



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

>>> Denmark

Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

>>> 01-01-2000

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.

>>> At the 6th Meeting of the Parties in 2015 the WEstern Siberia/North European population of Long-tailed duck and the Western Siberia & Northern Europe/NWEuropean population of Velvet Scooter were upgraded to be included in category 1b of column A, meaning that any taking of birds or eggs should be prohibited.

Denmark has made a reservation to this decision as both species are huntable under Danish national law and in compliance with the EU Birds Directive.

At the 7th Meeting of the Parties in 2018 Common Pochard (*Aythya ferina*) got listed in Category 1b of Column A and

Common Eider (*Somateria mollissima*) got listed in Category 4 of Column A.

Denmark has made a reservation to these decisions as both species are huntable under Danish national law and in compliance with the EU Birds Directive.

Further at the 7th Meeting of the Parties all populations of Atlantic puffin (*Fratercula arctica*) got listed in Category 1b of Column A, and Razorbill (*Alca torda islandica*) got listed in Category 4 of Column A.

Denmark has entered a reservation regarding these decisions on behalf of the Faroe Islands

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, The Danish Environmental Protection Agency

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Lars Hindkjaer, Director-General

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Tolderlundsvej 5

P.O.Box

>>> N/A

Postal code

>>> 5000

City

>>> Odense

Country

>>> Denmark

Telephone

>>> +45 7254 4000

Fax

>>> N/A

E-mail

>>> mst@mst.dk

Website

>>> <http://mst.dk/>

Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Camilla Uldal

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of Environment, The Danish Environmental Protection Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Tolderlundsvej 5

P.O.Box

>>> N/A

Postal code

>>> 5000

City

>>> Odense

Country

>>> Denmark

Telephone

>>> +45 9358 7947

Fax

>>> N/A

E-mail

>>> cakis@mst.dk

Website

>>> <http://mst.dk/>

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

Name and title of the TC NFP

>>> Preben Clausen

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Grenåvej 14

P.O.Box

>>> N/A

Postal code

>>> 8410

City

>>> Rønne

Country

>>> Denmark

Telephone

>>> +45 2334 4767

Fax

>>> N/A

E-mail

>>> pc@bios.au.dk

Website

>>> <http://dce.au.dk/en/>

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

Name and title of the CEPA NFP

>>> None appointed

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> N/A

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> N/A

P.O.Box

>>> N/A

Postal code

>>> N/A

City

>>> N/A

Country

>>> N/A

Telephone

>>> N/A

Fax

>>> N/A

E-mail

>>> N/A

Website

>>> N/A

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.

>>> Preben Clausen, Ib Krag Petersen and Ole Roland Therkildsen

DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy

and Department of Bioscience,

Aarhus University

Grenåvej 14

8410 Rønne

Denmark

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))

Yes

Please indicate the outcome of this review

Relevant national legislation was fully in line with the Agreement text and its annexes

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Because of the reservations made regarding table 1 in annex III the national legislation is in line with the Agreement text and its Annexes

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.

Yes

Did this require adjusting your national legislation?

No

Please describe how your current national legislation is compatible with the advice provided in the Guidance

>>> For population overlap in breeding season - No hunting at all in breeding season
For population overlap in wintering/non breeding season - species not huntable or for Anser fabalis rossicus hunting is restricted temporarily and spatially to avoid hunting og Anser fabalis fabalis

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.

[Denmark_Q3_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopCoIA_2.xlsx](#) - Q3 Denmark

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.

[Denmark_Q4_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColA-Cat2_3_4.xlsx](#) - Q4 Denmark

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.

[Denmark_Q5_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColB.xlsx](#) - Q5 Denmark

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Limes

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Hooks

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Tape recorders and other electronic devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Electrocuting devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Artificial light sources

Yes, fully

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

>>> Secondary Act on the release of game, hunting methods and hunting equipment (Secondary Act no 1652 / 2017)

According to Secondary act on game damage (secondary act no. 1006 / 2020) exceptions to this prohibition exist in order to perform derogation shooting of wild boar, raccoon dog and raccoon

Mirrors and other dazzling devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> Secondary Act on the release of game, hunting methods and hunting equipment (Secondary Act no 1652 / 2017)

According to Secondary act on game damage (secondary act no. 1006 / 2020) exceptions to this prohibition exist in order to perform derogation shooting of wild boar, raccoon dog and raccoon

Devices for illuminating targets

Yes, fully

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

>>> Secondary Act on the release of game, hunting methods and hunting equipment (Secondary Act no 1652 / 2017)

According to Secondary act on game damage (secondary act no. 1006 / 2020) exceptions to this prohibition exist in order to perform derogation shooting of wild boar, raccoon dog and raccoon

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

Yes, fully

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

>>> Secondary Act on the release of game, hunting methods and hunting equipment (Secondary Act no 1652 / 2017)

According to Secondary act on game damage (secondary act no. 1006 / 2020) exceptions to this prohibition exist in order to perform derogation shooting of wild boar, raccoon dog and raccoon

Explosives

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Nets

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Traps

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

According to Secondary act on game damage (secondary act no. 1006 / 2020) exemptions can be granted for derogation hunting of Eurasian magpie (pica pica), Hooded crow (corvus cornix) and Carrion crow (cornus corone)

Poison

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Poisoned or anaesthetic baits

Yes, fully

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

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

>>> Secondary act on weapons and ammunition allowed for hunting (Secondary act no. 1397 / 2020)

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

>>> Aircraft and motor vehicles: Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

Boats: Secondary Act on the release of game, hunting methods and hunting equipment (Secondary Act no 1652 / 2017)

Other non-selective modes of taking

Yes, fully

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

>>> Only rifles, shotguns and bow and arrow are allowed for hunting, but waterbirds are exclusively hunted with shotguns.

