



Report on the implementation of AEW A 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

>>> North Macedonia

Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

>>> 01.02.2000

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.

>>> The Republic of North Macedonia has not entered any reservations regarding populations listed in Table 1 of Annex 3 or specific provisions of the AEWA Action Plan

2. Institutional Information

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

Designated National AEWA Administrative Authority

Full name of the institution

>>> Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Izet Mexhiti, Minister

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Plostad "Presveta Bogorodica" nr. 3

P.O.Box

>>> 1000

Postal code

>>> 1000

City

>>> Skopje

Country

>>> North Macedonia

Telephone

>>> +389 2 3251-400

Fax

>>> +389 2 3220-165

E-mail

>>> infoeko@moepp.gov.mk

Website

>>> <https://www.moepp.gov.mk/>

Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Isuf fetai

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Plostad Presveta Bogorodica Nr. 3

Postal code

>>> 1000

City

>>> Skopje

Country

>>> North Macedonia

Telephone

>>> +389 2 3066-930

Fax

>>> +389 2 3220-165

E-mail

>>> i.fetai@moepp.gov.mk, isuf.fetai@yahoo.com

Website

>>> www.natura2000.gov.mk <http://redlist.moepp.gov.mk>

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

Name and title of the TC NFP

>>> Branko Micevski, Dr. Sci.

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> President of Macedonian Bonn Committee (MBC) and Bird Protection Macedonia

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Blvd. Februarski Pohod br 24/47

Postal code

>>> 1000

City

>>> Skopje

Country

>>> North Macedonia

Telephone

>>> +389 71 338 254

Fax

>>> +389 2400 276

E-mail

>>> brankom@ukim.edu.mk

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

Name and title of the CEPA NFP

>>> Branko Micevski

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Macedonian Bonn Commitee

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Blvd, Februarski POhod 24/47

Postal code

>>> 1000

City

>>> Skopje

Country

>>> North Macedonia

Telephone

>>> ++389 71 338 254

Fax

>>> +389 22 400 276

E-mail

>>> brankom@ukim.edu.mk

Website

>>> -

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

Please select from the list below as appropriate.

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.

>>> Nature sector under Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Pressures and Responses

4. Species Conservation

4.1 Legal Measures

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

No

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 review of national legislation in accordance with the AEWA Resolution 6.7 and the related Guidance has not yet been undertaken

Not enough human capacities and the same like in previous explanation above!

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.

[North_Macedonia_Q4_AEWA_NR_2021-2024_PopCoIA-Cat2_3_4_\(1\).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.

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.

[North_Macedonia_Q5_AEWA_NR_2021-2024_PopColB.xlsx](#)

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

No

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> A comprehensive review of enforcement and compliance with the domestic legislation relevant to AEWA implementation has not yet been undertaken following MOP8

Was a review undertaken before MOP8?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No comprehensive review was undertaken before MOP8. Prior to the 8th Meeting of the Parties, the domestic legislation relevant to AEWA implementation had not been subject to a specific and structured review in light of the AEWA Agreement text and its annexes. However, general provisions concerning species and habitat protection were already embedded within the national legal framework, notably the Law on Nature Protection. These provisions offered a legal basis for the implementation of AEWA obligations, though without a targeted assessment or harmonization process dedicated to AEWA prior to MOP8.

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.

Not Applicable

Please explain.

>>> The Republic of North Macedonia has not formally adopted the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on National Legislation; however, several elements of these guidelines have been considered during the development and implementation of national nature protection laws and strategies. The Law on Nature Protection incorporates provisions aligned with AEWA principles, particularly concerning the prohibition of hunting, disturbance, and trade of species listed under Column A of Table 1. Future revisions of national legislation and biodiversity strategies are expected to more explicitly integrate AEWA guidance, including species-specific protections and habitat conservation measures.

4.2. Species Action and Management Plans

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

Please report on all listed ISSAP, ISSMP and IMSAP

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Although there is no formal National Plan for the Ferruginous Duck in North Macedonia, the species is legally protected under the Law on Nature Protection. Conservation actions, such as habitat protection, monitoring during the International Waterbird Census (IWC), and inclusion in the Emerald Network and Ramsar sites, contribute to safeguarding the species at the national level.

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

Insufficient implementation – few of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Please provide details and reasons for the insufficient implementation.

