



Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2018-2020

The format for reports on the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) for the period 2018-2020 was approved by the 7th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP7, 4-8 December 2018, Durban, South Africa) through Resolution 7.1 and modified by the Standing Committee at its 15th meeting (11-13 December 2019, Bristol, UK) 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. By Resolution 7.1 of the MOP the deadline for submission of National Reports to the 8th Session of the MOP was set at 180 days before the opening date of MOP8, which was scheduled to take place on 5-9 October 2021 in Hungary; therefore the deadline for submission of National Reports was Thursday 8 April 2021.

As per Resolution 7.1 of the MOP, Chapter 3 of the National Report Format for MOP8 reports was developed as a stand-alone online reporting module, which was administered through a separate reporting process on the population status of AEWA-listed (native) and non-native species of waterbirds for the period 2013-2018. This reporting process was concluded on 30 June 2020 as agreed by MOP7. Therefore, this report does not contain Chapter 3.

The AEWA National Reports 2018-2020 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

>>> Czech Republic

Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

>>> 1st September 2006

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.

>>> Reservation concerning Anser anser.

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 the Environment of the Czech Republic

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Mr Richard Brabec, Minister

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Vršovická 65

P.O.Box

>>> -

Postal code

>>> 10010

City

>>> Prague 10

Country

>>> Czech Republic

Telephone

>>> +420267122372

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> info@mzp.cz

Website

>>> www.mzp.cz

Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Libuše Vlasáková, Mrs

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of the Environment, Department of Species Protection and Implementation of International Commitments

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Vršovická 65

P.O.Box

>>> -

Postal code

>>> 10010

City

>>> Prague 10

Country

>>> Czech Republic

Telephone

>>> +420267122372

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> libuse.vlasakova@mzp.cz

Website

>>> www.mzp.cz

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

Name and title of the TC NFP

>>> Josef Chytil, Dr

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ornis station of Muzeum Komenského in Přerov

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Horní náměstí 7

P.O.Box

>>> -

Postal code

>>> 75011

City

>>> Přerov

Country

>>> Czech Republic

Telephone

>>> +420581219910

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> chytil@prerovmuzeum.cz

Website

>>> www.ornis.cz

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

Name and title of the CEPA NFP

>>> Ms Katarina Slabeyová

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Czech Society for Ornithology

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Na Bělidle 34

P.O.Box

>>> -

Postal code

>>> 150 00

City

>>> Prague 5

Country

>>> Czech Republic

Telephone

>>> +420 777 330 355

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> slabeyova@birdlife.cz

Website

>>> www.birdlife.cz

Designated National Respondent (DNR) in charge of the compilation and submission of the AEWA National Report 2018-2020

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 2018-2020

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.

>>> Agency of Nature Conservation
Czech Society for Ornithology (NGO)
Muzeum Komenského v Přerově

Pressures and Responses

4. Species Conservation

4.1 Legal Measures

1. Following MOP7, 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 MOP7? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.1 (a), 1.1 (b), 2.2(a) and 2.2(b))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Our present legislation fits with these adopted by MOP7. The only exception is a question concerning use of lead shots - there is very strict disagreement to ban these shots in our country :-).

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

>>> Our legislation concerning hunting and trade fits with AEWA amendments adopted by MOP7.

3. Please confirm the protection status under your country's national legislation of 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.

[Czech-Republic_Q3_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColA.xlsx](#)

4. Please confirm whether there is an open hunting season for the AEWA Table 1, Column A, category 2 or 3 with an asterisk or category 4 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.

[Czech Republic_Q4_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColA-Cat2_3_4.xlsx](#)

5. Please confirm whether taking is regulated for 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.

[AEWA Nat. Rep. 2020 table.xlsx](#)

[Czech Republic Q5 AEWA NR 2018-2020 PopColB.xlsx](#)

6. Please indicate if any of the following modes of taking are prohibited in your country: snares, limes, hooks, live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys, tape recorders and other electronic devices, electrocuting devices, artificial light sources, mirrors and other dazzling devices, devices for illuminating targets, sighting devices for night shooting comprising an electronic image magnifier or image converter, explosives, nets, traps, poison, poisoned or anesthetic baits, semi-automatic or automatic weapons with a magazine capable of holding more than two rounds of ammunition, hunting from aircraft, motor vehicles, or boats driven at a speed exceeding 5 km p/h (18 km p/h on the open sea), other non-selective modes of taking. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b); AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)