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

>>> Act on hunting and game management (Act no. 265 / 2019)

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.

Yes

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

>>> A comprehensive review has not been undertaken but hunting season has been reviewed for a number of species leading to a hunting moratorium on Long-tailed duck (*Clangula hyemalis*), Velvet Scoter (*Melanitta fusca*), Common pochard (*Aythya ferina*) and Eurasian collared dove (*Streptopelia decaocto*)

Was a review undertaken before MOP7?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> A comprehensive review has not been undertaken, but a review of hunting seasons has been performed in 2016-2017 with adjustments entering into force in 2018.

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.

No

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

>>> Denmark has a long tradition for protection of migratory waterbirds and their habitats, that were well established before AEWA. Hence the guidelines were not used, but protection developed nationally, with some guidance from the Ramsar convention and later the EU Birds Directive.

Currently there are 113 Special Protection Areas for Birds, designated under EU Birds Directive Legislation in Denmark. 111 of these were designated in 1981, and two during 2003-2004, where two existing SPA's were also enlarged. Of these 113 SPA's 85 are designated for one or several waterbirds species. Currently there are: 402 designations addressing internationally or nationally important populations of wintering, spring- or autumn staging and moulting waterbirds. 305 designations addressing nationally important populations of breeding waterbirds, listed in the Annex I of the EU Birds Directive.

Almost all the SPA's are also designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC's) under the EU Habitats Directive, whereby protection of several habitat types of crucial importance for waterbirds have been implemented, e.g. intertidal mudflats, marshes, coastal lagoons etc.

44 of the SPA's are found within 28 Ramsar sites, hence also protected under that umbrella.

Reserves:

Denmark during 1993-2000 made a major revision of hunting protection of waterbirds found within most of the SPA's that are designated for populations staging during autumn and winter, i.e. the general hunting period for waterbirds. The revision involved a doubling of both the number of reserves, and the areas protected from hunting activities. An evaluation of the long-term effect of these reserves on populations of huntable species was published in 2013 (national overview) and 2014 (local reserves). Generally - dabbling ducks and geese - considered the more susceptible species to hunting disturbance, had increased 2- to 5-fold in the reserve network during 1994-2010, and the evaluation concluded the reserve network, nationally and in most reserves locally, was a success (Clausen et al. 2013, 2014).

Clausen, P., Holm, T.E., Laursen, K., Nielsen, R.D. & Christensen, T.K. 2013. Rastende fugle i det danske reservatnetværk 1994-2010. Del 1: Nationale resultater. Aarhus Universitet, DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 118 s. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 72.

<http://dce2.au.dk/pub/SR132.pdf>

Clausen, P., Holm, T.E., Therkildsen, O.R., Jørgensen, H.E. & Nielsen, R.D. 2014. Rastende fugle i det danske reservatnetværk 1994-2010. Del 2: De enkelte reservater. Aarhus Universitet, DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 236 s. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 132.

<http://dce2.au.dk/pub/SR132.pdf>

A few reserves were suffering from eutrofication issues back in 2010, negatively affecting food supplies, and thereby staging bird-numbers, but in two major reserves (Nibe Bredning and Ringkøbing Fjord) food supplies is currently recovering and waterbirds responding to these recoveries (Balsby et al. 2017, Clausen et al. 2017).

Balsby, T.J.S., Clausen, P., Krause-Jensen, D., Carstensen, J. & Madsen, J. 2017. Long-term patterns of eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) occurrence and associated herbivorous waterbirds in a Danish coastal inlet. - *Frontiers in Marine Science* 3: 285.

Clausen, P., Therkildsen, O.T., Nielsen, R.D. & Holm, T.E. 2017. Kortlægning af levesteder med forslag til målsætning og tilstandsvurdering for rastende vandfuglefløgearter. Arter tilknyttet bundvegetation, enge og moser. Aarhus Universitet, DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 120 s. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 248.

<http://dce2.au.dk/pub/SR248.pdf>

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

>>> Exemptions are granted in the interests of air safety and exemptions may also be granted on a case by case basis among others to prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries, in the interest of public health or to the benefit of other wild species. Denmark's derogation report to the EU:

<http://rod.eionet.europa.eu/countrydeliveries?spatialId=11&actDetailsId=276>

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

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions in the ISSMP are described in a way that they can be directly implemented at national level

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Adequate protection of sites is in place through the Natura 2000 bird protection sites

Scaring devices is used to keep geese away from sensitive areas

Derogation shooting is applied if no other satisfactory solution exists

Radar surveillance is in place in Copenhagen airport

A workshop with stakeholders and farmers were planned but has been postponed due to covid-19

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

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

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

>>> See above

Greylag Goose / *Anser anser*
National Plan for Greylag Goose / *Anser anser*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions in the ISSMP are described in a way that they can be directly implemented at national level

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Adequate protection of sites is in place through the Natura 2000 bird protection sites

Scaring devices is used to keep geese away from sensitive areas

Radar surveillance is in place in Copenhagen airport

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

Moderate implementation - some of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

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

>>> See above

Pink-footed Goose / *Anser brachyrhynchus*
National Plan for Pink-footed Goose / *Anser brachyrhynchus*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions in the ISSMP are described in a way that they can be directly implemented at national level

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Adequate protection of sites is in place through the Natura 2000 bird protection sites

Scaring devices is used to keep geese away from sensitive areas

The Danish Hunters Association has been conducting courses on better goose hunting increasing the effectiveness while minimising disturbance and crippling

Hunting is adapted to the decisions taken at the IWG meetings

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

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

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

>>> See above

Bean Goose / *Anser fabalis*

National Plan for Bean Goose / *Anser fabalis*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions in the ISSAP and the workplans agreed at the IWG meetings are described in a way that they can be directly implemented at national level

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Hunting bag statistics are in place

Key wintering sites are protected through Natura 2000

Lead shots are forbidden

Awareness campaigns have been performed by the Danish Hunters Association

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

Moderate implementation - some of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Long-tailed Duck / *Clangula hyemalis*

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions in the ISSAP are described in a way that they can be directly implemented at national level

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Hunting moratorium is in place

Sites are protected through Natura 2000. Action plans for all Natura 2000 areas are in place.

