They mark a targeted response to ongoing conservation concerns and contribute to improved compliance with AEWA requirements.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The current level of enforcement and compliance with the new regulations is unknown. No formal assessment or monitoring system is yet in place to evaluate the effectiveness of these measures or the degree of compliance by the public and relevant stakeholders. Further follow-up and data collection will be necessary to determine their impact.

## **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.

>>> The Guidelines have been used as an aid in the preparation of a new bill on wild birds and wild mammals for the Parliament.

## **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**

### **Greater White-fronted Goose / *Anser albifrons* National Plan for Greater White-fronted Goose / *Anser albifrons***

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> According to the current national legislation there are no requirements for species action plans or management plans. Revision of the legislation that was initiated few years back included provisions for Conservation and management plan for each species and a new bill presented for the Parliament. The bill did not pass but is currently being reviewed by new ministerial government.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> A new monitoring programme has been developed and implemented from 2024 to assess the number Greater White-fronted Goose at important staging areas in Southwest Iceland.

### **Barnacle Goose / *Branta leucopsis* National Plan for Barnacle Goose / *Branta leucopsis***

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> A new monitoring programme has been developed and implemented to assess the number of breeding pairs, breeding success, agricultural damage and distribution of Barnacle Goose in Iceland in accordance with ISSMP for the species.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Monitoring programme has been developed and implemented to assess the number of breeding pairs, breeding success, agricultural damage, and distribution of the Barnacle Goose in Iceland, in accordance with the ISSMP for the species.

The hunting season has been shortened and ban on selling Barnacle Goose products has been implemented with regulation no. 983/2024.

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

Advanced implementation - most of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Please provide details and reasons for the high degree of implementation.

>>> Monitoring programme has been developed and implemented to assess the number of breeding pairs, breeding success, agricultural damage, and distribution of the Barnacle Goose in Iceland, in accordance with the ISSMP for the species.

The hunting season has been shortened and ban on selling Barnacle Goose products has been implemented with regulation no. 983/2024.

### **Long-tailed Duck / *Clangula hyemalis*** **National Plan for Long-tailed Duck / *Clangula hyemalis***

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> According to the current national legislation there are no requirements for species action plans or management plans. Revision of the legislation that was initiated few years back included provisions for Conservation and management plan for each species. Continuation of the revision is uncertain at the moment.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The species is protected under Act No. 64/1994, and the population is monitored both during the winter, when migratory Long-tailed Ducks stay along the Icelandic coast, and during the breeding season at Mývatn. Monitoring has shown that the population has remained stable since 2013, and the updated national red list, published in March 2025, categorizes the species as Least Concern (LC).

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> According to the current national legislation there are no requirements for species action plans or management plans. Revision of the legislation that was initiated few years back included provisions for Conservation and management plan for each species. Continuation of the revision is uncertain at the moment. The species is fully protected in Iceland.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa islandica*) is protected under Act No. 64/1994 and is monitored as part of Iceland's national wader monitoring programme. Monitoring takes place at five key sites across the country. Although population trends vary regionally, recent analyses indicate an overall annual decline of approximately 1% since 2007. As a result, the species is classified as Near Threatened (NT) on the Icelandic Red List published in March 2025. The Icelandic population, which numbers around 68,000 pairs, is geographically widespread and largely confined to lowland wetlands and grasslands.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Iceland does not have a National Plan for the White-headed Duck because the species does not occur in the country.

### **Common Eider / *Somateria mollissima*** **National Plan for Common Eider / *Somateria mollissima***

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> According to the current national legislation there are no requirements for species action plans or management plans. Revision of the legislation that was initiated few years back included provisions for Conservation and management plan for each species. Continuation of the revision is uncertain at the moment. The species is fully protected in Iceland.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The Common Eider is protected under Act No. 64/1994 and is widespread around the Icelandic coastline, with breeding colonies found throughout the country except along parts of the sandy southern coast. The Icelandic wintering population is estimated at around 850,000 birds, including individuals from Northeast Greenland and Svalbard. Long-term monitoring indicates a sharp decline in winter numbers after 2000, followed by stability since 2014. Over the assessment period (1991–2024), winter counts suggest a decline of approximately 18%, corresponding to 0.6% annually. As most of the wintering birds originate from Iceland, the species is classified as Near Threatened (NT) on the Icelandic Red List published in 2025.

**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)**

Yes

Please provide details, including amount of funds donated

>>> Iceland supports the implementation of the ISSAP for the East Greenland/Scotland/Ireland Barnacle Goose population, with the government funding national monitoring efforts and funding for Icelandic delegates in working groups. Funds donated are approximately 35.000 EUR annually since 2021 but lower amount before that

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

Yes

Please provide details, including amount of funds donated

>>> Iceland takes part in developing a plan for the Icelandic-UK population of Greylag Goose, Iceland funds additional data gathering for that purpose, supports participation and meeting attendance of Icelandic experts and governmental representatives. Funds donated are approximately 100.000 EUR annually since 2023 but lower amount before that.

**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

>>> Iceland has been involved in development and implementation of Greenland Barnacle Geese and Graylag Geese ISSAP's, as well as monitoring for Brent Goose, Greylag Goose and Greater White-fronted Goose

**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))**

Yes

When was this review and prioritization completed?

