



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

>>> Germany

Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

>>> 01.11.1999

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

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

>>> Reservation of the EU in relation to amendments concerning nine huntable species under EU Birds Directive.

The EU and its Member States approved the proposed changes to the status of species as proposed in Annex I of the Draft Resolution 7.3. Among the species concerned by a population status change in Table 1 of Annex 3 of AEWA, nine species the Common Eider, Red-breasted Merganser, Common Pochard, Eurasian Oystercatcher, Northern Lapwing, Bar-tailed Godwit, Black-tailed Godwit, Red Knot, and Spotted Redshank are huntable under the EU Birds Directive. For these nine species, the proposed changes would require an amendment to the Birds Directive. As it is not possible to amend the Birds Directive within ninety days of the date of the adoption of the amendments by the Meeting of the Parties, the Commission shall enter a reservation in relation to the proposed amendments concerning these nine species.

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

>>> Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Bundesumweltministerin Svenja Schulze

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> BMU / Referat N I 5 (International Species Protection) / Robert-Schuman-Platz 3

P.O.Box

>>> -----

Postal code

>>> 53175

City

>>> Bonn

Country

>>> Germany

Telephone

>>> +49 228 305 2632

Fax

>>> +49 228 305 2684

E-mail

>>> oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

Website

>>> www.bmu.de

Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Oliver Schall

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, N I 5 (International Species Protection)

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Robert-Schuman- Platz 3

P.O.Box

>>> -----

Postal code

>>> 53175

City

>>> Bonn

Country

>>> Germany

Telephone

>>> +49 (0)228 99 305-2632

Fax
>>> +49 (0)228 99 305-2684

E-mail
>>> oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

Website
>>> www.bmu.de

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

Name and title of the TC NFP
>>> Dr. Timm Reinhardt

Affiliation (institution, department)
>>> Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)

Mailing address - Street and number
>>> Konstantinstrasse 110

P.O.Box
>>>

Postal code
>>> 53179

City
>>> Bonn

Country
>>> Germany

Telephone
>>> +49 228 84911433

Fax
>>> +49 228 84911419

E-mail
>>> Timm.Reinhardt@bfm.de

Website
>>> www.bfn.de

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

Name and title of the CEPA NFP
>>> cf. above: Oliver Schall (National Focal point)

Affiliation (institution, department)
>>> Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, N I 5

Mailing address - Street and number
>>> Robert-Schuman-Platz 3

P.O.Box
>>>

Postal code
>>> 53175

City
>>> Bonn

Country

>>> Germany

Telephone

>>> +49 (0)228 99 305-2632

Fax

>>> +49 (0)228 99 305-2684

E-mail

>>> oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

Website

>>> www.bmu.de

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.

>>> Timm Reinhardt (BfN - cf. above)

Karsten Lutz (Dachverband Deutscher Avifaunisten e.V.)

Johannes Wahl (Dachverband Deutscher Avifaunisten e.V.)

Martin Fichtler (Dachverband Deutscher Avifaunisten e.V.)

Martin Hormann (Staatliche Vogelschutzstelle für Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz und Saarland)

Nele Markones (Research and Technology Centre, Kiel University)

Federal State Agencies for Nature Conservation

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 not fully in line with the Agreement text and its annexes

Please describe the discrepancies that were identified.

>>> Federal hunting legislation needs a revision - cf. 6. Hunting !

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

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

>>> Adjustments took place by hunting regulations of German federal states.:
e.g. protection of (taiga) bean goose

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Beyond Hunting legislation:

Germany has started a review of the domestic legislation concerning the implementation of CMS as the mother convention of AEWA. This process is well progressed and will be probably finalized in May 2021. Given that AEWA is an Agreement under CMS, this process is the first step of the review and as soon as this process is settled further steps will follow. However, some considerations of legal changes to bring national legislation better in accordance with AEWA requirements started even earlier (cf. answer to question 2.). The further review concerning the AEWA provisions will use the results of the CMS review as starting point for a presumably needed legislative procedure in the next parliamentary period.

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?

Yes

Was your national legislation subsequently adjusted?

No. Please explain the reasons

>>> This process is not yet finalized and will need another legislative period.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Already in the previous legislative period a review of the hunting legislation took place. The process included AEWA species of Annex III Table 1, not yet protected by respective German legislation at that time. However, it was not possible to reach an agreement in the German parliament and so this legislative initiative of the federal government failed.

However, according to § 22 Federal Hunting Act (BJagdG) the German Federal States (Länder) have the possibility to deviate from the hunting or protection periods given in a specific Federal order called "Bundesjagdzeiten-Verordnung". Therefore they are in a position to create stricter protection in accordance with AEWA requirements.

So as far as "different populations of the same species are concerned" the Bean Goose (*Anser fabalis*) is a striking example. The German Länder Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Brandenburg have according to the AEWA SSAP a particular responsibility for the conservation of the Taiga Bean Goose (*Anser fabalis fabalis*) - a quarry population in decline. However, the Tundra Bean Goose (*Anser fabalis rossicus*) exists too in these two federal states and is a least concerned subspecies. In order to avoid look-alike effects the hunting of Bean

geese in general (*Anser fabalis*) is prohibited in the hunting regulations of both federal states. Furthermore other federal states, where the Taiga Bean goose is only occasionally present, have chosen the same approach.

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.

[Germany_Q3_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopCoIA.xlsx](#)

4. Please confirm whether there is an open hunting season for the AEWA Table 1, Column A, category 2 or 3 with an asterisk or category 4 populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

Guidance on responding to this question:

- 1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name. (**Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)
- 2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;
- 3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Germany_Q4_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopCoIA-Cat2_3_4.xlsx](#)

5. Please confirm whether taking is regulated for the AEWA Table 1, Column B populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

Guidance on responding to this question:

- 1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name. (**Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)
- 2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;
- 3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Germany_Q5_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopCoIB.xlsx](#)

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

non-selective modes of taking. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b); AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)

Yes, one or more modes of taking have been prohibited

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

Snares

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) Nr. 8 BJagdG (Bundes-Jagd-Gesetz /Federal hunting Act)

Limes

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) Nr. 5b BJagdG

Hooks

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) Nr.5b BJagdG

Live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5b BJagdG

Tape recorders and other electronic devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5a BJagdG

Electrocuting devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5a BJagdG

Artificial light sources

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19(1) 5a BJagdG

Mirrors and other dazzling devices

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5a BJagdG

Devices for illuminating targets

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5a BJagdG

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5a BJagdG

Explosives

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. Sprengstoffgesetz

Nets

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5b BJagdG

Traps

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 5b BJagdG

Poison

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 15 BJagdG

Poisoned or anaesthetic baits

Yes, fully

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) 15 BJagdG

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

>>> cf. § 19 (1) . BJagdG

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, partially

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

>>> Hunting exceptions for disabled persons are possible with a particular permission and only for motor vehicles

Boats are in general forbidden independent of the speed, if a motor is used.

cf. § 19 1 Nr.11 BJagdG

Other non-selective modes of taking

Yes, fully

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

>>> In the case of legal hunting : Only shotguns are allowed to take Birds out of their habitat.

Exceptions are made only for Birds Directive and AEWA conform reasons e.g. Research.

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

>>> cf. § 19 BJagdG

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

>>> -

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

Please provide information on each species for which exemption was granted

Germany

Exemption for Brent Goose / *Branta bernicla*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

Exemption for Barnacle Goose / *Branta leucopsis*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

Exemption for Greylag Goose / *Anser anser*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

(b) In the interests of air safety, public health, public safety, or

other imperative reasons of overriding public interests, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance to the environment

Exemption for Bean Goose / *Anser fabalis*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

Exemption for Greater White-fronted Goose / *Anser albifrons*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

Exemption for White Stork / *Ciconia ciconia*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(b) In the interests of air safety, public health, public safety, or

other imperative reasons of overriding public interests, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance to the environment

Exemption for Grey Heron / *Ardea cinerea*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

Exemption for Great Cormorant / *Phalacrocorax carbo*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(a) To prevent serious damage to crops, water and fisheries

Exemption for Eurasian Oystercatcher / *Haematopus ostralegus*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(c) For the purpose of research and education, of re-establishment and for the breeding necessary for these purposes

Exemption for Black-headed Gull / *Larus ridibundus*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(c) For the purpose of research and education, of re-establishment and for the breeding necessary for these

purposes

Exemption for European Herring Gull / *Larus argentatus*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(c) For the purpose of research and education, of re-establishment and for the breeding necessary for these purposes

Exemption for Common Tern / *Sterna hirundo*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(c) For the purpose of research and education, of re-establishment and for the breeding necessary for these purposes

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))

Yes

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

>>> - already in previous reporting periods

- in this reporting period a new revision was started by first analyzing the implementation of the mother Convention CMS - this process will be finalized presumably in May 2021.

What is the assessed level of enforcement and compliance?

High (almost full compliance)

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

>>> Cf. previous reports -

For small gaps cf. the answers under "hunting"..

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

Yes

Please describe the measures

>>> cf. additional information

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Yes, concerning the German hunting legislation. Cf. the answer to question 1. The process on Federal level is still not settled and during the first half of the year 2021 there will be the essential discussion in the German Parliament. However, for species related issues a new approach in the next legislative period (starting in autumn 2021) will be probably necessary.