A proposal for HELCOM has been made on producing sensitivity maps

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

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

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

>>> see above

Velvet Scoter / *Melanitta fusca*

National Plan for Velvet Scoter / *Melanitta fusca*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions in the ISSAP are described in a way that they can be directly implemented at national level

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Hunting moratorium is in place

Sites are protected through Natura 2000. Action plans for all Natura 2000 areas are in place.

A proposal for HELCOM has been made on producing sensitivity maps

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

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

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

>>> see above

Corncrake / *Crex crex*

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> A national plan existed before the AEWA plan. It has been followed up with habitat restoration projects

Tundra Swan / *Cygnus columbianus* National Plan for Tundra Swan / *Cygnus columbianus*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Actions are implemented directly

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> No hunting

Key sites are protected through Natura 2000 designation

Lead shots forbidden

Black-tailed Godwit / *Limosa limosa*

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> National plan for threatened meadowbirds in place since 2005 including black-tailed godwit.

No hunting is allowed. The action plan has been followed up with habitat restoration projects. Key sites protected through Natura 2000 designation

Eurasian Curlew / *Numenius arquata* National Plan for Eurasian Curlew / *Numenius arquata*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Plan being implemented directly

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Key sites protected through Natura 2000 designation. Action plans for sites are in place. No hunting

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> see above

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Denmark is not a range states but implement control of ruddy duck

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Control of ruddy duck

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)

Yes

Please provide details, including amount of funds donated

>>> AEWA EGMP

2018: 40.000 euro

2019: 55.785 euro

2020: 55.785 euro

13. Has your country provided financial or in-kind assistance for the development of new International

Species Action or Management Plans? (Resolution 7.5)

Yes

Please provide details, including amount of funds donated

>>> Action plan for common eider - in kind contribution. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency has financed the participation of Danish expert in the drafting group

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 overall review or prioritization has been made. Prioritization has been made case by case

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

Yes

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?

>>> Action plans prepared before guidelines were available. However, these are largely fulfilled.

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

>>> No further 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.

No

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

>>> the oiled bird emergency plan has been revised following guidelines from Helcom

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

>>> None.

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No re-establishment project for waterbirds has occurred

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

>>> See above.

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.

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> As no species were subject to re-establishment or translocation project, this is not relevant.

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

>>> None.

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 Ministry of Environments Danish Nature Protection Act no. 240 of 13/03/2019 paragraph 31, it is prohibited to release non-native animal species in nature in Denmark without permission from the Minister of Environment. Enforced by Danish environmental protection Agency

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None.

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)

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.

>>> Statutory order prohibiting new holdings and outfasing old holds of racoon dogs. EU legislation on invasive species is implemented. General rules apply for zoo and keeping of animals in general under the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None.

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)

Yes

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)

Yes

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

>>> Common plan against invasive species published in 2017. New action plan against invasive terrestrial predators (american mink, racoon dog and raccoon) published in 2020. Control programmes on the three species is implemented

Please provide further information for each relevant programme

>>> N/A

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?

>>> Denmark i 2017 published a new Action Plan against invasive species: Miljø- og Fødevareministeriet and Miljøstyrelsen (2017): Handlingsplan mod invasive arter. http://mst.dk/media/143350/handlingsplan_invasive-arter_juni17.pdf

According to this plan, and associated national legislation, three invasive waterbird species relevant to Denmark, i.e. Egyptian Goose, Ruddy Duck and Greater Canada Goose, may to regulated year-round, the first two without specific permission (with reference to EU legislation), the latter after permission outside the general hunting season for geese. Greater Canada Goose is also huntable during 1 September to 31 January. The statistics on regulated/hunted birds is available at: <http://fauna.au.dk/jagt-og-vildtforvaltning/vildtudbytte/> The number of regulated Ruddy Ducks is declining (as are the number of observed birds, mentioned above), and was only 3 birds in the season 2016/17.

The number of regulated Egyptian Geese is increasing (as are the number of observed birds), and was 273 birds in 2016/17.

The number of hunted and/or regulated Greater Canada Geese has been declining since 2010, and was 5213 in 2016/17. Likewise the staging population has been declining, since a peak count in 2002 (<http://novana.au.dk/fugle/traekfugle/traekfuglearter/canadagaas/>)

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.5. Introductions

>>> None.

4.6 Seabirds

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

Yes

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

Partial Data

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

>>> Currently unknown - under the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

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

No

33. Does your country have comprehensive data on hunting and egg harvesting (both legal and illegal) of AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

Yes

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

>>> <https://fauna.au.dk/jagt-og-vildtforvaltning/vildtudbytte/udbyttet-online-siden-1941/>

34. Have you assessed the impact of hunting and egg harvesting (both legal and illegal) on AEWA-listed

seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

Yes

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

>>> <https://dce2.au.dk/pub/SR434.pdf>

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

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> response to oil spill is prioritized in all Danish waters but must urgent sites would probably overlap with the Natura 2000 sites designated for seabirds

37. **(Applicable only to countries bordering the North or Baltic Sea)** Has your country undertaken a program of data-collection to validate models of population level impacts of offshore windfarms in the North and Baltic Seas on AEWA seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> impacts of offshore windfarms have to be evaluated before construction potentially is allowed

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))

Yes

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

>>> As mentioned under section 8 above, 113 areas, mainly internationally important wetlands, have been designated as Special protection Areas (SPA's) according to the EU Birds Directive, the majority of which are designated for breeding, moulting, staging or wintering waterbirds (see further details in section 8).