>>> But only regarding the resources needed for monitoring.

Has a corresponding national resource mobilization plan been established?

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> A dedicated national resource mobilization plan to support the implementation of ISSAPs has not been established. The main constraint has been a lack of financial and human resources to develop and maintain such a plan. Existing efforts rely largely on project-based funding and institutional capacity.

**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)**

No

**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.

Not applicable

## Iceland

### Atlantic Puffin / *Fratercula arctica*

**17. For those species in unfavourable conservation status for which no Species Action or Management Plans exist, but conservation or management guidance has been issued by the Technical Committee, please report on the implementation of recommended measures in your country. This list contains all the AEWA-listed species that are regularly occurring in your country with at least 1% of their respective population for which conservation or management guidance has been issued.**

**Have recommended conservation or management measures been implemented?**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> A new population model for the Atlantic Puffin is currently being developed, and based on its results, Iceland is in the process of preparing a national management plan for the species.

### **Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.2. Single Species Action Plans**

>>> New population model is being developed and on that basis Iceland is underway in making and national management plan for Atlantic Puffin.

## 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.

No emergency situation has occurred

**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

Please explain

>>> No emergency situations encountered.

## 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

>>> Iceland does not currently maintain a national register of re-establishment projects for bird species. There is no formal mechanism or database in place to track such initiatives at the national level.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Iceland does not currently have a dedicated regulatory framework for the re-establishment of species, including waterbirds. While general provisions under the Nature Conservation Act may apply to species introductions or movements, there are no specific legal or procedural guidelines governing re-establishment projects.

The main reasons are that re-establishment has not been a national conservation priority, due to Iceland's relatively intact avifauna and limited history of species extinctions. Additionally, the small size of the conservation administration and lack of targeted funding have constrained the development of such a framework.

**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

Please explain

>>> No projects have been carried out.

#### 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, but not being enforced properly or at all

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

>>> Nature Conservation Act no. 60/2013 and Act on Animal Imports no. 54/1990 adopted by the Icelandic parliament. The Ministry for the Environment and Natural Resources is responsible for the NCA and its agencies the Environment Agency and the Icelandic Institute of Natural History have the responsibility of implementing the legislation. The Ministry of Industries and Innovations, including the Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for the legislation on animal import and one of its agencies, the Icelandic Food and Veterinary Agency is responsible for the implementation. As the AAI is more specific than the NCA all requests for an import permit are treated and processed according to its provisions and considerations of the NCA. Lack of proper implementation is among other things due to lack of proper supervision.

**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, but not being enforced properly or at all

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

>>> The Nature conservation act does include

**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)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No, Iceland has not developed or implemented specific programmes to control or eradicate non-native species of waterbirds, as such species are currently not known to pose a significant threat to native or migratory waterbird populations in the country. The introduction of non-native waterbirds is extremely limited due to strict import regulations and geographic isolation. However, Iceland maintains precautionary legislation under the Nature Conservation Act No. 60/2013, which prohibits the release of non-native species without a permit and requires risk assessments. This legal framework helps prevent the establishment of potentially invasive waterbird species.

**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

>>> Yes, Iceland has implemented programmes to control non-native species that may negatively impact migratory waterbirds, particularly terrestrial predators. The American mink (*Neogale vison*), a known predator of ground-nesting birds including waterbirds, has been the subject of long-standing control efforts through coordinated trapping and removal programmes across the country. These efforts aim to reduce predation pressure on vulnerable bird populations, especially in coastal and wetland areas. Additionally, Iceland maintains a list of prohibited non-native plant species whose import is banned due to potential ecological risks, including impacts on wetland habitats important for migratory waterbirds. These measures are part of Iceland's broader strategy to prevent the establishment and spread of invasive species.

Please provide further information for each relevant programme

>>> Regulation No. 189/1990 on the Import and Export of Plants prohibits the import of certain non-native plant species that may pose a threat to native ecosystems, including wetland habitats used by migratory waterbirds.

Act No. 64/1994 on the Protection, Conservation and Hunting of Wild Birds and Mammals, as amended in 2004, allows hunters to cull American mink without a special permit, as part of efforts to control this invasive predator and reduce its impact on native bird populations.

**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.

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> Iceland has not formally used the AEWA Guidelines on the avoidance of introductions of non-native waterbird species, but the principles are reflected in national legislation and practice. The import and release of non-native species, including waterbirds, is regulated under the Nature Conservation Act No. 60/2013. Due to Iceland's geographic isolation and biosecurity policies, the introduction of non-native waterbird species has been minimal, and preventative measures are generally effective in avoiding such introductions.

## 4.6 Seabirds

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

Yes

**30. Does your country have comprehensive data on seabird by-catch? (Resolution 7.6)**

Partial Data

Please provide details (for example, but not limited to, the scale of by-catch and species affected), including references or attach a file, if available

>>> Reporting is required by law on fisheries but implementation is not 100%.

When and how do you plan to fill remaining data gaps?

>>> Unknown

**31. Have you assessed the impact of by-catch by artisanal fisheries to AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)**

Yes

Please provide details, including reference or attach a file, if available.

>>> But not recently.