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

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

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> The Federal Nature Conservation Legislation and Hunting legislation of the federal Government and or the German Länder take care of the requirements of the AEWA and it's guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats.

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

>>> Germany - as other EU states - is obliged to report about exemptions to the European Union. The EU reports back to the Berne Convention. Therefore cf. the respective reports.

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 and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> No NP and no conservation action needed: the species is abundant in Germany.

Greylag Goose / *Anser anser*

National Plan for Greylag Goose / *Anser anser*

No NP and no action implemented

Lesser White-fronted Goose / *Anser erythropus*

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> LFWG appear in Germany during migration and wintering period in only very small numbers in areas, which are usually anyhow protected for other water bird species, like e.g. the Ramsar site "Unterer Niederrhein" – an utmost important wintering place for White fronted Goose.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Research project on Lesser White-fronted Goose in Lower Saxony

(<https://niedersachsen.nabu.de/tiere-und-pflanzen/aktionen-und-projekte/zwerggansprojekt/23123.html>)

Bean Goose / *Anser fabalis*

National Plan for Bean Goose / *Anser fabalis*

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Bean goose -as species - is quite abundant in Germany. – However, as a special actiohunting bans n were realized in the federal states with wintering sites of *A. fabalis fabalis*.

Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca*

National Plan for Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> No NP but actions by the concerned Federal States (s. question 20).

Long-tailed Duck / *Clangula hyemalis*

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> In the Schleswig-Holstein Baltic Sea a "Voluntary Agreement for the Protection of Harbour Porpoises and Diving Sea Ducks" by State Fisheries Associations and the State Fisheries Ministry (MELUR) is in place to reduce the bycatch with gillnets.

A research project funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Protection (BfN) is aiming at a better understanding the habitat selection on migration and in wintering and stopover sites using data loggers with precise position determination as well as stable isotope analyses. This project has a special emphasis on Long-tailed Duck.

(<https://www.uni-giessen.de/fbz/fb08/Inst/tsz/voekophysiologie/forschung/Meeresenten>)

Velvet Scoter / *Melanitta fusca*
National Plan for Velvet Scoter / *Melanitta fusca*

No NP and no action implemented

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> cf. answer 12

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Due to lack of competence of the Federal Government no NP, but by special research and habitat management projects the federal government supported the German Federal states (Länder) in charge of specific plans or projects.

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Since Nov. 2020 a 6-year project on Tundra Swan started as part of the Federal Programme on Biological Diversity (Bundesprogramm Biologische Vielfalt; <https://www.bmu.de/WS4363>). As part of this project also a National Plan for Tundra Swan shall be developed. See <https://biologischevielfalt.bfn.de/bundesprogramm/projekte/projektbeschreibungen/zwergschwan.html> for a short description of the project goals.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Since nearly one century there have been no breeding sites in Germany anymore.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Germany is not part of the usual range of this species and observations in Germany are extremely rare and irregular.

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Species conservation program "grassland bird species" Bavaria (https://www.lfu.bayern.de/natur/artenhilfsprojekte_voegel/wiesenbrueter/index.htm)
EU LIFE+ project "Wiesenbrüter" in Lower Saxony (<https://www.wiesenvoegel-life.de/>)
EU LIFE project "Life Limosa" (<https://www.wo-ist-greta.de/static-navi/eng/>)
EU LIFE project "Wiesenvögel NRW - Breeding and migratory low wetland meadow birds in North-Rhine - Westphalia" in Northrhine-Westphalia (<https://www.lanuv.nrw.de/life-wiesenvoegel-nrw>)

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

No NP, but actions implemented

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> BfN launched a regional research Project on the Eurasian Curlew in 2020: "Investigating the flyways and the resting and wintering grounds of *N. arquata* breeding in north western Germany via GPS-telemetry." April 2020 - July 2021.

Species conservation program "grassland bird species" Bavaria

(https://www.lfu.bayern.de/natur/artenhilfsprojekte_voegel/wiesenbrueter/index.htm)

EU LIFE+ project "Wiesenbrüter" in Lower Saxony (<https://www.wiesenvoegel-life.de/>)

EU LIFE project "Wiesenvögel NRW - Breeding and migratory low wetland meadow birds in North-Rhine - Westphalia" in Northrhine-Westfalia (<https://www.lanuv.nrw.de/life-wiesenvoegel-nrw>)

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> No NP and no action needed - species usually not present in Germany.

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

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> This species was in the past not present in Germany, however, since the 1990ies - due to high populations in the Netherlands - the Spoonbill started to conquer considerable parts of Northern Germany. Until the last years the population is well developing and the number of breeding pairs are rapidly increasing. (ADEBAR 2014).

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

>>> In 2020 a workshop in Germany (planned on the island of Vilm (Baltic Sea) dedicated to Baltic ducks (in particular Long-tailed Duck/ *Clangula hyemalis* and Velvet Scoter / *Melanitta fusca* in the Baltic Sea was prepared. Due to the COVID pandemic this workshop only took place as a virtual meeting chaired by Germany. Germany already invited to the next meeting in March 2022 on the isle of Vilm.

Furthermore at the end of 2020, Germany, in particular the state of Lower Saxony invited the AEWA species working groups "Curlew / *Numenius arquata*" and "Black Tailed Godwit / *Limosa limosa*" to Papenburg in Lower Saxony for September 2021.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> cf. former reports too

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

>>> Germany has given a voluntary contribution to support the African Initiative of AEWA and in so far the work of the African desk officer including activities in Africa linked to respective African species activities.

The AEWA secretariat knows the exact amount of the funds donated.

Germany has further provided financial and service in-kind resources to the European goose management platform (EGMP). Additionally, financial and in-kind support has been provided to the platform by the Länder Lower Saxony and Schleswig Holstein.

The AEWA Secretariat knows the amount..

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.

>>> The prioritization of financial resources takes place each year in the frame of the budgetary planning. Action plans and related resources in this context were not seen as a federal matter given that this issue is due to the constitutional distribution of tasks under the auspices of the German Federal States (Bundesländer). In so far for the Federal government a resource planning is not the critical issue and the question is more, how to catalyze respective activities in the German Länder.

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

No

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

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In Germany the Federal States (Bundesländer) are responsible for the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans. In 2009 a new paragraph (§ 38 (2)) was integrated into the Federal Nature Protection Act (BNatSchG) concerning i.a. the creation of NSSAPs.

Germany has already elaborated several NSSAPs for a range of species, such as White Stork (*Ciconia ciconia*), Eurasian Curlew (*Numenius arquata*), Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa*), Corncrake (*Crex crex*), Northern Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*) and Black Stork (*Ciconia nigra*) taking due account of the AEWA guidelines.

As part of the project "Bewick's Swan: Protection concept for an endangered migratory bird species in Germany" also a National Plan for Tundra Swan shall be developed. See

<https://biologischevielfalt.bfn.de/bundesprogramm/projekte/projektbeschreibungen/zwergschwan.html> for a short description of the project goals

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?

Yes

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

Measures for Botulism

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> > In the past Botulism has occurred in some areas, but there has been no outbreak in the last triennium. Managers of protected areas are aware of this problem and are prepared to collect dead birds and to impose area restrictions.

Measures for Chemical pollution

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> There exists a well developed and comprehensive legislation concerning chemical pollution and pollutants, which implements the comprehensive European legislation and European Policies in that field too. In particular of AEWA Importance was the EU Instrument REACH, where the strategy for diminishing lead was and is

developed.

Measures for Infectious disease

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> Beside Avian Influenza (see chapter 11) there have been no problems with other infectious diseases for waterbirds in Germany.

Measures for Lead poisoning

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> Almost all Federal States in Germany have banned the use of lead shot for hunting [at water bodies] in wetlands (see chapter 6 "Management of human activities", question 50)..

A revision of the German Hunting act was launched at the end of the reporting period in 2020, which contains regulations to diminish lead shot even outside wetlands.

The Parliamentary discussion and decision is expected still in this legislative period, which ends in summer 2021.

Measures for Oil spill

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> - NETHGER-Plan: "Netherlands-German Joint Maritime Contingency Plan on Combating Oil and other Harmful Substances"

- Bonn Agreement (Articles 3, 4, 7): collective protection of the North Sea. Parties are Germany and the bordering countries of the North Sea Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the UK.

- HELCOM: "Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area". Parties are all the countries bordering the Baltic Sea.

- Helsinki Convention (Art. 13): contains obligations similar to those of the Bonn Agreement for the North Sea.

- VPS.system: project by the German coastal states and the German federal government to fulfil the demands of a sustainable contingency planning system for pollution incidents along the sea coasts.

Commissions for trans-boundary European rivers:

- International Commission for the Protection of the Elbe (IKSE).

- International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine (IKSR).

- International Commission for the Protection of the Danube (IKSD).

- International Commission for the Protection of the Odra (IKSO).

- International Commission for the Protection of the Moselle and the Saar (IKSMS).

- International Meuse Commission (IMC).

Measures for Predation

Shortly describe the emergency measures in place in your country

>>> Predation is part of the natural dynamics of ecosystems. Predation can become a problem in areas where the quality of natural habitats is affected (for example land consumption). Protection measures in case of predation are only implemented to protect nesting-sites of waterbirds in areas of high importance for local waterbird populations. Today only terrestrial mammals (mostly fox) can pose a local threat to nesting sites on inland waters, the Baltic Sea and areas of the North Sea coast. Particular measures are implemented in affected areas: selective hunting of predatory mammals or electric fences.