All habitats that are relevant to breeding and staging waterbirds, and prioritised habitats under the EU Habitats Directive is enrolled as part of the Natura 2000 network planning programme (see website), that was finished by the end of 2011 (first planning cycle 2009-2015, second 2016-2021).

A monitoring programme NOVANA provides more detailed data about threats and management status of the mapped areas.

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

>>> Lack of resources and no new international sites has been designated as natura 2000 sites

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional info

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?

>>> These areas were identified before the AEWA guidelines under national implementation strategies using EU Birds Directive and Ramsar Convention guidelines.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional info.

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

>>> No additional info.

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

Yes

Please give details as to where relevant information about these assessments have been published (either as publications or web-link).

>>> Two scientific papers have looked into this issue. The first has taken a national component of a single-species flyway population approach, assessing potential habitat loss for the East Atlantic flyway-population of light-bellied brent geese (listed in category A1c in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan): See Clausen, K.K., Stjernholm, M. and Clausen, P. (2013). Grazing management can counteract the impacts of climate change-induced sea level rise on salt marsh-dependent waterbirds. - Journal of Applied Ecology 50: 528-537.

The second has taken a wider perspective on a suite of species, covering all important areas for waterbirds in

the Limfjord, the largest sound/estuary in Denmark, and one of the most important haunts for moulting, staging, and wintering inshore waterbirds in the country. See Clausen, K.K. and Clausen, P. (2014). Forecasting future drowning of coastal waterbird habitats reveals a major conservation concern. - Biological Conservation 171: 177-185.

For the national protected area network

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Most important sites are under international protection

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

>>> 113

Total area (ha)

>>> 1470000

Number of internationally important sites under national protection designation

>>> 113

Area of international importance under national protection designation (ha)

>>> 1470000

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

Number of sites

>>> 113

Area (in ha)

>>> 1470000

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

>>> 113

Area (in ha)

>>> 1470000

All sites of national importance

Total number

>>> 126000

Total area (ha)

>>> 178000

Number of nationally important sites under national protection designation
>>> 126000

Area of national importance under national protection area designation
>>> 178000

Area (in ha)
>>> 86000

Has your country identified around which nationally or internationally important sites the establishment of buffer zones is needed to maintain or increase resilience?
 No

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING
 No

Please explain the reasons
>>> A proces of evaluating the designations is ongoing

MANAGEMENT GAP FILING
 No

Please explain the reasons
>>> There is not an action plan for management gap filling, but the actions plans for each of the SPA's are revised every 6 year and the issue of management gaps are treated in this proces

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

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?
>>> These areas were identified before the AEWA guidelines, using Natura 2000 and Ramsar Convention 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.
 No

Please explain the reasons
>>> These areas were identified before the development of the CSN Tool.

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
>>> Ressource constraints

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

>>> The sites are protected according to the provisions in the EU Birds Directive and the Ramsar Convention. Furthermore, the sites as a whole or partly are protected according to national legislation e.g. as nature conservation and/or wildlife reserves. A management planning process is being implemented for all Danish NATURA 2000-Sites including basic investigations, conservation goals, monitoring and management plan. In

Denmark the national wetland policy is covered by an integrated and a comprehensive set of nature protection and environmental laws and strategies which also complies with article 6 of the Convention of Biological Diversity. The aim of the entire nature and environmental conservation effort in Denmark is the preservation of biodiversity. The most relevant legal instruments regarding conservation and wise use of wetland are the following:

- The Nature Protection Act (1997, revised in 2004)
- The Act on the Structure of Agriculture (1999)
- The Raw Materials Act (2004)
- The Action Plan of the Aquatic Environment (2004)
- The Act relating to protection of the Tøndermarsh (2004)
- The Hunting and Game Management Act (2007)
- The Marine Environment Act (2008)

Approximately 300000 hectares are generally protected habitats (bogs, lakes, saltmeadows) important for waterbirds and of national importance. Of these, 60 % are situated outside the areas of international importance, equal to 180000 hectares. The total number of individual sites of national importance (situated outside the international areas) are identified to approximately 125000. Of the 180000 hectares approximately 86000 hectares are considered to have a proper management being implemented.

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

>>> Hunting of waterbird species is reviewed in general every 4th year though for some seaduck species a 2-year review was introduced. University of Aarhus is preparing a comprehensive report on the biological basis for sustainable use including eg. population trends, that are used as the scientific basis for decisions on hunting season.

Hunting seasons are regulated through the Secondary Act on hunting season for certain mammals and birds (secondary act no. 974 / 2020)

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

>>> Details given below.

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)

>>> The total bag of the Danish hunters is recorded annually. Each hunter is obliged to inform the authorities of their annual bag in conjunction with their online hunters license renewal.

The results are published annually in a Research note from

DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy.

A major assessment of population trends, bag statistics and harvest sustainability is made on a regular basis. If the bag of a waterbird species has significantly declined it is considered to close or reduce the open season for the species. The latest major report was published in 2016 (In Danish).

Asferg, T., Clausen, P., Christensen, T.K., Bregnballe, T., Clausen, K.K., Fox, A.D., Haugaard, L., Holm, T.E., Laursen, K., Madsen, A.B., Madsen, J., Nielsen, R.D., Sunde, P. & Therkildsen, O.R. 2016. Vildtbestande og jagttider i Danmark: Det biologiske grundlag for jagttidsrevisionen 2018. Aarhus Universitet, DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 140 s. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 195. <http://dce2.au.dk/pub/SR195.pdf>

An English-linguaged presentation of this reporting system was given by Bregnballe et al. (2007).