**32. Have you assessed the impact of artisanal/recreational fisheries on seabirds' prey? (Resolution 7.6)**

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Iceland has not conducted a formal assessment of the impact of artisanal or recreational fisheries on seabird prey populations. The primary constraint has been a lack of resources and targeted funding to carry out such evaluations.

**33. Has your country undertaken steps towards the adoption/application of measures to reduce the incidental catch of seabirds and combat Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing practices in the Agreement Area? (Resolution 3.8)**

Yes

Please provide short description of all actions

>>> Iceland has taken steps to reduce incidental catch of seabirds and to combat IUU fishing. This includes the application of mitigation measures such as onboard observer programmes and electronic monitoring off selected vessels. The country also enforces strict licensing and catch reporting systems aimed at preventing IUU activities. Additionally, Iceland participates in regional fisheries management organizations and agreements that promote sustainable fisheries and the reduction of by-catch, including of seabirds.

**34. Does your country have data on illegal killing and egg harvesting of AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)**

Partial Data

Please provide details, including references or attach a file, if available.

>>> We have hunting data for some bird species that have been protected due to population decline, such as *Cepphus grylle* and *Anser albifrons flavirostris*.

When and how do you plan to fill remaining data gaps?

>>> That is uncertain

**36. Have you identified those seabird colonies at risk from invasive non-native species? (Resolution 7.6)**

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> This question is not applicable to Iceland because invasive non-native species are not currently known to pose a significant threat to seabird colonies.

Iceland's geographic isolation and limited presence of invasive terrestrial predators on offshore islands, has helped safeguard seabird breeding sites. The main invasive predator of concern, the American mink (*Neogale vison*), is largely absent from most seabird colonies due natural barriers. As a result, systematic risk assessments specific to seabird colonies have not been deemed necessary.

**37. Have you identified the key coastal and at-sea areas where responses to oil spills would be most urgently required in relation to the presence of AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)**

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> This question is not directly applicable to Iceland, as the country has relatively low levels of offshore oil and gas activity and limited risk of large-scale oil spills in its territorial waters. Additionally, Iceland does not have major oil shipping routes passing close to its coastline. While AEWA-listed seabirds are present in coastal and marine areas, the perceived risk of significant oil pollution events affecting seabird concentrations has been considered low.

# 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)

Partially

Please describe the progress

>>> In preparation for a new Nature Conservation Registry the Natural Science Institute of Iceland prepared suggestions submitted in 2018 regarding important bird areas, including waterbird sites, for protection and inclusion in a network of important bird areas.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Although the inventory has not yet been formally reviewed and confirmed through the AEWA process, Iceland has identified a number of important sites for waterbirds, many of which are nationally designated protected areas. These include, among others: Breiðfjörður, Flatey á Breiðafirði, Hornstrandir, Látrabjarg, Vatnsfjörður, Guðlaugs- og Álfgeirstungur, Hrótey í Blöndu, Miklavatn, Friðland í Svarfaðardal, Krossanesborgir, Mývatn og Laxá, Vatnajökulsþjóðgarður, Vestmannsvatn, Gerpissvæðið, Hálsar, Kringilsárrani, Skrúður, Dyrhólaey, Herdísarvík, Ingólfshöfði, Oddaflóð, Ósland, Pollengi og Tunguey, Salthöfðamýrar, Surtsey, Þingvellir, Þjórsárver, Viðey í Þjórsá, Akurey, Ástjörn, Bakkatjörn, Bessastaðanes, Blikastaðakró-Leiruvogur, Eldey, Gróttá, Hlíð, Hvaleyrarlón, Kasthúsatjörn, Lundey, Skerjafjörður, Varmárósar, Vífilsstaðavatn, Andakíll, Blautós, Friðland við Fitjá, Grunnafjörður, Melrakkaey, and Snæfellsjökull.

#### 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

>>> National action to update the Nature Conservation Registry.

#### 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

Please explain the reasons

>>> No. Iceland has not yet reviewed and confirmed its inventory of nationally and internationally important sites under the AEWA process launched in August 2020. This is primarily due to limited capacity and competing priorities in national conservation work. However, Iceland recognizes the importance of this action and aims to address it when resources allow.

### 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

For the national protected area network

No

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING

No

#### 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

>>> Protected bird areas are incorporated into planning.

**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.

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> There is no management of such 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

>>> Lack of resources

**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))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

**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))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

# 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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[6.1\\_51.pdf](#)

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

>>> See attached document

**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))**

No

Please explain the reasons and barriers to introduction of legislation

>>> While Iceland has not yet implemented a ban on the use of lead shot, this is not solely due to a lack of interest or political will. The main reasons are resource constraints and competing priorities within the administration. Implementing and enforcing such a ban would require increased funding, stakeholder dialogue, and realistic expectations, particularly given the logistical challenges of monitoring compliance across large and remote areas.

Iceland is currently awaiting the adoption of a comprehensive ban at the broader (e.g. EU/EEA) level, which is seen as the most practical and effective approach. Nonetheless, it is encouraging that awareness is growing, and some ammunition manufacturers have already started producing and selling lead-free alternatives.

Has your country introduced self-imposed and published timetable for banning fully the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> See answer regarding reasons and barriers.