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

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The procedure of Germany is consistent with the AEWA Guideline to identify and tackle emergency situations for migratory waterbirds.

The Federal Republic of Germany is obligated by several Agreements to cooperate in emergency measures responding to threatening incidents for flora and fauna in the North Sea, the Baltic Sea and in trans-boundary rivers. These emergency measures also apply to situations that threaten populations of AEWA species (pursuant to 2.3 of the AEWA Action Plan).

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

>>> The number of such re-establishment projects is so low, that they are all known.

The re-establishment of the Ferruginous Duck (*Aythya nyroca*) at the "Steinhuder Meer" was initiated by Lower Saxony in 2010. From 2012 to June 2015 237 birds were released around Lake Steinhude. In 2015, the first two successful broods were observed.

More on the project can be found in Melles & Brandt (2016): Ein Versuch zur Wiederansiedlung der Moorente *Aythya nyroca* am Steinhuder Meer, Niedersachsen – erste Ergebnisse. Vogelkundliche Berichte Niedersachsen 45: 37-52 and from the website given below.

A re-establishment project of the Bald Ibis (*Geronticus eremita*) at Burghausen (Bavaria; with a second location at Kuchl/Austria) is financed by the European Union as part of the LIFE+ programme. More in the project see link below.

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

>>> The re-establishment of species is defined in § 37 of the Federal Nature Protection Law / Bundesnaturschutzgesetz as a special task of species protection.

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.

Yes

Please explain

>>> The translocation of waterbirds for conservation purposes is regulated by the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG) § 40 ff. The articles of the BNatSchG were implemented prior to the draft of the AEWA guidelines and comply fully with their criteria.

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.

>>> The EU regulation 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species was adopted in 2014 by the European Union and entered into force on 1st January 1 2015. German national law: §§ 40 a - g of the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG) complies with the Regulation and prohibits the introduction into the environment of any non-native species. The legislation is consistent and applied country-wide.

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.

>>> §42 of the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG) defines the requirements on the husbandry of

animals in zoos and the avoidance of accidental escapes from these. §43 BNatSchG regulates the husbandry of wild animals in facilities other than zoos. Both comply with the EU regulation 1143/2014 as implemented in 2017. The Federal Nature Conservation Act is a country-wide legislation; the Federal States (Länder) can define further specifications within the framework of the Federal Nature Conservation Act.

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

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

Ruddy Duck / *Oxyura jamaicensis*

For Ruddy Duck / *Oxyura jamaicensis*

Control or eradication programme developed and being implemented

Egyptian Goose / *Alopochen aegyptiaca*

For Egyptian Goose / *Alopochen aegyptiaca*

Control or eradication programme being developed

African Sacred Ibis / *Threskiornis aethiopicus*

For African Sacred Ibis / *Threskiornis aethiopicus*

Control or eradication programme developed and being implemented

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

>>> As part of the implementation of Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014 on invasive alien species, which came into force on February 2, 2015, the competent authorities (federal states) establish a system for monitoring invasive alien species of Union-wide importance or integrate this in an existing system that collects and records data on the occurrence of invasive alien species in the environment through surveys, monitoring or other processes in order to prevent the spread of these species into or within the EU. The list of invasive alien species of Union-wide importance (Union list) currently includes 49 species. There are currently several invasive species that can potentially influence the ecological conditions of wetlands:

E.g floating pennywort (*Hydrocotyle ranunculoides*), the african oxygen weed (*Lagarosiphon major*), Nutalls' waterweed (*Elodea nutallii*), the watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum aquaticum*), the water-primroses (*Ludwigia grandiflora* and *Ludwigia peploides*), spinycheek crayfish (*Orconectes limosus*), bullfrog (*Lithobates catesbeianus*), pond slider (*Trachemys scripta*), Egyptian goose (*Alopochen aegyptiacus*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) and raccoon dog (*Nyctereutes procyonoides*).

Fanwort (*Cabomba caroliniana*), watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum heterophyllum*), water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*), alligator weed (*Alternanthera philoxeroides*) and coati (*Nasua nasua*) and Sacred Ibis (*Threskiornis aethiopicus*) are i.a. species in the early detection category.

There is an obligation to eradicate invasive species listed on the Union IAS list that are new to a member state. For invasive species on this list that are already widespread, there is an obligation to design and implement measures to prevent further spread of these species. Work is currently underway in the federal states to establish an environmental monitoring system, as demanded by Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014.

Please provide further information for each relevant programme

>>> Specific programmes are currently under development.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The AEWA-Guidelines describe the approach of Germany to avoid the introduction of non-native waterbird

species.

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)

Yes

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

>>> The final report of a funded research and development project (F+E Vorhaben) "Analysis and assessment of by-catch of seabirds by passive marine fishing in the Baltic Sea" published in 2011, illustrates the situation in Germany. A total of 526 by-caught birds were recorded in this study. Sea ducks and diving ducks feeding on benthic invertebrates accounted for more than 50 % of by-caught birds in all types of gear and during catches of all target species. Diving ducks (e.g. Greater Scaup, Tufted Duck, Pochard) formed 65 % of by-catches in coastal lagoons, while seaducks (e.g. Common Eider, Long-tailed Duck, Common scoter) were dominating the by-catch in waters of the outer coast and the EEZ (47 %). A similar species composition of by-caught seabirds was found in gillnets off Usedom and can be assessed as representative for bird by-catches in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania during 2006-2009.

By-catch of seabirds occurred in all types of fishing gear and in the fishery of all target species studied. By-catch rates in gillnet and longline fisheries depended on target species, season and fishing area. The highest average by-catch rate recorded was 0.61 birds/1000 NMD (birds per 1000 meters of net length per day = birds/1000 NMD) in the gillnet fishery targeting pike perch, pike and perch. The lowest by-catch rate occurred in the turbot gill net fishery with 0.01 birds / 1000 NMD. The average by-catch rate in the longline fishery targeting eel was 0.031 birds / 1000 hooks day. Seasonally, the highest by-catch rates for bottom-set gillnets targeting cod, flounder, salmon, pike perch, pike and perch were recorded during winter, from December to April. In the pelagic gillnet fisheries, targeting herring and garfish, high by-catch rates occurred between January and May.

The results of the study showed that highest by-catch rates occurred in coastal lagoons and the 3 - nautical mile zone. In the German EEZ east of Rügen including the SPA "Pomeranian Bay", sampling of gillnet and longline fisheries, which are active mainly between May and September, was confined to German fishermen. The average by-catch-rates in this area were comparatively low (0.006 birds / 1000 NMD).

In the flyway populations of Long-tailed Duck and Scaup, mortality from by-catch and other human activities reach a level which may not be sustainable, and this may contribute to the currently observed decrease in the two species. Therefore, management measures to reduce seabird by-catch mortality in the Baltic gillnet fisheries including those in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, are imperative. Possible mitigation measures include seasonal and spatial closures in areas with concentrations of sea-birds as well as replacement of gillnets by alternative gear such as baited pots and in some cases bottom set longlines.

Further information:

Bellebaum, J. (2012): Untersuchung und Bewertung des Beifangs von Seevögeln durch die passive Meeresfischerei in der Ostsee. BfN-Skripten 295 - 2011

Sonntag, N., Schwemmer, H., Fock, H.O., Bellebaum, J., and Garthe, S. (2012): Seabirds, set-nets, and conservation management: assessment of conflict potential and vulnerability of birds to bycatch in gillnets. - ICES Journal of Marine Science, 69: 578 - 58

Bellebaum, J., Schirmeister, B., Sonntag, N. & Garthe, S. (2013): Decreasing but still high: bycatch of seabirds in gillnet fisheries along the German Baltic coast. Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst., 23: 210-221. doi: 10.1002/aqc.2285

Detloff, K.C. & S. Koschinski (2017): Wissenschaftliche Grundlagen für ein ökosystemgerechtes Fischereimanagement in der deutschen AWZ. Erprobung und Weiterentwicklung alternativer, ökosystemgerechter Fanggeräte zur Vermeidung von Beifängen von Seevögeln und Schweinswalen in der Ostsee. BfN, Bonn.

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

Yes

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

>>> Cf. answer to the previous question as a starting point.

However, European fishery policy is under the auspices of the European Commission, including bycatch issues.

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

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> No detailed assessment appeared in this reporting period necessary in German waters:
However, foot shortage due to shellfish fishery was analyzed in the framework of the Wadden Sea cooperation already more than 25 years ago - after starvation of ducks in the Netherlands due to intense shellfish fishery. Since that time no such major problems became known.
European fishery policy is under the auspices of the European Commission. including bycatch issues.
European studies concerning certain pray fish species might perhaps be useful on a European scale..

When and how do you plan to do that?

>>> As explained. it might be useful, if the AEWA secretariat would inform the European Commission, if there are any pray species, for which an EU impact assessment concerning fishery effects deems needed.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> European fishery policy is under the auspices of the European Commission, including bycatch issues. The reduction of harbor porpoise bycatch had a higher priority. -
Illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing is not considered to be an important issue. in Germany, German punishment law and other legislation prevent illegal fishing..

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.