Bregnballe, T., Noer, H., Christensen, T.K., Clausen, P., Asferg, T., Fox, A.D. & Delany, S. 2007. Sustainable hunting of migratory waterbirds: the Danish approach. In: Boere, G.C., Galbraith, C.A. & Stroud, D.A. (Eds): Waterbirds around the world. A global overview of the conservation, management and research of the world's waterbird flyways. Edinburgh Stationery Office. Pp. 854-860.

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))

Fully

When was lead shot use in wetlands banned?

>>> According to Ministerial Order no. 41, dated 21. January 1994, hunting with lead-ammunition has been forbidden since 1 April 1996, from which date it has also been forbidden to trade and carry lead ammunition while hunting. Use of lead ammunition for training purposes and target shooting was also forbidden after that date. Use of lead ammunition for hunting waterfowl and hunting on wetlands was however already forbidden since 1986.

What legislation is in place?

>>> Please see answer above

Who enforces this legislation?

>>> The Danish Ministry of Environment

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

Yes

Please explain how this was assessed.

>>> Researchers from Department of Bioscience at Aarhus University and the Danish Academy of Hunting, Denmark - is currently investigating the issue by use of data on a) plastic litters from shotgun cartridges, b) embedded and c) ingested shotgun shoots in waterbirds.

Results from part a) was published in 2018, but these results are not fully conclusive from a national perspective, because the plastic litter found beached may come from Danish hunting activities, but also via sea currents from hunting activities abroad.

In this context it is noteworthy, that steel shot shells and wads were more common in inner Danish waters (where Danish hunters are active), but steel shot shells and wads were over-represented on the North Sea coast, where hardly any sea duck hunting takes place in Denmark. Thus, the latter may in fact come from abroad, where lead shot is still being used.

The wads are considered more representative for current hunting activities, and 83 % of identified wads were judged to come from steel and 17 % from lead shot, suggesting a high degree of compliance to the lead-shot ban from Danish hunters, again because the lead-shot wads may come sea currents.

Reference: Kanstrup, N. & Balsby, T.S.J. 2018: Plastic litter from shotgun ammunition on Danish coastlines - amounts and provenance. - Environmental Pollution 237: 601-610.

Data on embedded and ingested shotgun shoots in waterbirds will be published during the next 2018-2020 AEWA reporting cycle.

Please explain what the compliance with legislation was found to be:

Good (almost full compliance)

Please indicate any known reasons for good compliance or any barriers to compliance. Please attach any published or unpublished references.

>>> Compliance generally thought to be good. See details below in answer 35 about compliance issues.

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?

Yes

Please explain how this was done. Please attach any published or unpublished references.

>>> This was investigated under project c) mentioned above.

Ingested shot in mallards (*Anas platyrhynchos*) after the regulation of lead shot for hunting in Denmark. / Kanstrup, Niels; Balsby, Thorsten Johannes Skovbjerg.

In: European Journal of Wildlife Research, Vol. 65, 42, 06.2019.

Research output: Contribution to journal/Conference contribution in journal/Contribution to newspaper > Journal article > Research > peer-review

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?

High

Please provide details

>>> There is a high degree of self-justice within the membership of the Danish Hunters Association (embracing the majority of hunting licence holders in Denmark), and a developed system of game reserve control is working well. Moreover, police is taking this issue seriously, and deals with it efficiently.

Compliance with hunting laws is thus generally considered to be high in Denmark, and especially after some years with new regulations. A good example of this is illustrated from a study of Mute Swans, that in the past were subject to illegal hunting and persecution in Denmark (and neighboring countries).

Andersen-Harild et al. (2002) thus showed that the proportion of swans with embedded shots had declined from 12 % i 1979 to 5 % in 1996, and explained the difference as reflecting improved compliance with general hunting as well as reserve regulations, but also reduced near-coastal hunting activity.

Reference: Andersen-Harild, P., Clausen, B. & Nilson, B.R. (2002): Beskydning af Knopsvaner (*Cygnus olor*) i Danmark - en sammenligning af forholdene i 1979 og 1996. - Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift 96: 9-14.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None

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

>>> Illegal killing of waterbirds is not a widespread problem. High degree of compliance with hunting regulation exists

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

>>> In order to obtain a hunting license you have to pass a test which includes bird identification, legal matters and safety issues including correct shooting distances

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)

Yes

What do these cover?

Other (please specify)

Please provide details on each item selected above

>>> Amongst others: be sure that you can identify species, do not hunt species that are vulnerable due to e.g. cold winters, weather conditions, during moult, minimise disturbance, hunting has to be sustainable, participate in habitat management

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> We don't have any surveys on the application and effectiveness but it is a general understanding that application is very high

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?

>>> A long-going programme is being used, from before the AEWA guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds was published: Every third year a scientific report is edited on the quarry species population and the hunting season is evaluated and possibly revised based on the results, to ensure sustainable harvest of migratory birds. Latest report was published in 2016 (also mentioned above in section 33, with link to the report).

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

>>> None.

6.2. Ecotourism

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

>>> Ecotourism is taken place in the Wadden Sea and is part of the national park strategy as it is the nature and habitats that attracts tourists to the area

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

High

Please provide details

>>> The area is strictly protected as both Natura 2000 site (habitat and bird) and game reserve to protect waterbird species and seals

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

High

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.

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.

>>> Since 1. December 2012 it has been illegal to import or sell fishing "gear" containing metallic lead to commercial as well as recreational fisheries (Ministerial Order No. 856 dated 5 September 2009).