**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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[53\\_Illegal\\_hunting.pdf](#)

How would you rate the effectiveness of the measures?

Moderate

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

>>> One of the main challenges in preventing illegal hunting in Iceland is the limited active enforcement of hunting regulations. Due to resource constraints and the vast, remote nature of many hunting areas, routine field inspections are rare, making it difficult to detect and respond to illegal activities effectively.

Furthermore, there is a need to strengthen cooperation with stakeholders, including hunting associations, landowners, and conservation organizations, to build a shared sense of responsibility for lawful and sustainable hunting practices.

Increasing education and outreach efforts aimed at hunters and the general public would also play an important role in raising awareness of hunting laws, the importance of species protection, and the broader goals of sustainable use under international agreements such as AEWA.

**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

>>> Every hunter has to pass an examination, including species identification test and attend practical shooting on a range, in order to receive his shooting licenc.

**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)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> But the hunters association has published best practice guidelines for its members.

**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.

No

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

>>> Iceland supports the principle of sustainable harvest as required by national legislation. While specific use of the AEWA Conservation Guidelines has not been formally documented, their objectives align with the general legal framework and practices regulating hunting in Iceland.

Hunting levels and available population trends have been used to inform decisions related to harvest management.

## 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))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Wetland- and waterbird-related ecotourism is not formally addressed as a separate focus area in national tourism strategies. However, it is framed more generally within broader nature-based tourism policies, such as the Act on a National Infrastructure Plan for the Protection of Nature and Cultural Heritage (No. 20/2016), the National Infrastructure Plan, and the Tourism Strategy to 2030 including its corresponding action plan. These frameworks support sustainable tourism development that can include wetland and bird-related ecotourism.

**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)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> While there are no formal national ecotourism programmes solely dedicated to migratory waterbirds, birdwatching forms an important part of Iceland's nature-based tourism. Various local initiatives and tour operators offer experiences that highlight migratory species and their habitats. Key locations include Lake Mývatn, known for its rich duck populations, and coastal areas such as Látrabjarg, Grímsey, and Borgarfjörður eystri, which attract visitors for seabird observation. These initiatives align with the broader objectives of Iceland's Act on a National Infrastructure Plan for the Protection of Nature and Cultural Heritage (2016 No. 20) and the Tourism Strategy to 2030, both of which emphasize sustainable tourism and the value of natural heritage.

## 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.**

Yes

Please describe what restrictions are in place, when they were introduced and whether they are considered to have worked (i.e. reduced the impact of lead poisoning). Please attach any published or unpublished references.

>>> Restrictions on the use of lead fishing weights have been introduced through the adoption of relevant EU regulations, which Iceland follows under the EEA Agreement. However, implementation and enforcement of these restrictions remain limited.

**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

>>> Iceland has comprehensive legislation mandating both Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) for activities that may significantly affect natural habitats or wildlife. The primary legal framework is the Environmental Impact Assessment Act No. 111/2021, which aligns with EU Directive 2014/52/EU as per the EEA Agreement.

Under this Act, projects likely to have significant environmental effects are subject to an EIA. The National Planning Agency evaluates whether a project requires an EIA and oversees the assessment process. The Act also stipulates that certain plans and programs undergo SEA to ensure environmental considerations are integrated at the strategic planning level.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> These assessments aim to identify, predict, and mitigate potential adverse impacts on the environment, including effects on biodiversity and natural habitats. The process involves public participation and consultation with relevant authorities, ensuring transparency and informed decision-making.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include cumulative impact assessment?

No

Please provide details

>>> Icelandic legislation mandates the consideration of cumulative impacts within both Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA). The Environmental Impact Assessment Act No. 111/2021, along with its implementing regulations, requires that assessments account for the combined effects of the proposed project and other existing or planned activities that may collectively impact the environment. This includes evaluating the incremental and synergistic effects on environmental factors such as biodiversity, water quality, and land use.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The Environmental Impact Assessment Act No. 111/2021, along with its implementing regulations, ensures that the public is informed and consulted at various stages of the assessment process. This includes the opportunity to review and comment on scoping documents and environmental impact statements. The National Planning Agency oversees the implementation of these provisions, facilitating transparency and public involvement in environmental decision-making.

**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)**

Yes

Please describe each measure and provide details for each of them

>>> In addition to the Environmental Impact Assessment framework, Iceland has several legal and administrative measures in place to protect areas of importance for migratory birds.

The Nature Conservation Act No. 60/2013 provides the basis for protecting natural habitats and biodiversity, including the designation of protected areas and habitats essential for bird species. This legal framework supports the avoidance and mitigation of negative impacts from development on key bird areas.

The Act on Water Management No. 36/2011 is also relevant, as it is based on the EU Water Framework Directive. It aims to protect and improve the ecological status of aquatic ecosystems, including wetlands, which are critical habitats for migratory waterbirds. River basin management plans under this legislation help guide development in a way that avoids or mitigates adverse effects on these habitats.

Please rank the effectiveness of these measures:

Medium

Please provide details and the reasons for lower effectiveness

>>> Environmental considerations are formally integrated into planning and assessment processes, and the tools for protection, mitigation, and compensation exist. However, limited monitoring capacity, resource constraints, and occasionally fragmented coordination between agencies can reduce overall impact.