>>> There is currently no dedicated National Action Plan for the Ferruginous Duck in North Macedonia. However, the species is legally protected and occurs in nationally and internationally designated sites such as Ramsar and Emerald Network areas (e.g. Lake Prespa, Lake Dojran). Some actions relevant to the ISSAP, such as habitat protection, wintering population monitoring, and awareness-raising, are being implemented. Nevertheless, these efforts are limited in scope and not directly aligned with the ISSAP timeline or structure. Therefore, implementation is considered insufficient at this stage.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> The Great Snipe is a rare and irregular species in North Macedonia, mostly observed during migration periods. There is currently no National Action Plan in place, nor specific conservation actions targeting this species. While it is protected under national legislation as a threatened species, no monitoring, research, or site-based management specifically addressing this species has been implemented to date.

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Although there is no National Action Plan specifically dedicated to the Eurasian Spoonbill, the species benefits from protection under national legislation and occurs in key wetland areas such as Dojran Lake and Prespa Lake, which are designated as Ramsar Sites and Emerald Network areas. Some site-level conservation actions—such as habitat protection, awareness activities, and occasional monitoring—contribute to the species' conservation. However, these efforts are not yet part of a structured or species-specific national plan.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Although there is no National Action Plan specifically dedicated to the Eurasian Spoonbill, the species benefits from protection under national legislation and occurs in key wetland areas such as Dojran Lake and Prespa Lake, which are designated as Ramsar Sites and Emerald Network areas. Some site-level conservation actions—such as habitat protection, awareness activities, and occasional monitoring—contribute to the species' conservation. However, these efforts are not yet part of a structured or species-specific national plan.

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

Insufficient implementation – few of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Please provide details and reasons for the insufficient implementation.

>>> While there is no formal National Action Plan for the Eurasian Spoonbill in North Macedonia, the species is protected by law and occurs in key wetland areas such as Dojran and Prespa Lakes. These areas are covered by international designations (Ramsar, Emerald) and some conservation activities—such as habitat protection and awareness-raising—are ongoing. However, these actions are limited in scope and are not directly aligned with the ISSAP schedule or structure.

11. Has your country provided assistance for the coordination and implementation of International Species Action or Management Plans through funding of AEWA International

Species Working and Expert Groups? (Resolution 7.5)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No. The Republic of North Macedonia has not provided financial assistance for the coordination or implementation of AEWA International Species Action or Management Plans through funding of AEWA International Species Working or Expert Groups.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No. The Republic of North Macedonia has not provided financial or in-kind assistance for the development of new AEWA International Species Action or Management Plans. Limited national resources and funding constraints have so far prevented such contributions

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))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No. The Republic of North Macedonia has not yet been directly involved in the development or implementation of any flyway-scale projects related to Single or Multi-Species Action Plans under AEWA. However, the country is interested in future participation in such initiatives, particularly for species occurring along the Adriatic or Central European flyways. Enhanced regional cooperation and technical support would be valuable to enable involvement in future flyway-scale conservation efforts

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

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> No. A formal review and prioritization of the resources required to develop and implement national action plans in response to AEWA International Single Species Action Plans (ISSAPs) has not yet been undertaken. Limited financial and human resources currently constrain the country's ability to initiate such processes.

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.

No

Please explain the reasons. What has been used instead as a basis for the preparation of NSSAPs?

>>> North Macedonia has not yet used the AEWA Guidelines for the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans, as no such plans have been developed to date

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?

Yes

Please provide information on each emergency situation for which measures have been developed and are in place

Measures for Introduction of alien species

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> North Macedonia has general emergency response mechanisms in place that can be activated in case of environmental threats affecting waterbirds. These include the national Crisis Management Center and the Protection and Rescue Directorate, which coordinate responses to natural disasters (e.g. floods, fires, pollution). The Law on Nature Protection allows for urgent conservation actions in protected areas. Veterinary protocols exist for the control of avian diseases, and the Environmental Inspectorate can respond to pollution events affecting key waterbird habitats such as lakes Prespa, Ohrid, and Dojran

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.

No

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

>>> North Macedonia has not yet applied the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds.

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

>>> North Macedonia does not currently maintain a national register of re-establishment (reintroduction or reinforcement) projects for waterbird species or other fauna. While no formal register exists, any such activities would require approval by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and would be assessed under the Law on Nature Protection. The development of a centralized register may be considered in the future as part of improved biodiversity monitoring and planning efforts.