>>> According to DDA, the German Umbrella organisation of ornithologists, in charge of the German Bird monitoring programme, the data situation is sufficient.

34. Have you assessed the impact of hunting and egg harvesting (both legal and illegal) on AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> German NGOs or the Trilateral Waddensea cooperation or the German Wadden Sea Nationalparcs are following the situation of sea birds at the North sea coast.
So far there is no major impact of hunting known to the AEWA focal point..
However, there is a process to consider hunting of Birds under Art. 2 birds directive in an unfavorable conservation status initiated by the EU / European Commission. This process will lead to further considerations, how to best approach Resolution 7.6.

When and how do you plan to do that?

>>> In dependence of the EU process explained in the previous answer and so far unknown publications giving reasons to follow this issue.

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

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> So far the AEWA focal point has not received information about any seabird colonies at risk from invasive non native species - despite a good monitoring of the German North sea / Waddensea coast and the German Baltic Sea.

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)

Yes

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

>>> Large partsof Germanmarin waters are considered as particular sensitive areas or as Important Bird areas - the respective German authorities are aware of the risks of oil spillis and the need of .their prevention and prepared for urgency measures in case of unforeseen accidents.

Are AEWA seabirds and seabird sites adequately represented within existing oil spill response plans?

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> The priority aim in Germany is to avoid oil spills, this includes prevention of effects on nature in general including seabirds.

In case of accidents immediate help is needed for all respective spots and not only or preferably sea bird areas. the Natura 2000 sites (including sites for seabirds) are known to the responsible authorities..

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)

Yes

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

>>> Assessments of impacts of windfarms concerning AEWA seabirds and respective population data were an issue of former reporting periods.

..

.

38. Have you identified priority sites by filling gaps in the Critical Site Network for seabirds (breeding, non-breeding, pelagic and coastal areas)? (Resolution 7.6)

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> This process started already more than 30 years ago, based on IBA studies, when the SPA network under the Birds Directive was created. This network was assessed by the European Commission since nearly two decades as sufficient.

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

>>> Sudfeldt, C., D. Doer, H. Hötker, C. Mayr, C. Unselt, A. v. Lindeiner & H.-G. Bauer (2002): Important Bird Areas (Bedeutende Vogelschutzgebiete) in Deutschland – überarbeitete und aktualisierte Gesamtliste (Stand 01.07.2002). Berichte zum Vogelschutz 38: 17–109.

Sudfeldt, C., D. Doer & J. Wahl (2002): Important Bird Areas und potenzielle Ramsar-Gebiete in Deutschland. Berichte zum Vogelschutz 39: 119–132.

At the national level the above mentioned are the most recent inventories including all species. Yet, several federal states (Länder) have identified sites of international and national importance at the state level (e.g. Lower Saxony, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, Brandenburg).

Wetlands International has just recently updated the international 1 % criteria for the AEWA region, and as part of the EU Birds Directive reporting for 2019 updated 1 % thresholds for sites of national importance will be available.

There are two publications outlining the identification of wetlands of international importance for waterbirds: Wahl, J., S. Garthe, T. Heinicke, W. Knief, B. Petersen, C. Sudfeldt & P. Südbeck (2007): Anwendung des internationalen 1 %-Kriteriums für wandernde Wasservogelarten in Deutschland. Ber. Vogelschutz 44: 83–105. Wahl, J. & T. Heinicke (2013): Aktualisierung der Schwellenwerte zur Anwendung des internationalen 1 %-Kriteriums für wandernde Wasservogelarten in Deutschland. Ber. Vogelschutz 49/50: 85–97.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The nationally and internationally important sites in Germany are designated as “SPAs” pursuant to Art. 4 Birds Directive and according to the Habitats directive these SPAs are part of the EU Network Natura 2000. All these sites are accessible in the Web by the following Webpages:

<https://geodienste.bfn.de/schutzgebiete?lang=de>

The European Commission has constantly monitored the designation of Natura 2000 sites in the EU member states. Regularly the European Commission publishes the results in an Natura 2000 Barometer. Therefore a monitoring of sufficiency for the species listed in the Birds directive takes place, with the result that Germany has sufficiently designated the appropriate sites under the Birds Directive as SPAs..

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Given that the EU instrument for such AEWA sites is the Natura 2000 network and its respective SPAs, it might be considered, that (as in the similar case of Emeralds Network under the Bern Convention) the EU might notify the respective SPAs as fulfilling the AEWA site criteria. A respective approach of the AEWA Secretariat adressed to the European Commission might be useful.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The identification of important Bird Areas was part of the process of designation and protection of Special Protection Areas (SPA) under the Birds Directive and within the in the Natura 2000 - Process. This process resembles the steps of the AEWA guidelines created much later.

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).

>>> cf. next answer:

For the national protected area network

Yes

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

>>> On Dec. 17th 2008 the Federal Cabinet adopted the "German Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change ". Within the strategy wetlands, coastal areas and especially tidal areas like the Wadden Sea and species depending on these are especially highlighted as being especially affected by climate change. Measures to adapt and to mitigate the effects of climate change like sea-level rise or drying-up of wetlands are considered in the strategy, e.g. improving the functionality of the Natura 2000 network with management plans or development strategies for coastal zone ecosystems incl. estuaries which are crucial habitats especially for migratory waterbirds.

In a Research and Development Project funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) the effects of recent climate change on the fauna in Germany were analysed:

RABITSCH, W., WINTER, M., KÜHN, E., KÜHN, I., GÖTZL, M., ESSL, F. & GRUTTKE, H. (2010): Auswirkungen des rezenten Klimawandels auf die Fauna in Deutschland. Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt 98, 265 p.

A conference held in Bonn in March 2010 „ Biodiversity and climate change“ summarized recent findings from a suite of other research projects funded by the German government, including modelling changes in the distribution of bird species and the influence of climate change as well as scenarios for protected areas in Germany under climate change.

An overall assessment of “Protected areas of Germany in the context of climate change - risks and options for action” was conducted as part of a Research and Development Project funded by the German government (published in 2013 in Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt volume 129).

The influence of climate change on migratory waterbirds in the Wadden Sea was highlighted in a publication “Migratory Waterbirds in the Wadden Sea 1987- 2008 – Trend, Phenology, Distribution and Climate Aspects” (Wadden Sea Ecosystem No.30).

At regular intervals, the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Group issues assessment reports of the Wadden Sea. The latest assessment report, Quality Status Report, was issued in 2017 at the online platform qsr.waddensea-worldheritage.org. This includes assessments of breeding as well as migratory species including the influence of climate change on both species groups (e.g. as cause of poor breeding success in recent years), but also in the Wadden Sea overall.

Moreover in recent years publications on distribution changes in waterbirds in which Germany participated and contributed with data from the International Waterbird Census and expertise were published, e.g.

Fox, A. D., L. Dalby, T. K. Christensen, S. Nagy, T. J. S. Balsby, O. Crowe, P. Clausen, B. Deceuninck, K. Devos, C. A. Holt, M. Hornman, V. Keller, T. Langendoen, A. Lehtikoinen, S.-H. Lorentsen, B. Molina, L. Nilsson, A. Stipniece, J.-C. Svenning & J. Wahl (2015): Seeking explanations for recent changes in abundance of wintering Eurasian Wigeon (*Anas penelope*) in northwest Europe. *Ornis Fennica* 93: 12-25.

Fox, A. D., A. Caizergues, M. V. Banik, K. Devos, M. Dvorak, M. Ellermaa, B. Folliot, A. J. Green, C. Grüneberg, M. Guillemain, A. Haland, M. Hornman, V. Keller, A. I. Koshelev, V. A. Kostyushin, A. Kozulin, L. Lawicki, L. Luigujoe, C. Müller, P. Musil, Z. Musilová, L. Nilsson, A. Mischenko, H. Pöysä, M. Sciban, J. Sjenicic, A. Stipniece, S. Svazas & J. Wahl (2016): Recent changes in the abundance of breeding Common Pochard *Aythya ferina* in Europe. *Wildfowl* 66: 22-40.

Lehtikoinen, A., K. Jaatinen, A. V. Vähätalo, P. Clausen, O. Crowe, B. Deceuninck, R. Hearn, C. A. Holt, M. Hornman, V. Keller, L. Nilsson, T. Langendoen, I. Tománková, J. Wahl & A. D. Fox (2013): Rapid climate driven shifts in wintering distributions of three common waterbird species. *Global Change Biology* 19: 2071-2081.

Pavón-Jordán, D., A. D. Fox, P. Clausen, M. Dagys, B. Deceuninck, K. Devos, R. D. Hearn, C. A. Holt, M. Hornman, V. Keller, T. Langendoen, L. Lawicki, S. H. Lorentsen, L. Luigujoe, W. Meissner, P. Musil, L. Nilsson, J.-Y. Paquet, A. Stipniece, D. A. Stroud, J. Wahl, M. Zenatello & A. Lehtikoinen (2015): Climate-driven changes in winter abundance of a migratory waterbird in relation to EU protected areas. *Diversity and Distributions*: 571-582.

Hence assessing the influence of climate change on waterbirds and protected areas is a topic since many years (decades).