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

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The main features of the Danish EIA are that companies or others making specific constructions, such as large husbandry farms, infrastructures, airports, and wind farms etc., have to make an assessment of the potential impact on the surrounding environment, including wetlands and waterbirds. If the impact is assessed to be significantly negative alleviating measures has to be carried out or the construction may even be translocated to another geographic position or may even be given up. The demands for carrying out EIAs are dependant upon the character and size of the development proposals or change in land/water use. Typically small projects do not require EIAs due to e.g. specified criteria for lower limits of agricultural development projects.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The EIA process includes a public hearing.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None.

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

>>> A general prohibition on disturbance as well as nest protection is in place

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))

Yes, all proposed projects

Please provide information on the outstanding cases

>>> Yes, if assessment concerning waterbirds is considered relevant. There is a massive volume of scientific papers and reports dealing with pre-construction EIA's and wind turbine installations both on land and from Danish waters.

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

Yes

63. 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?

>>> As for many other AEWA guidelines, Danish Authorities and Consultancies initiated such EIA studies well before the AEWA guidelines were produced, but current practices generally follow these.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Such data has to be provided when performing the EIA in the planning process

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?

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Only minor effects have been recognized

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

Please provide details.

>>> As mentioned above EIA's has to be performed for such Projects. If any significant adverse effects are recognized alleviating measures have to put in place or relocation will be necessary.

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

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?

Partially

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?

Not applicable

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

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?

No

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?

No

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?

>>> Guidelines on conducting EIA's existed before the AEWA guideline

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?

Being developed

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?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The procedures of EIA has been well established before

66.3. 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.

>>> A study on collision risk of taiga bean goose to wind turbines have been conducted. The geese avoided the turbines and no risk of collision was found

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

No

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?

>>> New constructions for renewable energy are subject to EIA including assessment of impact on waterbirdspecies in the area. Where wind turbines have been raised mostly only minor adverse effects have been recorded

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

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons

>>> No significant risk was found

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

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons

>>> No significant risk was found

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?

Not applicable

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?

No

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

Please explain

>>> Guidelines on EIA's are in place

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-catchis dealt with in section 4.6 Seabirds)

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The Danish Agency of fishery is financing an ongoing project on by-catch in Commercial fishery

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 6.3. Other Human Activities

>>> None.

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))

>>> In Denmark there are three major monitoring programmes, addressing waterbird populations.

The breeding bird programmes under NOVANA (the National Monitoring and Assessment Programme for the Aquatic and Terrestrial Environment) run by the Government focuses on distribution and numbers of breeding birds listed in Annex I of the Birds Directive, and within the Special Protection Areas designated for them under the Directive. The programme does not necessarily provide a complete national census for all species, although the majority of many species are found within the SPAs. The monitoring cadence under this programme varies in 2017-2021 from annually (very rare species with reduced distribution, e.g. Mediterranean Gull) to every second year (widely distributed and commoner species, e.g. Bittern and Arctic Tern).

The Common Birds Monitoring (CBM) programme run by Birdlife Denmark includes a point-count breeding birds programme, which embraces common and widely distributed waterbird species such as Mute Swan, Coot and Black-headed Gull, and provides annual indexes for these species populations (but not population estimates).

Some waterbird species are not covered systematically under either of these programmes, because they neither are Annex I nor widely distributed species, e.g. Northern Pintail and Gadwall. Such species are only covered by the Atlas censuses organised by Birdlife Denmark, that takes place typically every 20 years. The results of the latest Atlas III (2014-2017) is currently under data quality assessment, and will be published during the 2018-2021 AEWA reporting cycle.

The Atlas censuses are currently under data quality assessment, and will be published during the 2018-2021 AEWA reporting cycle.

Covering the passage period

Partially

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

>>> For the passage periods, the only monthly systematic surveys of waterbirds are undertaken in the Danish Wadden Sea (under the TMAP programme), at the Tipperne and Vejlerne reserves (partly under the NOVANA programme, but also under contract with the Ministry of Environment and Food of Denmark (Tipperne) and the Aage V. Jensen Nature Fund (Vejlerne)).

Outside these areas, the NOVANA programme includes more country-wide counts of selected species, such as Tundra Swan and Pink-footed Goose (March, November), two populations of Brent Geese (April, May), Golden Plover (April, October), dabbling ducks (September, October) - every second year.

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

Partially

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

>>> During winter a complete national census of waterbirds, involving land- and aircraft-based waterbird counts, is undertaken every three years. The last complete census was made in 2016.

In years without a complete census, Denmark contributes to the International Waterbird Census by counting all waterbirds species in 49 selected representative wetlands. These data are used to provide annual indices for wintering waterbird populations.

Annual complete midwinter-censuses of wintering Whooper and Tundra Swans and all goose species is also undertaken, the latter especially to contribute to the AEWA European Goose Management Platform.

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

No

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The results are published annually (in Danish), see <http://novana.au.dk/fugle/>

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

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)

Yes

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.

No

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

>>> In general agreement with the AEWA guidelines, but the Danish waterbird monitoring programme has been developed and improved since the beginning of the 1960'ies.

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)

Yes

Nationally

Yes

Please provide details

>>> See above under section 49 - dealing with the non-breeding/wintering period.

Internationally

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Denmark annually contributes approximately 29,500 EURO to Wetlands International

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None.

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.

No

Please explain the reason

>>> Lack of resources

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)

>>> It is illegal to import or sell fishing "gear" containing metallic lead to commercial as well as recreational fisheries (Current Ministerial Order: BEK nr 856 af 05/09/2009 - <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=126138&exp=1>).

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

>>> Three units within DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy at Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, are engaged in research related to migratory waterbirds within the AEWA region, i.e. the "Arctic Environment group" and "Arctic Ecosystem Ecology group" based in Roskilde and the "Avian Research Group"

based in Kalø. Staff from all groups, however, carry out research on various issues both in Denmark and the Arctic - and occasionally elsewhere in Western Europe and North Africa, and generally together with a broad network of collaborators in other countries.