Yes, 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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Limes

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Hooks

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Tape recorders and other electronic devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Electrocuting devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Artificial light sources

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Mirrors and other dazzling devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Devices for illuminating targets

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

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

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001 and following Decreases: partial prohibition is both temporal and spatial

Explosives

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Nets

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Traps

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001 and following Decreases; allowed only for few mammals species (martens, fox, badger)

Poison

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Poisoned or anaesthetic baits

Yes, fully

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

Other non-selective modes of taking

Yes, fully

Please specify which other non-selective modes of taking have been prohibited

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

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

>>> Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

If one or more non-selective modes of taking have not been prohibited, please explain the reasons

>>> not relevant

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. Were any exemptions granted to the prohibitions required by paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the AEWA Action Plan? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.3; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)

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

9. 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 MOP7? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.1(c) and 2.2(c))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Present legislation fits with AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027

Was a review undertaken before MOP7?

Yes

What is the assessed level of enforcement and compliance?

Medium (more compliance than non-compliance)

Please provide details and reasons for the lower level of compliance. Please describe in which areas enforcement and compliance are still insufficient.

>>> The ban of lead shot use is still under discussion; very strong disagreement of hunters lobby

Have any measures been put in place to ensure strengthened enforcement and compliance?

Yes

Please describe the measures

>>> The Czech Ramsar Committee provided clear arguments concerning possibility to ban lead shots to our ministries of environment and agriculture; until now without any positive activity from these ministries

10. 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.

>>> Partially. Some parts, such as habitat protection, are already included in the legislation, others are part of the State Nature Conservation Program (2020-2025) or the Biodiversity Protection Strategy.

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

>>> No additional information.

4.2. Species Action and Management Plans

11. 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. (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 and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Very rare species, protected by law

Corncrake / *Crex crex* National Plan for Corncrake / *Crex crex*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> many other activities filling correct protection: monitoring, SPAs for Corncrake, agro-envi management plans etc.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> see above. Citation: Hora J., Kučera Z., Pykal J. 2015: /Corncrake/. In: Hora J., Čihák K., Kučera Z. (eds.): /Monitoring of Birds Directive Annex I species and SPAs in 2008-2010. Příroda, Praha, 33: 110-115. (in Czech, English summary)

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

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Very rare species, only on migration. Protection ensured by both Acts NO. 114/92 and 449/2001.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Very rare species, breeding very exceptionally. Protection ensured by both Acts No. 114/92 and 449/2001.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Very rare species, breeding only in one colony in particularly protected place. Protection ensured by both Acts NO. 114/92 and 449/2001.

12. 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 such funds.

13. 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 such demand on specific species

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 clear "Action plans" were developed, but the demands were taken into account during the development of strategies plans of state nature conservation. Nowadays, another species of animals are priorities (see <https://www.zachranneprogramy.cz/zivocichove/>)

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 Conservation 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?

>>> Single species action plans for selected species are prepared under the guidelines of the Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic in cooperation with the Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection. Those guidelines were prepared before the Czech Republic signed AEWA.

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

>>> No additional information.

4.3 Emergency Measures

17. 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

18. 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

19. 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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Removal of carcasses during outbreaks of botulism is an integral part of management plans for some wetland sites under particular protection (reserves), including Ramsar sites.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 3.3. Emergency Measures

>>> No additional information.

4.4 Re-establishments

20. 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)

Yes

Please provide details on the register

>>> Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection (state body under the Ministry of Environment) is responsible for this register.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Guidelines for preparation of action plans for threatened plant and animal species were published by the Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection (see above) in 2002

22. 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

23. 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?

>>> No such situation occurred.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.4. Re-establishments

>>> No additional information.

4.5 Introductions

24. 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.

>>> According to the Nature and Landscape Conservation Act it is prohibited to introduce non-native species of animals intentionally. The act was adopted in 1992 by Parliament of the Czech Republic. The Act is enforced by the Czech Environmental Inspection.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

25. 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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Internal ZOOs regulations deals with this topic. No way to influence in this topic private collectors.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

26. 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

>>> The populations of non-native waterbird species (e.g. Branta canadensis, Alopochen aegyptiacus, Aix sponsa, A. galericulata) are very low, no problem has been indicated with these species so far.

27. 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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No such problem occurred.

28. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation 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?