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 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

>>> 207

Total area (ha)

>>> 4031523

Number of internationally important sites under national protection designation

>>> 207

Area of international importance under national protection designation (ha)

>>> 4031523

Please rate the effectiveness of the national protection designation

- High

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

>>> FFH- and Birds Directive are efficient instruments as a fitness check of the EU member states a few years ago has shown.

The nationally protected important sites for AEWA birds are under this umbrella..

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> The Federal government is not in charge of answering these issues, because the German Federal States have the respective data, given that the time for reporting was changed from 120 days before the MOP to 180 days before the MOP an involvement of the German Länder concerning these issues was not sufficiently possible (to reach a reporting really until the end of 2020)..

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

- Not Applicable

Please explain why it is not applicable to your country

>>> This task is not a task of the country Germany but would fall under the duties of the responsible federal states.

Usually the SPA designations correspond to the IBAs and are in so far already big enough. However, in special cases the German federal states may include in their management plans potential enlargement areas.

Examples of best practice (optional)

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

>>> The waterbird and wetland site of the most outstanding importance is in the middle of Europe the trilateral Dutch-Danish.-German Waddensea. Since the 80ies the Waddensea states cooperate on the basis of a Trilateral Ministerial Declaration and are therefore certainly an outstanding example of cooperation for an important waterbird site and meanwhile a UNESCO World Heritage site too.

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING

- No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Germany indeed had considerable gaps more than 20 years ago. However, meanwhile Germany has designated the appropriate sites as SPAs under the Birds Directive following the strategy to use existing IBA-publications as a guiding strategy. The question of the right management is an ongoing issue permanently followed by those in charge of biotope management in the areas concerned.

Please explain the reasons

Germany has -according to the European Commission - sufficiently designated the appropriate sites as SPAs and is under the EU obligation for Natura 2000 sites to avoid deterioration in these areas.

MANAGEMENT GAP FILING

Yes

Please provide full reference or a web link, as well as details concerning the process and the status of this strategy / plan

>>> Yes - however management is always an ongoing issue and this task is under the auspices of the German federal states.

Therefore the answer to the following question is not yes or no, but "ongoing"!

Has it been implemented?

Yes, fully completed

Please provide details

>>> According to the NATURA 2000 Barometer of the European Commission.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Cf. previous answer !!!

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

Yes, fully

Please provide details

>>> The internationally important sites for migratory birds in Germany are protected or federal state pursuant to the Birds Directive as "Special Protected Areas" - cf. Directive 2009/147/EC / Article 4 - in particular Art. 4 (2). They are therefore part of the EU Network Natura 2000 - cf. Article 3 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). In so far they are not only integrated in the respective national policies and protection regimes but they are even subject to EU protection.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Usually the sound management was already tackled earlier than the AEWA guidelines, and in so far for a lot of areas since decennia elaborated, like in the key site, the Waddensea (cf. the CWSS publications).

46. Has the Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool for the AEWA area been accessed and used in your country? (Resolution 7.9)

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

Yes

Please give examples of how you have used the CSN Tool

>>> The Critical Site Network tool is supported with data from the German important bird areas.

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))

Yes

Please provide details on each partnership arrangement your country has been involved in

>>> For more than three decades a part of the ongoing permanent tasks exist in the framework of the trilateral Wadden sea cooperation. To foster such processes a special secretariat was created by the three Wadden Sea States.

Further transboundary cooperations exist on regional scale. In the cooperation of the National Park "Unteres Odertal / Lower Odra-Valley" in particular Brandenburg is active with various stakeholder partners in this transboundary area with Poland (-in this case the national partners of Poland and Germany were also involved.)

Have a specific project or projects been established under the partnership arrangement(s) to implementation of habitat management, creation and restoration projects in the wider environment?

Yes

Please provide details on each project initiative

>>> Yes, but already in former reporting periods

.

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 in Germany is regulated on federal level by the federal hunting act (BJagdG) and in addition by the hunting acts of the federal states. § 2 of the federal hunting act lists all species which are huntable in Germany (mammals and birds). To secure the sustainability of hunting and to ensure that huntable species are not hunted during sensible times of the year (Times of pre-nuptial migration, nesting and breeding, etc.), the regulation on hunting seasons ("Jagdzeitenverordnung" see also § 22 BJagdG) lists exact time periods, in which hunting is permissible and times which are exempt from hunting. According to the Birds Directive protected species might be addressed in Germany by hunting laws and regulations too - but in fact they cannot be hunted due to a permanently closed season either in the federal "Jagdzeitenverordnung" or in the state specific hunting regulations.

Additionally, § 1 (1) of the federal hunting act, states that those who have the right of hunting are also obliged to care for the game. This care obligation aims to conserve an adequately biodiverse and healthy stock of huntable species as well as to secure its livelihood (§ 1 (2) BJagdG). Hunting is only allowed in hunting districts (§ 6 BJagdG), even if exemptions may be granted. The prohibitions of § 19 BJagdG are supposed to make sure that no forbidden hunting or trapping methods are used.

The priority for all threatened waterbird species in Germany is not harvest but species conservation. This is guaranteed by the respective conservation and hunting legislations on national and/or federal state level, including the regulations mentioned above.

For the strategical instrument of so called "Verantwortungsarten" - species for which the federal government provides financial help to improve protection the geographical range and other important characteristics of the species selected were taken into consideration (not the importance as a game species).

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

>>> which are allowed to be hunted

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)

>>> However: While a post mortem reporting for huntable species exists, in many cases the taxonomic differentiation in the hunting bag reports is still insufficient to estimate species specific bag sizes. For instance, in many cases Anser spp. are grouped as "wild (field) geese" and many Anas spp. might be grouped as "wild ducks". This causes some concern also when bag statistics are compiled on national level from different state reports.

Further, no quality control of the taxonomic level of reporting is established, such as a wing survey or other means of post mortem identification at the time of reporting (after the hunting season). This is of particular concern for very similar species or subspecies (e.G. Anser fabalis ssp.) and explains, why in the wintering area of Anser fabalis fabalis the whole species bean goose is protected and not only the subspecies.

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

Partially

When was lead shot use in wetlands partially banned?

>>> In Germany the essential federal states, have already phased out lead shot in their legislation. An exception are the two city states "Hamburg" and "Bremen", where hunting is not an important issue. However, in the EU REACH instrument a restriction on the use of lead shot in wetlands across the EU was agreed. It will apply from 15th February 2023 onwards in all EU member states. Germany already started in 2020 to adapt the hunting legislation respectively. The parliamentary debate of the new draft act will take place in 2021.

Overview of current Federal State regulations restricting the use of lead shot for waterbird hunting (as of March 2021):

Baden-Württemberg: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting at and above water bodies (§31 Jagd- und Wildtiermanagementgesetz (JWVG); 25.11.2014).

Bavaria: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting waterbirds at and above water bodies (§11 Verordnung zur Ausführung des Bayerischen Jagdgesetzes, 1983; zul. geändert 2016).

Berlin: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting waterbirds at and above water Bodies (§1 Verordnung über die Verwendung von Bleischrot bei der Jagdausübung, 2003).

Brandenburg: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting waterbirds at and above water bodies (§4 Verordnung zur Durchführung des Jagdgesetzes für das Land Brandenburg, 2019)

Bremen: No restrictions.

Hamburg: No restrictions.

Hesse: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting water game above water bodies (§23 Hessisches Jagdgesetz, 2001).

Mecklenburg-West Pomerania: Hunting of water game with lead shot is prohibited at water bodies and up to a distance of 400m from their banks (§3 Verordnung zur Änderung der Jagdzeiten, zur Aufhebung von Schonzeiten und zum Erlass sachlicher Verbote, 2008).

Lower Saxony: It is prohibited to use lead shot for waterbird hunting at and above water bodies (§24 Niedersächsisches Jagdgesetz, 2001).

North Rhine- Westphalia: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting at and above water bodies (§19 Landesjagdgesetz NRW 1994; zul. geändert 2015).

Rhineland-Palatinate: Hunting with lead shot at and above water bodies is prohibited (§23 Landesjagdgesetz Rheinland-Pfalz, 2010).

Saarland: The use of lead shot is prohibited for water game hunting in wetland areas. Wetland areas are defined as freshwater marshes, bogs and fens or water bodies that are naturally or artificially, permanently or temporarily stagnant or flowing (§32 Saarländisches Jagdgesetzes, 1998; zul. geändert 2015).

Saxony: The use of lead shot for hunting is prohibited (§18 Sächsisches Jagdgesetz, 2012; zul. geändert 2018).

Saxony-Anhalt: The use of lead shot for water game hunting at and above water bodies is prohibited (§23 Landesjagdgesetz für Sachsen-Anhalt, 1991; zul. geändert 2019).

Schleswig-Holstein: It is prohibited to use lead shot for water game hunting (§29 Jagdgesetz des Landes Schleswig-Holstein, 1999; zul. geändert 2020).

Thuringia: It is prohibited to use lead shot for hunting at water bodies within a distance of 100 m (§29 Thüringer Jagdgesetz, 2006).

What legislation is in place?

>>> Respective Hunting Legislation of the German Länder.

Who enforces this legislation?

>>> The competent authorities of the German Länder

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

>>> 94.5% of Germany's total area is covered by the ban. Only two city-states (Hamburg, Bremen) have yet to revise their hunting law. However, due to their urban character wetland hunting is only possible in relatively small areas - of presumably less than 1 Promille of the whole German territory.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Nearly all Federal States of Germany have prohibited already the use of lead shot in and around waterbodies for waterbird hunting. Due to an already decided EU prohibition the ban of lead shot in wetlands is already guaranteed within the EU.