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

No

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.

No

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

>>> North Macedonia has not yet used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on the translocation of waterbirds for conservation purposes.

4.5 Introductions

25. Does your country have legislation in place, which prohibits the introduction into the

environment of non-native species of animals and plants which may be detrimental to migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.1)

Yes, and being enforced

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

>>> North Macedonia has legislation in place that prohibits the introduction of non-native species which may pose a threat to native biodiversity, including migratory waterbirds. This is regulated under the Law on Nature Protection, which transposes provisions of the EU Birds and Habitats Directives as well as the Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 on Invasive Alien Species. The law includes restrictions on the introduction, keeping, breeding, and release of invasive alien species into the wild, particularly in protected areas and ecologically sensitive zones.

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

Yes, and being enforced

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

>>> In North Macedonia, the Law on Nature Protection, along with specific regulations for the keeping and handling of wild and exotic species, includes clear obligations for institutions such as zoos, animal parks, and private collections to prevent the escape of non-native species. These requirements are enforced by the State Environmental Inspectorate and Veterinary and Food Agency, through inspections, permit conditions, and facility compliance checks. While enforcement capacity can be improved, the system is functional and applied in practice.

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

>>> North Macedonia has not yet developed or implemented specific programmes for the control or eradication of non-native species of waterbirds. Although the issue of invasive alien species is addressed in general terms under the Law on Nature Protection and aligned with EU Regulation 1143/2014, no targeted action has been taken for waterbird species to date. Monitoring and assessment of potential threats posed by non-native waterbirds may be considered in future biodiversity planning processes or regional cooperation initiatives.

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)

Not applicable

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

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

No

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

>>> North Macedonia has not yet used the AEWA Guidelines on the avoidance of introductions of non-native waterbird species in a formal or structured manner. However, the issue is partially addressed through national legislation aligned with EU biodiversity regulations, particularly under the Law on Nature Protection and EU Regulation 1143/2014 on invasive alien species

4.6 Seabirds

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

for the country:

No

Pressures and Responses

5. Habitat Conservation

5.1 Habitat Inventories

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not enough human capacities and absence of any support of Bird Protection Macedonia from the international community

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.

No

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

5.2. Conservation of Areas and Habitats

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

For one or more single sites

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> same as above

For the national protected area network

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> same as above

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

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

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

All sites of national importance

Total number

>>> 3

Please rate the effectiveness of the national protection designation

Moderate

Please rate the effectiveness of the management measures

Moderate

Please rate the effectiveness of the climate resilience measures

Moderate

Examples of best practice (optional)

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

>>> Example of Best Practice: Lake Prespa – Ezerani Nature Park (Monument of Nature & Ramsar Site)

Why it's a best practice:

Integrated Management Plan: Developed in coordination with national institutions, municipalities, and local communities.

Climate resilience: Includes wetland restoration, natural water level regulation, and sustainable land use practices to address drought and biodiversity loss.

Community engagement: Involves local stakeholders in eco-tourism, sustainable agriculture, and awareness raising.

Cross-border cooperation: Part of the Prespa Park trilateral cooperation with Albania and Greece; contributes to a model for transboundary wetland governance.

EU project support: Implementation supported through EU-funded initiatives (e.g. PrespaNet, GEF/UNDP Prespa Lake Project).

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> same as above

MANAGEMENT GAP FILING

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> same as above

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.

No

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

>>> same as above

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

>>> same as above

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

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

Pressures and Responses

6. Management of Human Activities

6.1. Hunting

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

Yes

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

>>> The national legislation of North Macedonia, particularly the Law on Hunting and the Law on Nature Protection, incorporates the principle of sustainable use of wild species, including waterbirds. The legal framework:

Sets closed and open seasons for hunting,

Prohibits hunting during breeding and migration periods,

Includes a list of protected species and species allowed for hunting,

Requires the use of non-toxic shot in wetlands (in line with AEWA guidance),

Takes into account species' conservation status and geographic range through periodic updates.

However, implementation challenges exist due to limited capacity for enforcement and monitoring.

Strengthening the collection of harvest data and aligning with AEWA's flyway-level approach remains a priority for improving sustainability.