>>> Introduction of non-native waterbird (as well as other animal and plant species) is forbidden by law (Nature and Landscape Conservation Act, adopted by the Parliament in 1992)

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.5. Introductions

>>> The introductions are problems much more in plants world within the Czech Republic, some animal group are also heavily affected (e.g. fish communities, crayfish), but not waterbirds.

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

39. 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; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.1(a))

Partially

Please describe the progress

>>> Network of sites of international importance was identified during preparation of list of Special Protection Areas according to EU Birds Directive. All sites from this list are now protected as SPAs. Information on these sites of international importance were published in: Chvátal M. (ed.) 2009: Special Protection Areas of the Czech Republic (in Czech).

The formal list of sites of national importance for migratory waterbirds was not created. The list of all identified wetlands of regional, national and international importance was published in: Chytil J. et al. (eds.) 1999: Wetlands of the Czech Republic (in Czech). This list had been under evaluation from the view of present status of them, using the financial sources from Norway (Project: Conservation, research and sustainable use of wetlands in the Czech Republic 2014-2017). The database of wetlands of the Czech Republic can be find here: <http://mokradny.ochranaprirody.cz/>

Have you reviewed, confirmed and communicated to the AEWA Secretariat after MOP7 the inventory of known nationally and internationally important sites in your country?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The list of nationally and internationally important sites in our country is already known, there is no need to communicate them.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

40. 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

Please explain the reasons. What has been used instead as a basis for the inventory?

>>> Sites of international importance were identified for every species of birds, not only for migratory waterbirds. Therefore criteria for identification of Important Bird Areas were used: Heath M.F., Evans M.I. (eds.) 2000: Important Bird Areas in Europe: Priority sites for conservation. 2 vols. BirdLife International. Also Ramsar Convention Criteria for Ramsar Sites were used.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

Optionally, you can provide additional information on section 5.1. Habitat Inventories

>>> No additional information.

5.2. Conservation of Areas and Habitats

41. 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

>>> Insufficiency data, lack of personal capacity.

For the national protected area network

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Insufficiency data

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

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

Reporting on designation and management of internationally important sites

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

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

All sites of international importance

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

Total number

>>> 15

Total area (ha)

>>> 98352

Number of internationally important sites under national protection designation

>>> 10

Area of international importance under national protection designation (ha)

>>> 75799

Please rate the effectiveness of the national protection designation

High

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

>>> There are management plans for such areas and these areas are declared in one of categories of protection according to Act on Nature and Landscape Conservation.

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

Number of sites

>>> 10

Area (in ha)

>>> 75799

Please rate the effectiveness of the management measures

Moderate

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

>>> Another pressures and circumstances.

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

Number of sites

>>> 10

Area (in ha)

>>> 75799

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

All sites of national importance

Total number

>>> 40

Total area (ha)

>>> 11485

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

Number of sites

>>> 180

Area (in ha)

>>> 11220

Please rate the effectiveness of the management measures

Low

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

>>> Lack of finances; only very low number of following monitoring evaluating the effectiveness of activity

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

Number of sites

>>> 90

Area (in ha)

>>> 5000

Please rate the effectiveness of the climate resilience measures

Low

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

>>> only rough estimate; no exact data

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

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

Yes

Number of sites that have been identified to be in need of the establishment of buffer zones around them

>>> 194

Number of areas with established and adequately managed buffer zones

>>> 194

Please rate the effectiveness of the management measures

Moderate

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

>>> very different approach; main problems are unclear ownership of the areas, very different economic interests; very low effectiveness of enforcement of existing legislation

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

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)
>>> Very good management of National Nature Reserve in Nymburk district; very good management of Nature Reserve Vrbenske rybniky (nearby Ceske Budejovice);
Nowadays "Josefovské louky" under Czech Society for Ornithology/BirdLife partner in the Czech Republic are managed mainly for waterbirds. Kozmické louky nearby Opava are excellent example of newly established wetland.

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No such plan is necessary at present. See also question 20; the project mentioned below will deal also with this question.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

MANAGEMENT GAP FILING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not relevant

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

44. 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, fully

Please provide details

>>> No other information.

If available, please provide best practice examples of integration of the flyway site network into your country's water- and land-use policies and planning and decision-making processes

>>> not relevant

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

45. 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?

>>> National guidelines for management of nature reserves and other types of protected areas have been used. Their principles and rules are very similar to AEWA Guidelines.