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

Yes

Please explain how this was assessed.

>>> Such compliance issues are in principle under the auspices of the German Länder - However, a federal Hunting act exists supervised by the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture BMEL). A constant monitoring of

the legal situation concerning lead shot in wetlands took place and the Länder were constantly asked to report.

Please explain what was compliance with legislation found to be:

Good (almost full compliance)

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

>>> There is still a lack in German Federal Hunting legislation concerning species of Annex 3 / Table 1, which are ,at least sufficiently protected by respective Länder legislation, because the Länder ,may deviate from Federal hunting times and decide a protection of a species all over the year.

However, there is a need to adapt the hunting legislation on federal level too, which was not yet possible during this reporting period.

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

>>> no reasons of AEWA interest

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

>>> The result of a governmental assessment was. that German Federal Legislation was not sufficient and a legislation process was initiated. However, given, that meanwhile under the EU instrument REACH a prohibition of lead shot in wetlands was reached, the risk of lead poisoning is so already considerably reduced for waterbirds (and for consumers of waterfowl too !).

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 and reasons for the high level of effectiveness.

>>> Violations of hunting restrictions are strictly prosecuted. Poaching is a criminal act according to German legislation (§ 292 Strafgesetzbuch) and can be punished with up to 3 years in jail (in major cases even 5 years).

Please provide details

>>> Violations of hunting restrictions are strictly prosecuted.

Poaching is a criminal act according to German legislation (§ 292 Strafgesetzbuch) and can be punished until 3 years years (in major cases even 5 years).

Hunters too are obliged to respect the hunting regulations (like closed season or hunting interdictions of protected game species), otherwise they loose their hunting license and risk a further punishments.

Illegal waterfowl hunting is therefore not a major problem in Germany

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Furthermore cf. the previous answer concerning the CABS project and its effects.

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

>>> According to CABS (cf. above) and to the assessment of other respective experts the illegal taking of waterbirds in Germany is negligible, whereas a system exists for raptors taken illegally.

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

>>> According to the Federal Hunting Act it is mandatory that hunting is tied to possession of a valid hunting

license (§ 15 BJagdG). Important requirements for granting a hunting license are that the applicant is trustworthy and has the necessary knowledge encompassing the knowledge of huntable species. In the current new draft hunting act even a longer and more intense preparation for the hunting examination will be required..

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)

>>> Specific training course including examination for acquiring a hunting license ("Jägerprüfung").

Please provide details on each item selected above

>>> Cf. BJagdG

Please rate the degree of application of these best practice codes and standards:

High (almost always applied)

Please provide details and reasons for the high degree of application

>>> In Germany hunters are attentive with regard to ecological issues and interested in applying good practice and good standards.

Traditionally there exists the idea of "Waidgerechtigkeit", which means a fair treatment of animals hunted and is a kind of code of conduct for hunting.

Please rate the effectiveness these best practice codes and standards in supporting enforcement of hunting laws and regulations:

High (very effective in supporting enforcement of hunting laws and regulations)

Please provide details and reasons for the high degree of effectiveness

>>> cf. answer above.

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?

>>> Germany has used more or less respective rules already before they were established under AEWA. AEWA Guidelines resonate with the consideration of hunting and closed seasons in the federal hunting law and in the hunting laws of the federal states. The relevant conservation and also hunting laws are much older than the AEWA harvest guidelines. However, the national laws and practices are in compliance with the AEWA Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds. So is also the relevant EU wide legislation on the same issues which is mostly relevant for shaping the conservation and hunting regulations on birds in Germany.

6.2. Ecotourism

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

Yes

Please describe and provide details

>>> The Federal Nature protection legislation ("Bundesnaturschutzgesetz") contains in chapter 7 ("recreation in nature and landscape") umbrella regulations facilitating touristic and ecotouristic recreation. Potential risks of tourism are limited by respective protection regulations within the said legislation, guaranteeing e.g. avoidance of disturbance of protected species.

The regulation of accessibility to wetlands (including eco-tourism) is regulated by site specific protection orders (Unterschutzstellungs-Verordnungen) usually by the German Federal states. However, e.g. in the Waddensea area federal regulations for vessel traffic in the Waddensea exist. These include "ship traffic for touristical purpose" in the Wadden Sea ("Verordnung über das Befahren der Bundeswasserstraßen in Nationalparken im Bereich der Nordsee (NPNordSBefV)" of 1992, last amendment 02.06.2006).

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

>>> There is a huge variety of ecotourism initiatives with focus on migratory waterbirds and their habitats e.g. wetlands. Exemplary there are Brent Goose Days (Ringelganstage) and West Coast Bird Watch (Westküsten-Vogel-Kiek) with excursions, guided walks and boat trips in Schleswig-Holstein. In the National Park "Lower Oder Valley" in January the Whooper Swan Days are celebrated. In Hamburg Wadden Sea Nationalpark there are Geese Weeks (Gänsewochen) and in the Wadden Sea Nationalpark of Lower Saxony the Migratory Bird Days (Zugvogeltage; www.zugvogeltage.de) are celebrated with annually over 250 events. Especially at some Ramsar-sites there are annual events focused on wetlands and their protection (e.g. World Wetlands Day).

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

High

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

Medium

Please provide details and the reasons for successful delivery and barriers to fuller delivery

>>> no publications known to the AEWA focal point, which state the contrary..

6.3. Other human activities

58. Have restrictions on use of lead fishing weights been introduced in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12). When answering this question please also consider question 78 in chapter 7 - Research and monitoring.

No

If appropriate, please provide further details.

>>> The European Anglers Alliance (EAA) has agreed upon a resolution in December 2014 to resign from the usage of lead on a voluntary basis. An EU Approach concerning lead avoidance is in preparation in the framework of REACH (a chemical policy Instrument of the EU).

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

Yes and being implemented

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

Entire country

Please provide details

>>> The respective EU SEA / EIA legislation is implemented in German legislation. Furthermore the Habitats Directive requires in its Art. 6 a specific assessment procedure in case of plans or projects concerning Natura 2000 sites, which include Special Protected Areas for Birds.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Waterbirds are in particular important in the framework of SPAs under the Birds Directive, which are part of Natura 2000 and the respective Art. 6 procedure of the habitats directive. Furthermore birds and their habitats are considered during the Environmental Impact Assessment (Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung; UVP).

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> § 9 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Act (Gesetz über die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung, UVPG) regulates the participation of the public.

60. Are there any other legal and/or administrative measures in your country to avoid, mitigate and

compensate for adverse impacts of development activities on the sites of national and international importance for migratory birds? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.5)

Yes

Please describe each measure and provide details for each of them

>>> The avoidance, mitigation or compensation of impacts or other respective protection needs are regulated primarily in the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG), which implements respective regulations of the Birds- and Habitats Directive too and their specific requirements for SPAs and other Natura 2000 sites.

In particular the SPAs –as part of the network Natura 2000 – enjoy a European protection, which includes issues of avoidance, mitigation, compensation of impacts in such sites.

Furthermore, some of the most important migratory bird sites in Germany are Ramsar sites too. If development activities could endanger such sites, the Ramsar Secretariat has the possibility to put the site on the Montreux record. This is the principal tool of the Ramsar Convention for highlighting those Ramsar Sites, where an adverse change in ecological character has occurred, is occurring, or is likely to occur, and which are therefore in need of priority conservation attention. The country concerned could request a Ramsar Advisory Mission.

Please rank the effectiveness of these measures:

High

Please provide details and the reasons for the high effectiveness

>>> Supervision by court procedures are possible and not rare.

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

>>> Offshore wind parks

In past years, many offshore wind parks were built in the AWZ (EEZ) of the North and Baltic Sea. The Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (Bundesamt für Seeschifffahrt und Hydrographie; BSH) authorizes wind energy sites in the German North and Baltic Sea. It is responsible for the application procedure within the EEZ. During the authorisation procedure, the BSH assesses the potential level of risk to protected marine elements (e.g. birds, fishes, marine mammals, benthos, soil, water). For wind energy projects with more than 20 installations it is also necessary to conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment pursuant to the Environmental Impact Assessment Act (Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfungsgesetz; UVPG). For this purpose the applicant has to analyse the marine environment in the intended area and to forecast the consequences of the project. According to §56 Abs. 1 Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG), species and habitat protection also applies in the EEZ and is executed by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (§58 Abs. 1 BNatSchG). The agency assesses whether the project contravenes species or habitat protection commitments and decides whether exceptional case authorization is permissible. Under §15 BNatSchG, the intervention into nature and landscape regulation (Eingriffe in Natur und Landschaft) may also be operative.

Fehmarnbelt crossing

The plan to build a crossing from Germany to Scandinavia – the “Fehmarnbeltquerung” – is a major project to achieve a direct connection between central Europe and Scandinavia. Such a project requires authorisation from multiple authorities from Germany and Denmark. Besides them, the public of both countries will also have opportunities to comment at official inquiries into the environmental aspects of the undertaking.