As a result, the measures are moderately effective in safeguarding key habitats for migratory birds, but there is room for improvement in enforcement, follow-up, and habitat-specific planning.

**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))**

Yes, all proposed projects

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

Please describe the measures put in place

>>> When EIA processes have identified potential significant negative impacts on migratory waterbirds or their habitats, steps have been taken to avoid such impacts. In several cases, project sites—particularly within infrastructure and energy development—have been modified to avoid sensitive areas such as wetlands.

**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.

>>> There is currently no centralized national system for recording adverse impacts of development activities on sites of national or international importance for migratory waterbirds. However, many companies are mandated through conditions in their operating licenses to carry out environmental monitoring, which may include tracking impacts on bird habitats. These monitoring efforts are typically conducted independently and the results are not systematically compiled at the national 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.

No

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

>>> While not formally adopted into national legislation, the principles outlined in the AEWA Conservation Guidelines No. 11—have been informally considered in Iceland's environmental assessment processes. These guidelines emphasize the importance of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) in evaluating potential impacts on waterbirds and their habitats. In practice, Iceland's SEA and EIA procedures incorporate similar considerations, such as stakeholder involvement, assessment of cumulative impacts, and the application of the precautionary principle. This alignment reflects Iceland's commitment to the conservation objectives of AEWA.

**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?

No

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

>>> While there is general awareness of the potential impacts of power lines on migratory waterbirds, regular

consultation and coordination among relevant stakeholders—such as government bodies, researchers, NGOs, and the energy sector—do not currently take place in a systematic way. The main constraint has been a lack of dedicated resources for structured monitoring and stakeholder engagement on this issue.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Establishing baseline data on waterbird distribution, population sizes, and movements is typically done early in the planning process for power line projects, as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documentation. These assessments include data collection and expert input on species potentially affected, with particular attention given to species known to be vulnerable to electrocution or collision.

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.

>>> Efforts are generally made to avoid identified risks to migratory waterbirds when planning power line projects. This includes considering alternative routing, avoiding key habitats, and applying mitigation measures where feasible. However, while avoidance is often attempted during the planning and EIA process, full implementation of mitigation measures is not always achieved due to practical constraints or competing land-use priorities.

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

No

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

>>> The location, route, and direction of new power lines in Iceland are not systematically designated based on national zoning maps. While spatial planning frameworks exist, there is currently no dedicated national zoning system in place that integrates ecological sensitivity or bird migration data specifically for this purpose. The main constraints are the lack of detailed ecological zoning data, limited integration of biodiversity considerations into early-stage infrastructure planning, and insufficient resources to support the development and use of such mapping tools.

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.

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> While efforts are made during the planning and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) processes to avoid constructing power lines in areas of high conservation value—such as wetlands and known bird habitats—there is no formal national zoning system that systematically excludes major migration flyways or critical habitats from infrastructure development. Consequently, some power lines have been constructed in or near sensitive areas, potentially impacting migratory waterbirds. Constraints include limited ecological data integration into spatial planning and the absence of comprehensive national guidelines for routing infrastructure away from key bird areas.

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?

No

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

>>> Bird-safe designs, such as insulation of wires or markers to reduce collisions, are not systematically used in the construction of new power infrastructure in Iceland. The main constraints are the lack of a legal framework mandating such measures and insufficient national data on the effectiveness of specific mitigation designs under Icelandic conditions. While awareness of the issue is growing, further research, guidance, and

regulatory support are needed to promote consistent implementation.

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?

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> Some areas where waterbird collisions or electrocutions are suspected or have been observed have been informally identified, often through local observations. However, there is no systematic national monitoring programme in place to identify high-risk sections of power lines. As a result, knowledge of problem areas remains limited and fragmented.

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?

No

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

>>> Although some sections of power lines with known or suspected impacts on waterbirds have been noted, there is currently no formal mechanism or mandate to prioritize and implement modifications to reduce electrocution or collisions. The absence of targeted monitoring, legal obligations, and dedicated funding limits the ability to address these issues systematically.

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.

>>> While a number of bird counts and impact investigations related to power lines have been carried out in specific areas, there is no regular or coordinated national-scale monitoring programme in place to assess the impact of power lines on waterbird populations. Most efforts have been project-based or local in scope.

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?

No

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

>>> Currently, there is no regular or systematic national programme in Iceland to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures implemented to reduce the impact of power lines on waterbird populations. While some localized studies and assessments have been conducted, these are not part of a coordinated national strategy. The primary constraints include limited resources, absence of a legal framework mandating such evaluations, and a lack of comprehensive data on the effectiveness of specific mitigation measures under Icelandic conditions.

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?

>>> The measures outlined in AEWA Resolution 5.11 on Power Lines and Migratory Waterbirds have not been formally incorporated into Iceland's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan or relevant national legislation. The specific provisions of Resolution 5.11 have yet to be systematically integrated into national policy frameworks. Constraints to implementation include limited resources, the absence of a dedicated legal mandate, and the need for further data on the effectiveness of mitigation measures under Icelandic conditions.

## **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.

No

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

>>> While general environmental assessments are conducted, the detailed recommendations of the AEWA guidelines have not been fully integrated into practice.