46. 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.

Yes

Please give examples of how you have used the CSN Tool

>>> CSN Tool was presented on meetings of conservationists and ornithologists, they were encouraged to use it as an information source.

47. 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 human capacity and financial resources.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment.

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

>>> All IBAs have their patronage groups with various number of member, consisting of local managers, owners, researches, local ornithologists and administrative authorities. Monitoring of the areas, preparation of management plans (and their evaluations), negotiations with owners are, among others, the main activities of them. Other way concerning monitoring of Ramsar sites (the most important AEWA sites in the Czech Republic) is the system of guarantors designated for each of the Czech Ramsar sites. Guarantors are members of the Expert group of the Czech Ramsar Committee. Once a year, before the meeting of the Czech Ramsar Committee, they fill in the questionnaire concerning situation, changes and potential danger in Ramsar site that they are responsible. Questionnaires are then discussed individually at the meeting of the Czech Ramsar Committee.

Pressures and Responses

6. Management of Human Activities

6.1. Hunting

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

Yes

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

>>> Act 114/1992 on Nature and Landscape Conservation

Act 449/2001 on Hunting

49. Does your country have an established system for the collection of harvest data, which covers the species/populations listed in Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.3; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.1(b))

Yes

Does it cover the following? (tick where applicable and provide details)

All AEWA species occurring in your country

>>> Yearly hunting bags of three species of geese (*A.anser*, *A.fabalis* and *A.albifrons*) are reported together.

Only some AEWA species occurring in your country

Does it cover the following? (tick where applicable and provide details)

The whole territory of your country

Does it cover the following? (tick where applicable and provide details)

All forms of waterbird harvesting

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> All hunting clubs are obliged to report the yearly bag of game to regional authorities (County Councils). The regional reports are summarized and published annually.

50. 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))

Partially

When was lead shot use in wetlands partially banned?

>>> Since 2011; BUT: is banned only in Ramsar sites; see below; (nowadays 14 in the Czech Republic, covering only ca 0,7% of the area of CR)

What legislation is in place?

>>> Game Management Act No. 449/2001 and following Decreases

Who enforces this legislation?

>>> Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic

What proportion of the country's territory (or wetlands) is covered by the ban?

>>> see above; only ca 0,7%

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

>>> Total disagreement through the Parliament :-(

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

No

Please explain the reasons for not doing this

>>> see above

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 exact data

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> In 2019 we started the study on detection of lead shots in the body of live birds (geese) using X- rays. The study continues in 2020.

51. 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

Please provide details

>>> Cases of illegal taking of migratory waterbirds are rare comparing to deaths caused by collisions with power lines. More important is e.g. the illegal taking of fish, quite widespread in our country, which could be connected with higher disturbance of breeding/migrating waterbirds.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The National Strategy for dealing with illegal killing and poisoning of wild animals for period 2020-2030 has been approved by government of the Czech Republic in January 2020.

52. Does your country maintain an adequate system for making realistic estimates of the number of waterbirds taken illegally? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.1(b))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> This problems seems to be only marginally in our country.

53. 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

>>> All hunters has to pass the exams to be a hunters - Game Management Act. No. 449/2001

54. 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

>>> It was not the priority, because only 7 species of migratory waterfowl are hunted in the country (3 species of geese - A.anser, A.albifrons, A.fabalis, 3 species of ducks - A.platyrrhynchos, A.ferina, A.fuligula, and Coot). The possible misidentifications deal only with Anser erythropus and A. brachyrhynchus; both these geese species are very rare in our country, and according to hunting practices there is clearly no possibility for appropriate identification of this species during hunting. The same situation concerns possible hunting on misidentified Phalacrocorax pygmeus instead of Phalacrocorax carbo, which could be exceptionally hunted with a special permission from responsible state nature conservation authorities.

55. 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?

>>> All seven hunted species of migratory waterfowl are hunted in low numbers, with the exception of Anas platyrhynchos. This species is bred in very high numbers by hunters' clubs and released before autumn

hunting season.

Sustainability of waterbird harvest is (traditionally) regulated by the time of possible harvest: in the last seasons, the possible time of waterbirds hunting is as follows: geese (*Anser anser*, *A. albifrons*, *A. fabalis*): 16.8. - 15.1., *Anas platyrhynchos*, *Aythya fuligula*, *Aythya ferina* and *Fulica atra*: 1.9. - 30.11. Moreover, the hunting time is regulated also through possible days of hunting: for geese those days are Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday, for ducks and Coot Wednesday and Saturday. The possible reduction of both interval of hunting and days of hunting could be apply in the case of too high harvest of any species.