Initially there were three alternatives for the Fehmarnbelt crossing: a) bridge, b) tunnel, c) combination of both. For various reasons including concerns about migratory waterbirds, for which the Fehmarnbelt is an internationally important migration corridor, it has been decided in 2015 to build the Fehmarnbelt crossing as a tunnel.

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

Yes

Please describe the measures put in place

>>> Cf. e.g. above the discussion about the Fehmarn belt crossing.

In its origin a bridge was intended, however due to expected negative impacts (on migratory birds too) a tunnel solution was decided.

Approval is refused for projects in which the SEA/EIA does not rule out significant negative impacts after

taking into account all possible mitigation measures. So already in former reporting periods e.g. the presence of wintering divers (*Gavia spec.*) was taken into account for decisions, where offshore wind parks in the exclusive economic zone might be placed to best avoid such species concerns and how the protection of the divers could be guaranteed.

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

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> In Germany at Federal Level no need for such a record was seen so far: usually such cases do even not reach the Federal Level, because the German Federal states / Länder already care for avoiding, compensating or mitigating such impacts.

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

>>> Such data are on Federal level not available.

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

>>> Such data are on Federal level not available.

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

>>> Such data are on Federal level not available.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> This is regulated by the Environmental Impact Assessment (Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung), the nature protection law (BNatSchG §14 and §15) and the Habitat directive impact assessment (FFH-Verträglichkeitsprüfung) in Germany (also see question 34). These laws were implemented prior to the draft of the AEWA-Guidelines and comply with their criteria.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The "Forum Netztechnik / Netzbetrieb in the VDE (FNN)" is the responsible committee for the development of technical information for the safe operation of power lines and is also a non-profit expert panel supporting experience exchange. This facilitates the implementation of innovative technologies and accelerates adaptations to European standards. The FFN FNN published in December 2014 in a Germany-wide project group consisting of representatives of network operators, nature conservation organizations, ministries and authorities, planning offices and manufacturers the note "Bird protection marking on high voltage and extra high voltage overhead lines". Since then, these are applicable in the planning of new power lines with nominal voltages of 110 kV. They provide technical advice for deciding in which sections bird protection markings are to be applied to minimize the collision risk. Wetlands with large numbers of migrating and staging/wintering (water)birds are given special consideration. In addition, the FFN FNN reference provides a modified assessment method according to which ornithological conflict areas should be identified and thus kept free

from power lines from the point of view of area or species protection. The guideline describes the species protection and technical requirements for bird protection markings.

The Federal Nature Conservation Agency (BfN) funded the Research and Development Project "Nature Conservation and Renewable Energies" aiming at building a forum for exchange between the numerous research projects which the BfN has placed or commissioned on behalf of the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (Bundesumweltministerium, BMUB). This resulted in several workshops and the online portal www.natur-und-erneuerbare.de presenting news, resources and information on projects under the topic "Nature Conservation and Renewable Energies". Among the projects funded by the German government in the past triennium related to waterbirds were:

- Effectiveness of different bird protection markers on power lines („Wirksamkeitsanalyse unterschiedlicher Vogelschutzmarker“; 12/2016–11/20178)
 - Root cause analysis of population changes in indicator bird species and renewable energy („Ursachenanalyse von Bestandsveränderungen bei Indikatorvogelarten und Energiewende“; 2014–2017)
 - Analysis of the importance and impact of renewable energies on Natura 2000 sites („Analyse der Bedeutung und Auswirkungen Erneuerbarer Energien auf Natura 2000-Gebiete“; 10/2016–3/2018)
 - Nature conservation guidance for the federal sector planning for the expansion of the transmission network in Germany: strengthening of the nature conservation association's participation („Naturschutzfachliche Begleitung der Bundesfachplanung zum Ausbau des Übertragungsnetzes in Deutschland: Stärkung der verbandlichen Beteiligung“; 4/2015–8/2016)
- Research on nature conservation and technical support of the energy transition
www.natur-und-erneuerbare.de

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

>>> It is common practice to assess these data in the process of planning a power line project according to the Environmental Impact Assessment (Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung; UVP). These assessments are project related but also include the extensive knowledge about migration patterns as well as resting and breeding sites of waterbirds in Germany to mitigate or avoid negative impacts like electrocution or collision. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (Strategische Umweltprüfung; SUP) of the planned power grid extension until 2030 in Germany has been carried out. The aim of such a SUP is to incorporate environmental aspects into the process of planning even long before an authorisation has been given. The results of the SUP are published in the environmental report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (“Umweltbericht der Strategischen Umweltprüfung“; (see link below). The SUP is based on the second draft of the Development Plan Electricity 2017–2030 (Netzentwicklungsplan Strom) and the Offshore Development Plan Electricity 2017–2030 (Offshore-Netzentwicklungsplans). The report highlights measures to avoid or mitigate detrimental environmental impacts as well as compensatory measures. The implementation of these measures during the process of the electricity network development will ensure that the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG) will be adhered. Important criteria are the Natura 2000 network, Important Bird Areas (IBA) as well as Ramsar sites. Thus, areas with high numbers of staging waterbirds are considered as potentially high-risk areas for electrocution and collision and should hence be avoided.

Environmental report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment incl. maps and annexes

https://data.netzausbau.de/2030/2017-2030_NEP-UB_gesamt.zip

Development Plan Electricity 2017–2030

https://www.netzausbau.de/bedarfsermittlung/2030_2017/nep-ub/de.html

A BfN-publication by Bernotat & Dierschke (2016) “Übergeordnete Kriterien zur Bewertung der Mortalität wildlebender Tiere im Rahmen von Projekten und Eingriffen“

(<https://www.bfn.de/themen/planung/eingriffe/besonderer-artenschutz/toetungsverbot.html>) evaluates, among others, the mortality risk of varying bird species caused by different project types such as electricity power lines and thus provides an important manual for the Impact Assessments. Additionally, methods to integrate baseline knowledge on waterbird distribution, population sizes and movements are developed to ensure the recognition of important flyways and habitats for birds already at an early stage of the authorisation procedure. See also publication about planning approaches for the assessment of powerlines. Rogahn & Bernotat (2016): Planerische Lösungsansätze zum Gebiets- und Artenschutz beim Netzausbau.

https://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/BfN/planung/eingriffsregelung/Dokumente/expertenworkshop_1015_loesungen_netzausbau.pdf.

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?

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> Due to respective legal obligations !

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The planned energy system transformation in Germany requires an electricity network expansion. However, the construction of power lines along major migration flyways or conservation areas is avoided whenever possible (also see question 42.2). The needs to construct new power lines will be coordinated with the needs to preserve biodiversity as part of a regional planning procedure. This is assured with the Environmental Impact Assessment (UVP) and the Strategic Environmental Assessment which considers the Natura 2000 network, Important Bird Areas and Wetlands of International importance as important criteria (see question 42.2).

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.

>>> See answer 64.2

Unfortunately, not in all cases reasonable alternatives to avoid habitats of conservation importance are possible, especially if old electricity lines already exist. However, in those cases mitigation measures such as the replacement of old and smaller electricity lines as well as bird protection markers are used to mitigate detrimental effects, especially the collision risk, as much as possible.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> A reduction of electrocution is legally consolidated in Germany (BNatSchG § 41). Even existing medium-voltage power lines needed to be modified by the end of 2012. The VDE-Application Rule (VDE-Anwendungsregel) "VDE-AR-N 4210-11" provides details for the technical implementation of bird-safe medium-voltage power lines according to BNatSchG § 41. Measures to mitigate the risk of collision on high-voltage power lines are not regulated by law yet, but there is a technical note of the FNN (Forum Netztechnik/Netzbetrieb im VDE) describing technical requirements for bird protection markings on high-voltage powerlines (FNN-Hinweis "Vogelschutzmarkierung an Hoch- und Höchstspannungsfreileitungen"). The results of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (Strategische Umweltprüfung; SUP) are published in the environmental report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment ("Umweltbericht der Strategischen Umweltprüfung"; see link below). Measures to protect birds from collision are explained in this report. Depending on the local conditions, bird-safe mast construction such as single-level power lines (conducting wires are arranged on one level) and bird-protection markings should be used. Research on the development of new mast constructions is being conducted.

The German government has funded a Research and Development Project "Effectiveness of different bird protection markers on power lines („Wirksamkeitsanalyse unterschiedlicher Vogelschutzmarker“; 12/2016–11/2018).

Environmental report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment incl. maps and annexes

https://data.netzausbau.de/2030/2017-2030_NEP-UB_gesamt.zip

Development Plan Electricity 2017–2030

https://www.netzausbau.de/bedarfsermittlung/2030_2017/nep-ub/de.html

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> There is currently no systematic and comprehensive search for highly problematic power lines in Germany. However, there are several individual assessments that have identified areas with a high risk of collision. As a result, some of these power lines have been modified. The risk of electrocution due to medium-voltage power lines is generally low for birds in Germany since the reduction of electrocution is legally consolidated in

Germany by § 41 of the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG).

For existing high-voltage powerlines there is currently no uniform procedure to mark these in sensitive areas. However, some network operators have made great efforts to minimize the risk of collision of birds. For example, Amprion has systematically assessed its entire high-voltage power line network (> 10,000 kilometers in length) and has subsequently secured the critical sections. Many sections dangerous for waterbirds in Western Germany could be secured in this way. The black and white markers from Ribe which are recommended by FNN were used.