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

Fully

When was lead shot use in wetlands banned?

>>> North Macedonia has taken initial steps toward phasing out lead shot in wetlands, in line with AEWA commitments. The Law on Hunting and associated bylaws refer to restrictions on the use of toxic ammunition, and there have been awareness campaigns regarding the negative impacts of lead on waterbirds and wetland ecosystems.

What legislation is in place?

>>> Law on hunting

Who enforces this legislation?

>>> Hunting and environmental inspectorate

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

No

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

No

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

>>> no such project financed!

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

Yes

How would you rate the effectiveness of the measures?

Other

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)

Partially

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

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

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

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

>>> For such activity should be involved Bird protection Macedonia, but it should be organized through some project initiative

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.

>>> see above

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

Please provide details

>>> North Macedonia has a comprehensive legal framework that provides for both:

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) – regulated by the Law on Environment and relevant bylaws, applied to plans and programmes that may affect biodiversity or natural habitats.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) – also regulated by the Law on Environment, mandatory for projects likely to have significant effects on the environment, including those impacting wetlands, migratory waterbirds, or protected areas.

The national EIA and SEA systems are aligned with EU directives and incorporate consultation with the public and environmental authorities. AEWA-listed species and habitats of importance are considered within the screening and assessment processes

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In North Macedonia, both Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedures explicitly consider biodiversity components, including waterbirds and the wetland and aquatic habitats they rely on.

The Law on Environment and related bylaws require assessment of potential impacts on protected species, migratory species, and ecologically sensitive areas, such as Ramsar Sites, Emerald Network areas, and Important Bird Areas (IBAs).

Projects near or within habitats important for AEWA-listed species are typically required to:

Include baseline bird monitoring,

Assess seasonal/migratory sensitivity,
Propose mitigation or avoidance measures where needed.
This ensures that waterbirds and their habitats are integral parts of the decision-making process for development and land-use planning.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include cumulative impact assessment?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In North Macedonia, both SEA and EIA processes include provisions for the assessment of cumulative impacts, as required by the Law on Environment and aligned with EU Directive 2011/92/EU (EIA Directive). Specifically:

Cumulative impacts are assessed in relation to existing and planned activities, especially when projects are located near or within ecologically sensitive areas, such as wetlands, Ramsar sites, or habitats important for migratory waterbirds.

The EIA Guidelines recommend that the assessment consider:

Combined effects of multiple projects (e.g. agriculture + tourism + infrastructure),

Long-term and large-scale effects on biodiversity,

Impacts across the full lifecycle of waterbirds (e.g. breeding, migration, wintering).

While the requirement exists, implementation in practice can be improved, particularly in cross-sectoral coordination and long-term ecological monitoring.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In North Macedonia, both Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) processes include mandatory public participation, in accordance with the:

Law on Environment,

Aarhus Convention, and

EU Directives on SEA/EIA (transposed into national legislation).

Public participation includes:

Public notification of SEA/EIA reports,

Public access to documentation, often through municipal offices or online platforms,

Public hearings or consultations allowing individuals, NGOs, and local communities to provide input,

Consideration of public comments during the decision-making process.

These processes are applied especially when projects may affect protected areas, wetlands, or important bird habitats.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> If there is no some international financial institutions (some of them sometimes take care for environment and implement their environmental policies) nobody take care for environment that much! Even some banks, like KfW from Germany is not aware of that! (example of Wind Farm Bogdanci).

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

Partially (some projects only)

Please provide information on the projects where potential impact on migratory birds has not been assessed

>>> Yes, in the last three years, North Macedonia has applied Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedures for relevant development projects, including those in the energy sector (e.g. renewable energy installations and power line construction), to evaluate their potential impact on migratory waterbird species listed in AEWA Table 1 and the habitats or sites on which they depend. The legal basis is provided by the Law on Environment, which requires biodiversity to be considered in the assessment process, especially when projects are located in or near:

Protected areas (e.g. Ramsar sites, Emerald Network areas, national parks),
Important habitats for migratory bird species,
Ecologically sensitive zones, including flyways and wetlands.
However, while most major projects go through the SEA/EIA process, some challenges remain in practice, such as:

Limited availability of baseline data on bird species,
Inconsistent involvement of ornithological experts in EIA reports,
Weak post-construction monitoring of actual impacts.
Therefore, while the SEA/EIA system is applied in line with national legislation and AEWA commitments, further improvements are needed to ensure full and effective implementation, particularly for infrastructure projects near ecologically valuable bird habitats.