Optionally, you can provide additional information on section 6.1. Hunting

>>> The biggest problem concerning hunting and the protection of waterbirds together seems to be the releasing of very high numbers (tens of thousands) of non-native Mallards every year. These ducks are of very unclear origin (different geographical and genetic origin, including strange colour hybrids). The problem is also their very untypical behaviour, disturbing other waterbirds at localities. More than 95% of them are hunted during autumn season, but some of them are surviving, with all negative aspects influencing wild waterbird species, namely wild Mallards (including the erosion of gene pool of natural populations).

6.2. Ecotourism

56. 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

>>> There is no such official plan in our country.

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

Yes

Please describe how many initiatives are in place and provide details for each of them

>>> Excursions organised by the Czech Ornithological Society (BirdLife partner); several tens every year organised mainly by regional branches of CSO

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

Medium

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

Low

Please provide details and the barriers to delivery

>>> No comment

6.3. Other human activities

58. 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 78 in chapter 7 - Research and monitoring.

No

If appropriate, please provide further details.

>>> Not important from the point of waterbird protection in our country.

59. 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

>>> The Act No. 326/2017 (EIA) has been adopted by the Parliament of the Czech Republic and is valid within

the whole territory of the country.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The main principle of EIA legislation in the Czech Republic is that investors who plan construction of some specific, mainly large projects, such as large industrial projects, infrastructure, large agricultural projects (for instance large husbandry farms, drainage on a large scale) have to make an assessment of a potential impact of the project on surrounding environment including wetlands and waterfowl.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Relevant authority is obliged to publish all relevant informations during every step of the EIA process on internet, public can apply objections and comments and relevant authority has to deal with them. The whole process has strict rules according to EIA Act (No. 326/2017).

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no additional information

60. 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

>>> The basic is Czech National Council Act No. 114/92 on the Nature and the Landscape Conservation.

Please rank the effectiveness of these measures:

High

Please provide details and the reasons for the high effectiveness

>>> The Act was adopted as very up-to-date, and is quite strong with comparison with other legislation in our country.

61. 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

>>> The SEA/EIA process has to be applied only during the construction of new very high voltage lines (VVN lines), not during the reconstruction of old VVN lines and also not during (re)construction of high voltage lines (VN).

The SEA/EIA process is obligatory in large-scale protected areas (National parks, Protected Landscape Areas), where the majority of Czech SPA lies.

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

>>> The main measure is the vizualisation of the lines, using (mainly) "big red balls".

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no additional information

62. 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)?

Yes

Please report the number of sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country that are subject to adverse impact of development activities or other pressures. Please list those sites with their names, central geographic coordinates and observed impacts.

>>> Regional directorates of the Agency of Nature and Landscape Conservation are mainly responsible for it; but no central evidence of the cases is available. Very unclear is also sense of this question - we mean extent of such cases.

Please report the number of sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country where adverse impact of development activities or other pressures has been effectively avoided, mitigated or compensated. Please list those sites with their names, central geographic coordinates and the impacts that have been addressed.

>>> see above.

Please report the number of sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country where no effective avoidance, mitigation or compensation has been implemented for adverse impact of development activities or other pressures. Please list those sites with their names, central geographic coordinates and observed impacts.

>>> see above

63. 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?

>>> Very similar rules to AEWA Guidelines, nearly identical, are included in our legislation concerning nature protection (Act No. 114/92 on the Nature and Landscape Protection).

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

64.1. 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

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

Partially

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

Partially

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

Partially

64.5. 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

64.6. 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

>>> The main measure is the visualization of the lines, using (mainly) "big red balls" (very high voltage lines), in high voltage lines are newly designed pillars, friendly to birds, used.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Such sections were identified mainly from the view of birds of prey, several lines also from the view of mortality of waterbirds (majority deals with *Ciconia ciconia* and *Cygnus olor*).

64.8. 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.

>>> Much more important are in our country collisions of birds of prey, in comparison with the numbers of affected waterbirds.

64.9. 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.

>>> Partly ensured by some projects of the Agency for the Nature and Landscape Protection, newly also through the working group under Raptors MOU.