Projects have thus within the past 18 years been carried out in Arctic Canada, Greenland, Svalbard, Arctic Russia, Iceland, Ireland, United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Egypt, and China.

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.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No specific programme developed and implemented. However, at many important bird areas the public has access to bird observation points and hides as well as information boards regarding the birds at the sites. At many areas also leaflets and/or descriptions are available at the Nature Agency's web page (<http://naturstyrelsen.dk/naturoplevelser/>) describing the areas and among others the birds and other animals that can be found.

Further there is an ongoing cooperation with the Danish Hunters Organization that are informing about waterbird conservation, better hunting organization, goose identification etc.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> None appointed

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None

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

>>> see answer to point 57. In addition the Danish Hunters Association produces a members magazine with information on subjects relating to both hunting and general conservation and protection issues.

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

>>> No specific WMBD activities has been carried out, however, Birdlife Denmark has for many years held an annual "Fuglenes Dag" ("Bird Day") - in mid May, where the public is invited on tours or out in bird observation towers, staffed by volunteer dedicated field ornitologists.

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

>>> This has not been prioritised - resource constraints

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> None

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

>>> Department of Bioscience staff have since 2009 been responsible for teaching a 10 ECTS Master of Science course in Biology at Aarhus University.

The course is named "Wildlife Ecology and Management". Approximately 1/3 of the curriculum, lectures, and exercises (theoretical and practical) deals with waterbird ecology and management issues. A red line through the course includes discussions about management planning, where some student groups are engaged with presenting and evaluating some of the AEWA single-species action plans for other students. In recent years the "Adaptive Nature Management" programmes supporting the AEWA

The Department since 2017 also introduced a course in "Adaptive Nature Management" The course is a "continuing education" aimed at all those who work with administration, education or consultancy in the field of nature and wildlife management in public administration, consultancy firms, special interest organisations as well as academics. The course has the adaptive management approaches used under the AEWA European Goose Management Platform as a highlighted example.

Staff from the Department in summer 2019 also contributed to teaching at a NOVA summer school on "Wetland Ecology and Management" for PhD and advanced MSc students held by University of Helsinki at Lammi Field Station.

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

>>> This has not been prioritized yet

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

>>> Ressource constraints

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.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Coordination is done case by case. The biodiversity MEAs are the responsibility of the Danish Ministry of Environment and staff dealing with these are either working close together or distributed in only a few different units.

A national goose management group has been established implementing the management and actions plans under the AEWA European goose management platform

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> A national goose management group has been established

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

>>> This has not been prioritized yet

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

>>> Through the Danish foreign aid wetland related support to management and conservation has been given directly or indirectly to initiatives in partner countries by which Danida has an agreement such as Vietnam, Tanzania, Indonesia and Kenya.

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))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The tasks are distributed but a close collaboration exists

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

>>> The same officers are responsible for international and national implementation and close collaboration is in place between different agencies that are involved in implementation

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

>>> A close collaboration is in place

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)?

92.2 Other strategic plans and policies

Yes

Please name the other strategic planning processes

>>> Aftale om natur- og biodiversitetspakke (Agreement on nature and biodiversity) Political agreement on the priorities in Danish nature policy. Includes an initiative on developing a strategy for threatened species.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> It has not been so specific but waterbird management is in focus

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 resources.

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

Yes

Please provide details, including amount of funds donated

>>> Funding for the AEWA EGMP and in-kind contribution to the development of the action plan for common eider (answered in other questions)

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

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

>>> Resources have been provided for development and implementation of action- and management plans

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

>>> Lack of resources

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

>>> Lack of resources

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

>>> Have not been fully aware of the options

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

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

>>> Department of Bioscience at Aarhus University in the past participated in the NOWAC (Nordic Waterbirds And Climate) network <http://www.ducksg.org/activities/nowac/>, a research collaboration aimed at exploring already observed and/or expected impacts of climate change of waterbirds in the northern parts of Europe. Although NOWAC is now formally finished, the network continue to produce papers, dealing with aspects of climate change on waterbirds and foreseen management challenges. In the 2018-2020 triennium e.g. these were published or accepted for publication, which are relevant for the AEWA region:

Clausen, K.K., Madsen, J., Cottaar, F., Kuijken, E. & Verschuere, C. (2018). Highly dynamic wintering strategies in migratory geese: coping with environmental change. - *Global Change Biology* 24: 3214-3225.

Pavón-Jordán, D., Clausen, P., Dagys, M., Devos, K., Encarnação, V., Fox, A.D., Frost, T., Gaudard, C., Hornman, M., Keller, V., Langendoen, T., Ławicki, Ł., Lewis, L.J., Lorentsen, S.-H., Luigujoe, L., Meissner, W., Molina, B., Musil, P., Musilova, Z., Nilsson, L., Paquet, J.-Y., Ridzon, J., Stipnice, A., Teufelbauer, N., Wahl, J., Zenatello, M. & Lehikoinen, A. (2019). Short- and long-term changes in abundances linked to changes in winter weather conditions in Europe differ between species with different habitat preferences. *Diversity and Distributions* 25: 225-239. doi:10.1111/ddi.12855

Pavón-Jordán, D., Abdou, W., Azafzaf, H., Balaž, M., Bino, T., Borg, J.J., Božič, L., Butchart, S.H.M., Clausen, P., Sniuksta, L., Dakki, M., Devos, K., Domsa, C., Encarnação, V., Etayeb, K., Faragó, S., Fox, A.D., Frost, T., Gaudard, C., Georgiev, V., Goratze, I., Hornman, M., Keller, V., Kostiusyn, V., Langendoen, T., Ławicki, L., Ieronymidou, C., Lewis, L.J., Lorentsen, S.-H., Luigujoe, L., Meissner, W., Mikuska, T., Molina, B., Musil, P., Musilova, Z., Nagy, S., Natykanets, V., Nilsson, L., Paquet, J.-Y., Portolou, D., Ridzon, J., Santangeli, A., Sayoudan, S., Šćiban, M., Stipnice, A., Teufelbauer, N., Topić, G., Uzunova, D., Viziati, A., Wahl, J., Yavuzav, K.E., Zenatello, M., Lehikoinen, A. (2020). Positive impacts of important bird and biodiversity areas on wintering waterbirds under changing temperatures throughout Europe and North Africa. - *Biological Conservation* 246: 108549.