In Iceland, guidance on mitigating the impact of power infrastructure on birds has largely been derived from general environmental assessment procedures under the Environmental Impact Assessment Act No. 111/2021, as well as case-by-case expert input during project planning. There is currently no national guideline specifically addressing bird-safe power infrastructure.

## **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

>>> Iceland has developed a national sensitivity and zoning framework through the Master Plan for Nature Protection and Energy Utilization (Rammaáætlun). This strategic planning tool assesses proposed renewable energy projects—primarily hydro and geothermal—based on environmental, cultural, and economic criteria. Projects are categorized as either suitable for development, requiring further study, or protected from development.

The Rammaáætlun process considers bird species and their migratory routes, typically on a species-specific level, particularly where data on distribution, breeding areas, and known flight paths are available. Although the framework does not provide a detailed, dedicated sensitivity map for all migratory waterbirds, bird-related data are factored into environmental evaluations and contribute to decision-making.

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.

>>> Yes. Iceland's Master Plan for Nature Protection and Energy Utilization (Rammaáætlun) integrates several international environmental guidelines and best practices into its assessment framework for renewable energy projects.

Notably, the Master Plan adopts a strategy aligning with principles outlined in the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2001/42/EC). This ensures that environmental considerations are integrated into the early stages of policy, plan, and program development.

It also considers international agreements such as, the Ramsar Convention principles by recognizing the importance of wetlands and their role in supporting migratory waterbird populations.

Additionally, the plan incorporates aspects of the EU Birds and Habitats Directives, particularly in identifying areas of ecological significance, such as Important Bird Areas (IBAs).

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 mandated in certain operating licenses issued by the Icelandic Environment Agency. These licenses often require operators to implement monitoring plans that assess environmental impacts, including those on ecosystems and biodiversity, following the construction and operation of renewable energy installations.

A notable example is the Kárahnjúkar Hydropower Project, operated by Landsvirkjun. Since its construction, Landsvirkjun has conducted annual monitoring of the pink-footed goose (*Anser brachyrhynchus*) populations in the impact area, particularly around the Háslón reservoir. These studies have tracked nesting densities and population trends, providing valuable data on the species' response to habitat changes resulting from the project.

While such monitoring efforts are in place for major projects like Kárahnjúkar, the extent and specificity of post-construction monitoring requirements can vary between projects, depending on factors such as the type of renewable energy development and its potential environmental impacts.

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

Yes

Are mitigation measures being implemented?

Yes

Please provide details on the measures implemented.

>>> The construction of the Kárahnjúkar Hydropower Project led to habitat loss, including the inundation of nesting sites used by pink-footed geese (*Anser brachyrhynchus*). However, long-term monitoring suggests that the species has shown some adaptability by relocating to nearby areas. For example, increased nesting densities have been recorded in Kringilsárrani, and overall population trends appear stable. Mitigation measures in the area have focused primarily on minimizing disturbance during sensitive periods, such as the nesting season. This work is coordinated by Vatnajökull National Park, which identifies and manages sensitive areas based on ongoing monitoring data. These efforts aim to reduce human and operational impacts on key habitats and support the continued use of the area by migratory waterbirds.

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

No

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

>>> Currently, Iceland does not have a formal legal or regulatory framework that mandates compensation for biodiversity loss resulting from renewable energy developments. While environmental impact assessments (EIAs) are required for such projects, they primarily focus on avoiding and mitigating impacts rather than providing for compensatory measures when damage is unavoidable.

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

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons

>>> No wind farms are operating in Iceland.

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.

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons

>>> No wind farms are operating in Iceland.

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.

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons

>>> No wind farms are operating in Iceland.

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?

>>> There are currently no specific measures in place, as biofuel production does not take place in Iceland.

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?

>>> While environmental impact assessments (EIA) is standard procedure for renewable energy projects in Iceland, and the Rammaáætlun (Master Plan for Nature Protection and Energy Utilization) considers environmental factors, these frameworks do not explicitly reference AEWA Resolution 5.16 or its specific provisions.

## **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?

>>> In Iceland, the main guidance used in assessing renewable energy developments includes the Environmental Impact Assessment Act No. 111/2021 and the Strategic Environmental Assessment framework, both of which align with EU directives under the EEA Agreement. Additionally, the Rammaáætlun (Master Plan for Nature Protection and Energy Utilization) serves as a central tool for evaluating the environmental and social impacts of proposed energy projects.

**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)**

Yes

Please provide details (incl. the scale of by-catch and species affected)

>>> By-catch of waterbirds, particularly diving species such as seaducks, occurs in Icelandic coastal gillnet fisheries, most notably in the lumpfish (*Cyclopterus lumpus*) fishery. While some spatial and temporal restrictions exist, Iceland does not yet have a comprehensive national plan specifically addressing waterbird by-catch. Further efforts are needed to improve data collection and develop effective mitigation strategies.