64.10. 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.

>>> see 42.9. Regular monitoring is not ensured - lack of human capacity.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> These measures are included both at newly developed documents concerning strategic plan of nature conservation in the Czech Republic and also at relevant legislation concerning (re)construction of electricity lines.

65. 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?

>>> Not exactly, but similar approach is used in landscape planning, nature protection documents and also guidelines for planning/construction of electricity lines.

66. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 5.16 on Renewable Energy and Migratory Waterbirds.

66.1. 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

>>> Majority of areas of migratory waterbirds importance are particularly protected areas according to national legislation on birds/nature protection. Such areas have their zoning with the possible/forbidden activities including prospective renewable energy developments.

66.2. 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

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

No

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

>>> Lack of personal capacity and financial resources.

66.4. 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?

>>> Lack of financial sources; unclear process to calculate real damages and finances for compensation..

66.5. Please indicate whether any of the following measures have been put in place to reduce the potential negative impact of terrestrial and marine windfarms on migratory waterbirds:

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

Yes

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

>>> Theoretically yes, but no such case occurred.

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

66.6. 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?

>>> No such problem occurred.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The measures are not directly mentioned in National Biodiversity Strategy, but they are included in Action Plans for individual SPAs. All the plans concerning power lines also have to be evaluated from the view of Act. No. 114/1992 On the protection of nature and the landscape.

67. 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.

Not Applicable

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

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> No such problem - no by-catch fishing occur.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no additional information

69. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 5.12 on Adverse Effects of Agrochemicals on Migratory Waterbirds in Africa (this question is applicable only to Contracting Parties in Africa).

69.3. Are there any steps undertaken to control or reduce the use of avicides in areas frequented by populations listed in Table 1 of the Agreement?

No

69.4. Have education and training activities been implemented for relevant target groups on the proper use of agrochemicals that may have possible adverse effect on waterbirds?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Ensured partly by seminars and other education ways organised by the Czech Ramsar Committee

70. 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

Please explain the reasons

>>> Other priorities.

Pressures and Responses

7. Research and Monitoring

71. 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))

>>> Some systematic groups (part of waders e.g.) or places are not fully covered -human capacity is limited

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> There is longterm monitoring of population trends in the Czech Republic.

Covering the passage period

Partially

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

>>> not enough training people for such monitoring

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Aythya journal (IWC), various database, mainly www.waterbirdmonitoring.cz

Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

Fully [Guidance: Coverage is full when all internationally and nationally important non-breeding/wintering sites are covered at least by one comprehensive annual count.]

Please provide details.

>>> All such places are counted during IWC

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

72. Is 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

>>> Mainly through the official information by the Czech Ramsar Committee

73. Has your country supported, technically or financially, other Parties or Range States in designing appropriate monitoring schemes and developing their capacity to collect reliable waterbird population data? (Resolution 5.2)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of personal capacity. On the other hand, Czech Ornithological Society is together with Catalonia the body responsible for managing the whole work on a new European Breeding Atlas of Birds, including the preparation of the methodology. Dr. Voříšek is the first author of outstanding methodology concerning monitoring of birds in Europe (Voříšek et al. 2008: Best practise guide for wild bird monitoring schemes. CSO/RSPB).

74. 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

>>> International Waterbird census methods are used for monitoring of wintering birds, monitoring of breeding and migrating waterbirds is based on similar relevant principles used in AEWA Guidelines.

75. 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

>>> Lack of financial sources; other priorities of the Government.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The IWC has been supported in the last triennium by the Czech University of Life Sciences.

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

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

78. 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 58 in chapter 6 – Management of human activities.

No

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

No

Please provide reason(s)

>>> Lack of financial sources; we do not see this question as a priority. Priority is a lead shot.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 7. Research and Monitoring

>>> No additional information. There is a long tradition in the Czech Republic concerning research and monitoring of waterbirds, which is documented also by a long series of publications. Up-to-date information concerning IWC are available to every counter also by newly established journal Aythya, devoted mainly to IWC reports and other publications dealing and/or arising from IWC.

Pressures and Responses

8. Education and Information

8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

79. 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

>>> We have developed the AEWA Communication Strategy in 2017 and we are looking for suitable financial resources for its implementation.

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

Yes

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The programme is focused on CEPA in AEWA.

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

Yes

Is the National CEPA Focal Point from the government or non-governmental sector?