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?

Partially

Please describe the measures put in place

>>> Yes, when SEA or EIA processes in North Macedonia identify a likelihood of significant negative impacts on migratory waterbirds or their key habitats, steps are taken to avoid such impacts, in line with the Law on Environment and Nature Protection legislation.

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

Estimated number of sites

>>> 8 sites

Estimated number of sites avoided

>>> Internationally important sites: 2

Nationally important sites: 2

Estimated number of sites mitigated

>>> 5 sites

Estimated number of sites compensated

>>> 2 sites

Estimated number of sites

>>> Ramsar site Dojran lake, Macedonia! in the vicinity a wind farm was built without prior bird survey and impact assessment!

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

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?

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> Not enough capacities and supported actions!

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?

No

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

>>> Not enough capacities and supported actions!

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?

No

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

>>> It was not asked by the Ministry issuing environmental permit!

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?

>>> It is not demanded by the Ministry responsible for AEWA implementation in Macedonia

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

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

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> Yes, wherever possible, the construction of power lines along major migratory flyways and in key waterbird habitats has been avoided or carefully planned to minimize negative impacts. This is done in line with national environmental regulations and guided by Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) which specifically consider the risks to migratory waterbirds.

However, in some areas, power line construction has occurred or is planned, but mitigation measures such as marking power lines to reduce bird collisions, routing adjustments, and habitat conservation efforts are being implemented or proposed to reduce impacts.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Yes, in North Macedonia, bird-safe designs are increasingly being incorporated into new power infrastructure projects. This includes measures to:

Reduce electrocution risks by insulating dangerous parts of power poles and transformers.

Minimize collisions through the installation of bird flight diverters and markers on power lines in sensitive areas, especially along migratory flyways and important waterbird habitats.

These practices are promoted through environmental impact assessments and guidelines aligned with international best practices, though implementation varies depending on the project and funding.

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 sections of existing power lines that pose relatively high risks of waterbird injury or mortality due to electrocution or collisions have been identified, especially in sensitive areas near important wetlands and migratory routes.

This identification is based on monitoring by environmental authorities and NGOs, as well as reports from local communities and bird conservation groups. However, a comprehensive nationwide mapping is still ongoing or in planning stages.

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?

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> In cases where sections of existing power lines have been identified as causing relatively high levels of waterbird injury or mortality due to electrocution or collision, priority has been given to modifying these sections where resources and technical capacity allow.

Modifications have included installing bird diverters, insulating dangerous parts, and rerouting lines in some critical locations, particularly near important wetlands like Lake Prespa and Lake Dojran.

However, the scale of modifications is still limited by funding and technical challenges, and further work is planned to address remaining high-risk sections.

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.

>>> In North Macedonia, regular monitoring and evaluation of the impact of power lines on waterbird populations at the national scale is limited.

While some monitoring activities are conducted by environmental authorities and NGOs at specific important sites—especially near Ramsar wetlands like Lake Prespa and Lake Dojran—there is no comprehensive, systematic national monitoring program focused solely on power line impacts.

Efforts are ongoing to strengthen monitoring capacities and integrate this topic into broader biodiversity and bird conservation programs.

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

Partial

Please provide details.

>>> Regular and systematic monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of mitigation measures on power lines impacting waterbird populations is currently limited.

Some targeted monitoring takes place at key sites where mitigation measures (like bird diverters or insulation) have been implemented, often led by NGOs or research institutions. However, a coordinated national-level program to assess how effective these measures are is not yet fully established.

Efforts are being planned to improve monitoring and evaluation as part of broader biodiversity conservation and infrastructure management strategies.

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 contained in Resolution 5.11 (which focuses on reducing the impact of power lines on migratory waterbirds) have been partially integrated into the country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and relevant legislation.

The NBSAP includes commitments to minimize impacts of infrastructure on biodiversity, including power lines. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs) for infrastructure projects consider risks to migratory waterbirds, in line with Resolution 5.11 recommendations.

Specific technical guidelines and legislation related to bird protection from electrocution and collision are being developed or updated.

However, full and comprehensive implementation across all sectors remains a work in progress, with ongoing efforts to strengthen enforcement and awareness.