**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)**

Yes

Please provide details for each project / initiative

>>> Iceland has undertaken few initiatives that recognize and integrate the cultural and provisioning ecosystem services provided by migratory waterbirds into policy and decision-making processes. One example is re-wetting project funded by LIFE that is collaboration between the Icelandic government, Icelandic Institutes, stakeholders, and international partners to restore and protect lowland wetlands, which are critical habitats for migratory waders such as the Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa*), Dunlin (*Calidris alpina*), and Common Snipe (*Gallinago gallinago*). These efforts not only aim to conserve biodiversity but also acknowledge the cultural significance of these species and their habitats to local communities. Additionally, the Reykjavík Biodiversity Policy emphasizes the importance of ecosystem services, including those provided by waterbirds, in urban planning and development. This policy framework seeks to incorporate biodiversity considerations into decision-making processes, reflecting the cultural and recreational values associated with migratory waterbirds

# 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

Partially

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

>>> Yes for Greylag Goose, Horned Grebe, Common Loon, Eurasian Oystercatcher, Black-tailed Godwit, Dunlin, Purple Sandpiper, Black-legged Kittiwake and Atlantic Puffin

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Information on drivers of population trends in migratory waterbirds is being collected to some extent, for example, changes in land use are tracked using CORINE land cover data, and weather and climate-related variables are monitored.

While these efforts contribute valuable insights, systematic and long-term assessments of the full range of drivers—such as predation, disturbance, or pollution—are still limited. Further integration of these factors into national monitoring frameworks would improve understanding of population changes.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Demographic data is collected for certain species, such as some geese, puffins, and some endangered species.

#### Covering the passage period

Partially

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

>>> Yes fully for Brent Goose,  
Partially for Greater White-fronted Goose and Red Knot,

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

Are demographic data (age and sex classes) 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))

>>> Partially for Greylag Goose, Long-tailed Duck, Common Eider, Common Loon, Eurasian Oystercatcher, Black Guillemot

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

No

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

No

**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

>>> No, Iceland has not undertaken an assessment of existing monitoring activities against the priorities set out in AEWA/MOP 8.27 since MOP8. This is primarily due to limited capacity and resources. However, the need for such an assessment is recognized, and it may be considered in future planning to improve alignment with AEWA monitoring recommendations.

**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

Please provide details

>>> Yes, national monitoring schemes are actively used in Iceland to inform national-level implementation of AEWA.

One key programme is the Icelandic Christmas Bird Count, which operates in parallel with the Audubon Society's Christmas Bird Count and contributes valuable long-term data on waterbird populations. These data support population assessments, conservation planning, and national and international reporting obligations under AEWA.

**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)**

Yes

Which country(ies) were supported?

>>> UK, through cooperation on graylag gees and barnacle gees monitoring and population data collecting.

**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

>>> Yes, Iceland has used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on waterbird monitoring, particularly in relation to structuring monitoring efforts for goose species.

**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

>>> Over the past triennium, the Icelandic government has provided support for national waterbird monitoring schemes. This includes funding and logistical backing for the Mid-Winter Bird Count (the Christmas Bird Count), a nationally coordinated initiative inspired by the Christmas Bird Count, organized by the Natural Science Institute of Iceland. The count involves volunteers across the country and contributes important data on wintering bird populations.

In addition, the government has supported other monitoring schemes related to migratory waterbirds, including breeding bird surveys and species-specific.

## Internationally

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The main reason for the lack of international support is limited funding and capacity, which has restricted Iceland's ability to contribute directly to cross-border monitoring programmes. National efforts remain the priority within available resources.

### **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 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 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)**

Yes

Please provide details and reference to each publication or attach a copy

>>> During the reporting period, Iceland has published results from various conservation and management interventions to inform future actions. These include annual hunting data and monitoring reports on species such as waterbirds.

Additionally, waterbird monitoring efforts, such as those conducted at the Andakíll Ramsar site, have been documented and made publicly available.

# 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.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

**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

Please explain the reasons

>>> We have not identified the appropriate person or institution for the task.

**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

>>> Lack of resources

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

**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)**

No

# 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

>>> Partially. Iceland has undertaken assessments of resource needs for specific actions under the AEWA Strategic Plan, particularly related to the monitoring and management of priority species. These species have been the focus of national monitoring efforts, data collection, and conservation planning, often aligned with AEWA's objectives.

However, a comprehensive national assessment covering all objectives and targets of the AEWA Strategic Plan has not been carried out. The main constraint is limited financial and human resources, which have prevented the development of a full-scale, strategic resource plan for AEWA implementation.

### 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

>>> Partially. Iceland has provided some resources to support the international coordination and delivery of the AEWA Strategic Plan. This includes funding for participation of national experts and government representatives in AEWA meetings, working groups, and relevant international processes. Additionally, resources have been allocated for data collection and processing to contribute to international reporting obligations and shared assessments. However, overall contributions remain limited due to budget constraints.

### 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

### 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

>>> There is a cooperation between ministries, agencies, organizations and focal points regarding different MEA's and strategies.

Are priority capacity gaps addressed by the coordination mechanism?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Iceland has a national coordination mechanism in place for the implementation of AEWA, which operates in connection with coordination structures for other biodiversity-related MEAs. While the mechanism is not formalized through a dedicated AEWA-specific body, relevant institutions and stakeholders collaborate on AEWA-related matters as part of broader environmental governance. Priority capacity gaps are addressed to some extent through this coordination, particularly in relation to monitoring, reporting, and participation in international processes.