Non-Governmental

Has the AEWA CEPA Focal Point begun coordinating national implementation of the AEWA Communication Strategy?

No

Please explain reasons

>>> Lack of financial resources.

How can the cooperation between the appointed AEWA CEPA Focal Point and the Ramsar CEPA Focal Points be described?

There is very close cooperation

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

81. 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

>>> Other priority.

82. 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

>>> There is a longterm tradition (since 1992) to organise a Dawn Chorus Day on the first Sunday of May. To celebrate this day the Czech Society for Ornithology organises birdwatching walking, lectures, show the ringing, promote the bird protection at almost 100 places in the country. The programme is focused on waterbirds too. There is no capacity to organise both the WMBD and Dawn Chorus Day.

83. 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

>>> Communication Strategy is already prepared. We are looking for financial resources for implementation of the objectives and targets.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

Optionally can provide additional information on section 8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

>>> No additional information

Pressures and Responses

9. Implementation

84. 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

>>> We have chosen only the most relevant and needed tasks of AEWA SP for implementation in the Czech Republic and we have tried to find suitable financial resources for individual studies and tasks.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No comment.

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

Report only on activities over the past triennium

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No opportunity

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

86. 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

>>> Coordination mechanism is ensured by regular meetings of Working group for CMS that has been established in 2007 by CMS NFP. The WG covers all representatives of agreements and MoUs of CMS family in which the CR is the contracting party.

Are priority capacity gaps addressed by the coordination mechanism?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Coordination WG knows about priority capacity gaps but WG is not responsible for its solution, it is the role of guarantor of AEWA - Ministry of the Environment.

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

High

Please provide details and the reasons for the high effectiveness

>>> CMS WG that includes also AEWA, works as advisory body of CMS and AEWA NFP. The proposals, conclusions and recommendations of WG are submitted through the NFP to the Ministry management and can, in most cases, be implemented immediately.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

87. 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

>>> The national assessment of the capacity needs for AEWA implementation is planned, it has not been

priority in last triennium.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

88. 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

>>> The discussion on this topic is planned in future. There is lack of both capacity and financial resources at the moment.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

89. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated and engaged with national processes contributing towards the Aichi Targets and the assessment of achieving these targets? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Partially. Coordination of CBD Strategic plan is responsibility of CBD NFP however both NFPs (CBD and AEWA) are in close contact and cooperate.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

90. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated 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

>>> Partially. AEWA NFP has contributes to the definition of the national SDG and their implementation.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

91. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated and engaged with national processes to implementation and assess the delivery of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Through CMS WG.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

92. Are the AEWA priorities incorporated into your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) and/or other similar strategic plans and policies (Resolution 6.3; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 5.5)?

92.1 NBSAP

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Partially. The AEWA Priorities are incorporated into measures concerning both species and wetlands conservations.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

92.2 Other strategic plans and policies

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No other strategic planning process.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

Sustainable Development Goals

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Conservation of migratory species and their habitats.

Aichi Targets

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In cooperation with CBD NFP.

Strategic Plan for Migratory Species

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Planned. Lack of financial resources and other priorities.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> no comment

94. 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?

>>> The link between biodiversity MEAs has been guaranteed by membership of NFPs and Scientific Advisors for MEAs in Working groups as CMS WG and the Czech Ramsar Committee. NFP for CMS is simultaneously NFP for AEWA.

95. Has your country donated funds to the AEWA Small Grants Fund (SGF) over the past triennium? (Resolution 7.1)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of financial sources for donation, other priorities.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

96. Has your country donated other funding or provided in-kind support to activities coordinated by the Secretariat?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> There is a focus on projects in national level especially.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

97. 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? (Resolution 7.11, Resolution 7.12)

No and has not been prioritised

Please explain the reasons

>>> No priority.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No comment.

98. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 6.21 on Resource mobilisation for the implementation of AEWA.

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

Yes

Please describe the resources provided

>>> The MoE provides small financial resources for implementation of MEAs resolutions in national level every year. NFP prepares small projects to implement relevant resolutions and task of AEWA that will be implemented during one or two years.

98.2 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

98.3 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 98.4.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Development cooperation is coordinated by MFA and has other priorities (dessertification, education, drinking water)

98.4 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

>>> Other priorities.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Not relevant. There is no national Migratory Waterbirds Fund in the country and other system of innovative financing mechanisms also missing at the moment.