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?

>>> It mainly depend who is going to do particular ESIA study and in majority cases they have not involved experienced Bird experts!

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?

No

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

>>> That should be a special project and such project is still not financed

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?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> depends who is making ESIA studies!

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 of renewable energy installations and associated infrastructure is currently limited but gradually improving.

In some key projects, especially larger ones like hydropower plants and wind farms near sensitive habitats, post-construction environmental monitoring is conducted to assess impacts on wildlife and habitats.

Monitoring focuses on issues such as bird and bat collisions, habitat disturbance, and water quality.

However, a systematic, nationwide post-construction monitoring framework is still under development, with efforts ongoing to expand and standardize monitoring practices

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

Yes

Are mitigation measures being implemented?

Yes

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?

>>> such projects are done by organizations /people close to the government and not some ordinary people!

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> For the only one WF in Macedonia, KfW did not ask simple bird survey to be done and what about some mitigation measures!

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> see above

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> We just agree with this state! otherwise such activities have not been done!

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

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

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?

>>> It depend who is doing such ESIA study. It should be asked by the Ministry such Guidelines to be used!

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

No Information

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

No

Pressures and Responses

7. Research and Monitoring

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> For Monitoring activity it is necessary financial support of Bird Study and Protection Society of Macedonia! and such support for the last 10 years is missing!

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, North Macedonia has not yet undertaken a formal assessment of existing monitoring activities specifically against the priorities outlined in AEWA/MOP 8.27. However, there is awareness of the recommendations contained in the document, and the need for alignment has been recognized by relevant institutions.

The Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, together with research institutions and NGOs involved in bird monitoring (such as the Hydrobiological Institute - Ohrid and local ornithological groups), plan to conduct a review during the next national biodiversity planning cycle or within the framework of international support for capacity building (e.g., under the GBIF or EU Biodiversity Strategy processes).

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))

No

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> North Macedonia is developing country

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.

No

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

>>> There is no monitoring by relevant organization!
Bird protection society is not supported by any means!

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not enough capacity for understanding this topic!

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

>>> Macedonia is developing country

79. (Applicable to African Contracting Parties only) Were the periods of breeding and of pre-nuptial migration for all AEWA-listed species and their respective populations occurring on the territory of your country identified at national level? (Resolution 7.8)

No

Please explain the reason

>>> Not enough capacities, interest or funds for such activity!

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)

>>> Not enough capacities, interest or funds for such activity!

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not enough capacities, interest of the Ministry or funds for such activity!

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not enough capacities, interest or funds for such activity!

Pressures and Responses

8. Education and Information

8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

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

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

Yes, but not being implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Yes, North Macedonia has undertaken several activities and initiatives to raise awareness and promote understanding of waterbird conservation and AEWA, but these have not yet been formalized into a comprehensive, long-term national awareness programme.

Key activities include:

Celebration of World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) through public events, school activities, and media outreach, especially near Prespa and Dojran Lakes.

Educational outreach through the Hydrobiological Institute – Ohrid, including lectures and field visits for students and the public.

Information campaigns during wetland-related events (e.g., World Wetlands Day) organized by the Ministry of Environment and partner NGOs.

Awareness materials (leaflets, posters) produced as part of EU and donor-funded nature conservation projects.

However, there is no national communication strategy specifically targeting AEWA objectives. The development of a dedicated communication plan, with clear objectives, target audiences, and sustainable funding, would improve effectiveness.

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

No

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

No

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

Yes

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

Please explain the reasons

>>> North Macedonia has not provided direct funding or formally reported support specifically for the implementation of the AEWA Communication Strategy or priority CEPA activities under the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027.

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

>>> No, North Macedonia has not yet undertaken a formal national assessment of the financial, human, technical, or institutional resources needed for the delivery of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027.

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

>>> No, North Macedonia has not provided dedicated resources (financial or in-kind) to directly address the resource needs identified in document AEWA/MOP 8.43 for enabling and strengthening the international-level coordination and delivery of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027.

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.

No

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

No

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

No

93.2. Establish procedures for ensuring continuity of succession and transfer of knowledge and skills, when there are changes in personnel responsible for AEWA national implementation.

No

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

No

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

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

the auspices of the wider CMS Family, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and UNEP.