Gaget, E., Pavón-Jordán, D., Johnston, A., Lehikoinen, A., Hochachka, W.M., Sandercock, B.K., Soutan, A., Azafzaf, H., Bendjedda, N., Bino, T., Božič, L., Clausen, P., Dakki, M., Devos, K., Domsa, C., Encarnação, V., Erciyas-Yavuz, K., Faragó, S., Frost, T., Gaudard, C., Gosztonyi, L., Haas, F., Hornman, M., Langendoen, T., Ieronymidou, C., Kostyushin, V.A., Lewis, L.J., Lorentsen, S.-H., Luigujoe, L., Meissner, V., Mikuska, T., Molina, B., Musilová, Z., Natykanets, V., Paquet, J.-Y., Petkov, N., Portolou, D., Ridzoň, J., Sayoud, S., Šćiban, M., Sniuksta, L., Stipnice, A., Strebel, N., Teufelbauer, N., Topić, G., Uzunova, D., Vizi, A., Wahl, J., Zenatello, M., Brommer, J.E. (2021). Benefits of protected areas for nonbreeding waterbirds adjusting their distributions under climate warming. - *Conservation Biology* (early view). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13648>

Clairbaux, M., Cheung, W., Mathewson, P., Porter, W., Courbin, N., Fort, J., Strøm, H., Moe, B., Fauchald, P., Descamps, S., Helgason, H., Bråthen, V.S., Merkel, B., Anker-Nilssen, T., Bringsvor, I.S., Chastel, O., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Danielsen, J., Daunt, F., Dehnhard, N., Erikstad, K.E., Ezhov, A., Gavrilo, M., Krasnov, Y., Langset, M., Lorentsen, S.H., Newell, M., Olsen, B., Reiertsen, T.K., Systad, G., Thórarinnsson, T.L., Baran, M., Diamond, T., Fayet, A.L., Fitzsimmons, M.G., Frederiksen, M., Gilchrist, H.G., Guilford, T., Huffeldt, N.P., Jessopp, M., Johansen, K.L., Kouwenberg, A.L., Linnebjerg, J.F., McFarlane Tranquilla, L., Mallory, M., Merkel, F.R., Montevecchi, W., Mosbech, A., Petersen, A. & Grémillet, D. (2021). Meeting Paris agreement objectives will temper seabird winter distribution shifts in the North Atlantic Ocean. - *Global Change Biology* 27: 1457-1469.

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)

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

>>> The NOWAC network, mentioned above, has undertaken a specific study on the potentially vulnerable population of Greater Scaup:

Marchowski, D., Ławicki, Ł., Fox, A.D., Nielsen, R.D., Petersen, I.K., Hornman, M., Nilsson, L., Haas, F., Wahl, J., Kieckbusch, J., Nehls, H.w., Calbrade, N., Hearn, R., Meissner, W., Fitzgerald, N., Luigujoe, L., Zenatello, M.,

Gaudard, C., & Koschinski, S. 2020: Effectiveness of the European Natura 2000 network to sustain a specialist wintering waterbird population in the face of climate change. - Scientific Reports 10: 20286.

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

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

>>> Staff from Department of Bioscience has published a paper with potential impacts of short-stopping on our current European monitoring programmes limitations for actually detecting impacts of climate change: Fox, A.D., Nielsen, R.D., & Petersen, I.K. (2019). Climate-change not only threatens bird populations but also challenges our ability to monitor them. - Ibis 161: 467-474.

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Climate change has not been the focus of reviews of waterbird management. In the past trienna focus has been on management of hunting.

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

>>> see above

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?

>>> Due to resource constraints this has not been prioritized

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

>>> None.

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

>>> In 2018, 148 dead or sick wild birds (passive surveillance) and 866 apparently healthy wild birds (active surveillance) were tested for avian influenza (AI). HPAI H5N6 was detected in White-tailed Se-eagle (12), Common Buzzard (11), Pheasant (5), Mute swan (4), Common Eider (2), Hooded Crow (2), Mallard (2), Black-headed Gull (1), Cormorant (1), Greylag Goose (1) and Herring Gull (1). None of the apparently healthy birds were positive for HPAI.

In 2019, 111 dead or sick wild birds and 898 apparently healthy wild birds were tested for AI. HPAI H5N6 was detected in a Common buzzard. None of the apparently healthy birds were positive for HPAI.

The detailed results of the AI surveillance in wild birds in 2020 are not yet available. However, in 2020, 288 dead or sick wild birds and 786 apparently healthy wild birds were tested for AI. HPAI H5 was detected in 92 dead or sick wild birds, whereas two apparently healthy wild birds were positive for HPAI H5.

No actions are taken to respond to the spread of HPAI among wild birds in Denmark.

List required further guidance or information

>>> None

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Reports on Avian Influenza and other diseases are reported annually by the Danish Veterinary and Food Administration, and can be found here:

<https://www.foedevarestyrelsen.dk/english/Animal/AnimalHealth/Pages/default.aspx>

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

>>> None.

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.

Date of submission

>>> 23-04-2021