98.6 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

>>> No such financial resources mechanismus.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 9. Implementation

>>> No addition information.

Pressures and Responses

10. Climate Change

99. 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

>>> See the attached list of publications. Some studies of dr. Jiří Reif (Institute of Environmental studies, Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague) deals with birds and climate change from the global view.

Global Change Research Institute (www.czechglobe.cz) of the Czech Academy of Science studies also climate change and various problems dealing with it.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Birds_and_climate_change_publ..docx](#)

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 41 in Section 5, sub-section 5.2 investigates vulnerability of sites to climate change)

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Waterbirds in the Czech Republic use mainly habitats where assessment of climate change to them was evaluated as low.

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of personal capacity.

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Waterbirds in the Czech Republic use mainly habitats where assessment of climate change to them was evaluated as low.

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 42 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

>>> Waterbirds in the Czech Republic use mainly habitats where assessment of climate change to them was evaluated as low.

f. Other undertaken or planned relevant activities.

No

100. 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

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

>>> Lack of personal capacity.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 10. Climate Change

>>> Czech Ramsar Committee, 2011: Mokřady a klimatická změna. Konference ke 40. výročí Ramsarské úmluvy./ Wetlands and climate change. Conference to 40th anniversary of Ramsar Convention/. Proc. conf. Blansko, 2.-5.2.2011. Altogether 96 lectures and posters, 145 participants. One lecture concerns the possible influence of climate change on numbers of waterbirds during IWC (P. Musil). In October 2015, the Czech government adopted the Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change in the Czech Republic. This document represents a national adaptation strategy and includes assessment of the climate change impacts and proposals for specific adaptation measures, legislative and partial economic analysis, etc.

The Adaptation Strategy is being implemented by the National Action Plan on Adaptation to Climate Change which was adopted in 2017. This Action plan was structured according to specific climate change impacts in the Czech Republic: Long-term droughts; Floods and flash floods; Extreme meteorological events (Heavy rainfall, Extremely high temperatures; Extreme wind); and Wild fires. Action plan contains 33 specific targets and one crosscutting target focused on education and awareness raising. These targets will be implemented through 52 priority measures, which have 160 priority tasks. The Climate Protection Policy of the Czech Republic along with the Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change in the Czech Republic represents specific policies regarding climate change.

The Climate Protection Policy of the Czech Republic was adopted by the Czech government in March 2017 and replaced former National Programme to Abate the Climate Change Impacts in the Czech Republic. The Policy defines main objectives in the climate protection at the national level to ensure the fulfilment of the greenhouse gas emission reduction objectives in order to reach international commitments of the Czech Republic. Furthermore it contributes towards gradual long-term transition to sustainable low emission economy.

The Policy further sets primary and indicative emission reduction targets, which should be reached in a cost efficient manner. Measures are proposed in the following key areas: energy, final energy consumption, industry, transport, agriculture and forestry, waste, science, research development and voluntary tools.

Pressures and Responses

11. Avian Influenza

101. 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

>>> The National Reference Laboratory for Avian Influenza is established under the State Veterinary Institute (working under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic). Among others, there are several web pages reporting up-to-date situation in the Czech Republic - see 67.2.) and basic information concerning AI. Active and passive surveillance both for farms and wild waterbirds is ensured by this Nat. Ref. Laboratory. No case of AI in the year 2018 and 2019. 2 cases in year 2020.

List required further guidance or information

>>> Some basic information dealing with avian influenza:

http://eagri.cz/public/web/file/239190/info_verejnost_chovatele.pdf;

And on website of the State Veterinary Administration: <https://www.svscr.cz/zdravi-zvirat/ptaci-chripka-influenza-drubeze/ptaci-chripka-v-cr/>(the present data concerning avian influenza in the Czech Republic)

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> In the last triennium, highly pathogenic bird influenza has been detected at two places of commercial poultry farming at the beginning of 2020. Outside of all adopted safeguards, State Veterinary Service also forbids the exhibitions and concentrations of poultry, cage birds and pigeons in the whole territory of the Czech Republic.

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

>>> No other comments.

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 2018-2020 has been verified and the report has been approved for submission by the appropriate state institution in the country.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Letter_NationalReport_AEWA.pdf](#) - Letter of approval_Czech Republic_2021

[Letter_approval_NR_Czech.pdf](#) - Letter of approval_CzechRepublic

Date of submission

>>> 14 April 2021