No

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

No

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))

No

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))

No

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

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))

No

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

>>> North Macedonia's previous NBSAP expired in 2023, and the country is now in the early stages of preparing a new strategy, which is expected to align with the Kunming-Montreal GBF.

99.2 The relevant Sustainable Development Goals

No

99.3 The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> \

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

No

Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024-2032

No

Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024

No

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

>>> Macedonia is developing country!

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

>>> Macedonia is developing country!

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

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

>>> Macedonia is developing country!

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

>>> Macedonia is developing country!

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

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financial resources

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

>>> Lack of financial resources

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financial resources

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financial resources

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 financial 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.

No

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

No

Pressures and Responses

11. Avian Influenza

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

List challenges

>>> /

List required further guidance or information

>>> /

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> /

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

Yes

Please provide more information

>>> Yes, the country has basic surveillance and testing programmes in place for HPAI in dead birds, coordinated mainly through the Food and Veterinary Agency of North Macedonia. When dead wild birds are found in or near important wetland and protected areas, samples are collected and sent for laboratory testing. These procedures are part of the national contingency plan for avian influenza and follow OIE (WOAH) and EU guidelines.

However, testing is usually reactive, and capacity is limited by available funding, equipment, and field coordination between veterinary and nature conservation authorities.

The results from testing are used to inform veterinary risk assessments, but linkages with biodiversity monitoring and site-level biosecurity measures are not yet fully developed.

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

Yes (please clarify)

>>> Yes, North Macedonia submits official data on detected cases of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) in domestic and wild birds to WOAHS's WAHIS platform (World Animal Health Information System), through the Food and Veterinary Agency, which serves as the national focal point for WOAHS (formerly OIE).

These reports include epidemiological information on species affected, geographic location, laboratory results, and control measures undertaken. This helps improve cross-border disease tracking and informs the international understanding of HPAI impacts, as recommended by the CMS/FAO Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds.

However, submission of data from wild bird cases is still infrequent, mostly due to underreporting, lack of surveillance in remote areas, and limited coordination between veterinary and nature protection sectors.

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No, the Republic of North Macedonia has not significantly adapted or changed its monitoring and assessment systems during the last triennium in response to HPAI H5N1 outbreaks or other diseases affecting migratory waterbirds.

Although occasional monitoring and sampling of wild birds are conducted through the veterinary sector—especially in the case of suspected outbreaks—these are not part of a systematic, species-focused monitoring programme. There is no formal integration of avian influenza surveillance with bird conservation

frameworks, nor is there a national plan that links disease monitoring with potential emergency conservation measures under paragraph 2.3 of the AEWA Action Plan.

Lack of resources, technical capacity, and coordination between health and nature authorities remain key constraints.

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

Yes, nationally

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

>>> Partially. North Macedonia has a national contingency plan for avian influenza, which is coordinated by the Food and Veterinary Agency. This plan outlines measures for prevention, detection, and response in case of outbreaks, mainly focused on domestic poultry and public health protection.

However, the plan does not specifically include targeted measures for wild migratory waterbirds or address contingency planning at key wetland or protected sites important for migratory species. Currently, no site-level HPAI contingency plans have been developed for locations of particular importance to waterbirds, such as Ramsar Sites or Emerald Network areas.

Is the plan being implemented?

Yes (please provide details)

>>> the national contingency plan for avian influenza is being implemented, but mainly in response to outbreaks in domestic poultry. The implementation is carried out by the Food and Veterinary Agency through surveillance, movement control, biosecurity measures, and public awareness campaigns.

However, its implementation regarding wild migratory waterbirds and key conservation sites remains very limited. There is no regular monitoring, preparedness exercises, or specific response protocols targeting protected areas or Ramsar sites, despite their importance for waterbird populations.

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

>>> In North Macedonia, the national contingency plan for Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) is implemented primarily through the Food and Veterinary Agency. The focus remains on early detection and containment of outbreaks in domestic poultry, with protocols for culling, disinfection, movement restrictions, and public communication.

While wild birds are included in surveillance activities, this component is underdeveloped. There is no dedicated inter-institutional coordination mechanism between the veterinary and nature protection sectors for managing avian influenza in wild populations. Additionally, there are no formal contingency measures at important wetland sites or Ramsar areas for protecting migratory waterbirds.

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

>>> 08/07/2025