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

Medium

Please provide details and the reasons for the lower effectiveness

>>> Lack of resources

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not formally. However, partial assessments have been carried out on a project-by-project basis. These have typically focused on specific species or monitoring needs, and have informed targeted actions and resource allocation. A comprehensive national capacity assessment for AEWA implementation has not yet been undertaken.

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> There is no formal procedure currently in place to ensure continuity of succession or structured transfer of knowledge and skills when personnel changes occur. However, informal communication and cooperation between key institutions and individuals involved in AEWA implementation are generally good, which helps maintain continuity in practice.

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

**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)**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

**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

>>> To a large extent, the same institutions—and in many cases the same individuals—are involved in both AEWA implementation and national processes related to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. This overlap supports coordination and coherence between AEWA-related work and broader biodiversity commitments.

**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

Please provide details

>>> Yes, to some extent the same institutions and often the same individuals are involved in these two processes regarding issues related to AEWA.

**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))**

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not applicable.

**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

Please provide details

>>> To some degree. There is overlap in the institutions and individuals responsible for AEWA and Ramsar implementation in Iceland, which allows for some level of coordination. However, relatively little attention has been given to Ramsar-related activities in recent years, and integration with the Ramsar Strategic Plan has not been a strong focus.

**99. Are the AEWA priorities integrated into your county'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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The current NBSAP is old and AEWA priorities were not incorporated. A new NBSAP is in preparation based on the new Global Biodiversity Framework being developed and the outcome remains to be seen.

99.2 The relevant Sustainable Development Goals

No

99.3 The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Iceland is not a party to the Migratory Species Convention.

99.4 The Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024

No

99.5 Other international strategic plans and policies

No

Sustainable Development Goals

No

Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Iceland has promoted the relevance of AEWA implementation in the context of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF), particularly through coordination between AEWA focal points and national biodiversity policy processes. Further integration of AEWA objectives, along with those of Ramsar, SPMS, and the SDGs, is planned as part of the new National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), which is currently under development. This will provide an opportunity to better align waterbird and wetland conservation with national and international development priorities.

Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not applicable

Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not a priority for the current government.

**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?**

>>> By coordinating and intergrade better work, strategies, action plans, implementation and reporting of different agreements.

**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 resources

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

**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?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

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 resources

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 resources

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

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not eligible.

## 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

Please provide references or weblinks to any such work so as to facilitate their use as potential case-studies to assist other Contracting Parties

>>> Iceland is preparing to launch research in 2026 on wetland restoration at multiple locations across the country. One of the key aims of the study is to assess how restored wetlands affect migratory wader populations, including their potential role in enhancing resilience to climate change.

In addition, Iceland is using trackers on Atlantic Puffins, multiple geese species, and several wader species.

These tracking efforts provide valuable data on movement patterns, habitat use, and migration timing, which can inform the development of effective adaptation measures for waterbirds under changing climatic conditions.

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> The assessment of the vulnerability of key habitats used by waterbird species to climate change is highly relevant in the Icelandic context. While some general evaluations of habitat types have been carried out, there are currently no plans to conduct a comprehensive assessment specifically focused on waterbird habitats, primarily due to limited resources. However, existing data on habitat vulnerability could support such efforts in the future, should funding and capacity become available.

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

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

Planned

Please provide details

>>> Planned as part of the new National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), which is currently under development.

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

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.

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

# 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

>>> One of the main challenges in responding to the spread of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) in Iceland has been the low detection rate of affected wild birds. Iceland is a large country with most of the population concentrated in a few urban areas, while bird colonies and migratory pathways are often located in remote and sparsely populated regions. As a result, many bird deaths likely go unnoticed.

Additionally, there has been insufficient funding for targeted monitoring programmes to estimate the presence and spread of the virus in wild bird populations.

National efforts have so far focused primarily on assessing the risk of transmission to domestic poultry and livestock, rather than systematic surveillance in wild birds. Further guidance on cost-effective monitoring approaches for remote regions, and support for integrating wild bird surveillance with broader animal health strategies, would be beneficial.

List required further guidance or information

>>> Cost-effective surveillance methods for remote and sparsely populated areas.

Risk assessment tools to evaluate potential transmission pathways between wild birds and domestic animals. Guidance on prioritising species and sites for monitoring based on migratory routes and conservation importance.

Access to shared international data platforms for rapid exchange of HPAI findings in migratory waterbirds across the flyway.

### 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)?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Iceland does not have a dedicated surveillance and rapid testing programme for HPAI in wild bird populations aimed at informing population monitoring or site-level biosecurity measures. Current surveillance efforts are primarily focused on preventing the introduction and spread of HPAI to livestock and poultry, rather than being oriented toward wildlife conservation or population-level responses.

### 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

>>> Yes, the Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority (Matvælastofnun – MAST) has in place a surveillance and rapid testing programme for HPAI in dead birds. However, the current scope and intensity of the programme are not sufficient to provide concrete information on the effects of the virus on wild bird populations. While the system supports initial detection and response, it does not allow for detailed assessment of population-level impacts or informed enhancements to long-term monitoring and site-level biosecurity measures.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of resources

## **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**

>>> 13.05.2025