Due to the implementation of the BNatSchG § 41 for medium-voltage powerlines only a very small number of birds are nowadays killed in the mast cap area. Losses of birds are only recorded where unsuitable systems have been used to make mast caps bird-save. Initially, the German Railways (DB Netz AG) was exempted from the provisions of § 41 BNatSchG. However, negotiations are ongoing between the DB and representatives of nature conservation as to how § 41 BNatSchG can be implemented on the railway power lines.

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

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> There are many examples where power lines have been marked at migration hotspots in several federal states (Länder) or by operator (see 42.7) to avoid electrocution and collisions with power lines. But there is still a lot to be done.

Commonly, whenever changes to existing powerlines are made such as raising masts to fulfill clearance specifications etc., in critical areas such as flyways and habitats of conservation importance, bird protection markers are subsequently installed.

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

Partial

Please provide details.

>>> There is no monitoring of bird collisions with powerlines at the national scale. Regular monitoring of birds killed by collisions on power lines is only done in planning projects or project areas (e.g. Elbaue south of Hamburg "Hörschelmann-Trasse", Oderbruch / Brandenburg).

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

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

>>> There is no regular monitoring yet, but to evaluate the effectiveness of markers of power lines the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation has funded a Research and Development Project "Effectiveness of different bird protection markers on power lines („Wirksamkeitsanalyse unterschiedlicher Vogelschutzmarker“; 12/2016–11/2018).

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> All measures contained in resolution 5.11 are already implemented in the German National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and in relevant legislation (such as Federal Nature Conservation Act, BNatSchG) and Environmental Impact Assessment Act, UVPG), which are rigorously implemented.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The implementation of the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG) and the Environmental Impact Assessment Act (UVPG) during the planning process of electricity power lines leads to the avoidance or at least mitigation of the negative impact of power lines on migratory birds in Germany and comply with the AEWA Guidelines.

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

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Spatial management is a crucial component to avoid or mitigate conflicts between the development of renewable energy and the protection of important areas for birds in Germany. Spatial management is a matter of regional planning and the federal states (Länder) have developed different strategies and planning approaches. Most federal states have their own state planning act. In addition, they issue decrees and guidelines on renewable energy development.

Suitable areas for the development of renewable energy and/or areas that need to be excluded are designated in the regional plans of the federal states.

Decrees and guidelines of the federal states for the planning of renewable energies contain restrictions to keep main flyways of migratory birds free as well as to maintain a minimum distance to breeding and resting sites of birds.

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

Yes

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

>>> National laws comply with international environmental guidelines, recommendations and criteria for impact assessment of renewable energy developments.

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

Yes

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

Yes

Are mitigation measures being implemented?

Yes

Please provide details on the measures implemented.

>>> Hötter, H., K.-M. Thomsen & H. Koster (2005): Auswirkungen regenerativer Energiegewinnung auf die biologische Vielfalt am Beispiel der Vögel und der Fledermäuse. BfN-Skripten 142, Bundesamt für Naturschutz, Bonn.

Please share information and lessons learnt from the mitigation measures.

>>> Hötter, H., K.-M. Thomsen & H. Koster (2005): Auswirkungen regenerativer Energiegewinnung auf die biologische Vielfalt am Beispiel der Vögel und der Fledermäuse. BfN-Skripten 142, Bundesamt für Naturschutz, Bonn.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> There is a compensation rule (Eingriffs-Ausgleich-Regelung) in Germany. According to the Federal Nature Protection Act (§13ff BNatSchG), damage of nature and landscape should be avoided as a matter of priority. For unavoidable damage there is a legal obligation for compensation measures. The damage needs to be compensated with nature and landscape conservation measures (Ausgleichs- und Ersatzmaßnahme). The procedure is defined by law (§ 17 BNatSchG). Impaired function of the ecosystem should be improved promptly and locally through appropriate measures.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Cf. previous reports.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Cf. previous reports.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The Federal Agency for Nature Conservation funds a Research and Development Project "Bird migration over the open sea: methods, space-time patterns and conflicts with offshore wind energy use (BIRDMOVE; "Vogelzug über dem offenen Meer: Methoden, Raum-Zeit-Muster und Konflikte mit der Offshore-Windenergienutzung"; 10/2015–12/2018)". The aim of the project is to investigate the potential effects of offshore wind turbines on migratory and resting birds, including waterbirds. It includes studying the migration routes using automatic recording of bird migration as well as individual-based research.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> There are many research projects that assess potential negative impacts of biofuel production on migratory waterbirds and their habitats funded by the German government. These projects have not only identified potential impacts, they also recommended actions to avoid negative impacts. Competition for land is a major aspect that has been identified. The avoidance or mitigation of habitat loss can be achieved by creating compensation areas.

Examples for Projects:

Conservation and advanced biofuels („Naturschutz und fortschrittliche Biokraftstoffe"; 12/2016–7/2019). A special focus of the project is the analysis and assessment of the impact of "advanced" biofuel routes (= biofuels with Less negative impacts on land use are expected than for conventional biofuels e.g. rape or palm oil) on conservation issues and the development of criteria to address these concerns.

Preceding projects on this topic:

- Biomassenutzung - Erprobung integrativer Handlungsempfehlungen zum Erhalt einer artenreichen Agrarlandschaft unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Vögel. Financed by Federal ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMU)

Dziewiaty, K. & P. Bernardy (2010): Brutvögel und Energiepflanzen. Umwelt und Raum, Band 1: 115-126. Institut für Umweltplanung, Hannover.

- Auswirkungen zunehmender Biomassenutzung (EEG) auf die Artenvielfalt - Erarbeitung von Handlungsempfehlungen für den Schutz der Vögel der Agrarlandschaft. Financed by Federal ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMU)

Schümann, K., J. Engel, K. Frank, A. Huth, R. Luick & F. Wagner (2011): Naturschutzstandards für den Biomasseanbau. Naturschutz und biologische Vielfalt 106. BfN, Bonn.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> All measures contained in resolution 5.11 are regulated by law in the German National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (such as Federal Nature Conservation Act, BNatSchG) and Environmental Impact Assessment Law, UVPG), which are consequently implemented.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The requirements of the resolution 6.11 as well as the recommendations of the guidelines are fully enforced in Germany in the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG), in particular in the context of the implementation of the European Directives on species and habitat protection, the Environmental Impact Assessment (Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung) and via the Strategic Environmental Assessment (Strategische Umweltprüfung; SUP; cf. 42).

For the long-term perspective on Renewable Energy Technologies the German government funded two Research and Development Projects

1. "Ecologically sound renewable energies in 2050 - need for action and strategies" (Naturverträgliche Energieversorgung auf Basis erneuerbarer Energien im Jahr 2050 - Handlungsbedarf und Strategien"; 2015–2017).

2. "Scenarios for the expansion of renewable energies from a nature conservation perspective" ("Szenarien für den Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energien aus Naturschutzsicht"; 2016–2018)

tackling potential conflicts between renewable energy developments and nature conservation

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The final report of a funded research and development project (F+E Vorhaben) "Analysis and assessment of by-catch of seabirds by passive marine fishing in the Baltic Sea" published in 2011, illustrates the situation in Germany. A total of 526 by-caught birds were recorded in this study. Sea ducks and diving ducks feeding on benthic invertebrates accounted for more than 50 % of by-caught birds in all types of gear and during catches of all target species. Diving ducks (e.g. Greater Scaup, Tufted Duck, Pochard) formed 65 % of by-catches in coastal lagoons, while seaducks (e.g. Common Eider, Long-tailed Duck, Common scoter) were dominating the by-catch in waters of the outer coast and the EEZ (47 %). A similar species composition of by-caught seabirds was found in gillnets off Usedom and can be assessed as representative for bird by-catches in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania during 2006-2009.

By-catch of seabirds occurred in all types of fishing gear and in the fishery of all target species studied. By-catch rates in gillnet and longline fisheries depended on target species, season and fishing area. The highest average by-catch rate recorded was 0.61 birds/1000 NMD (birds per 1000 meters of net length per day = birds/1000 NMD) in the gillnet fishery targeting pike perch, pike and perch. The lowest by-catch rate occurred in the turbot gill net fishery with 0.01 birds / 1000 NMD. The average by-catch rate in the longline fishery targeting eel was 0.031 birds / 1000 hooks day. Seasonally, the highest by-catch rates for bottom-set gillnets targeting cod, flounder, salmon, pike perch, pike and perch were recorded during winter, from December to April. In the pelagic gillnet fisheries, targeting herring and garfish, high by-catch rates occurred between January and May.

The results of the study showed that highest by-catch rates occurred in coastal lagoons and the 3 - nautical mile zone. In the German EEZ east of Rügen including the SPA "Pomeranian Bay", sampling of gillnet and longline fisheries, which are active mainly between May and September, was confined to German fishermen. The average by-catch-rates in this area were comparatively low (0.006 birds / 1000 NMD).

In the flyway populations of Long-tailed Duck and Scaup, mortality from by-catch and other human activities reach a level which may not be sustainable, and this may contribute to the currently observed decrease in the two species. Therefore, management measures to reduce seabird by-catch mortality in the Baltic gillnet fisheries including those in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, are imperative. Possible mitigation measures include seasonal and spatial closures in areas with concentrations of sea-birds as well as replacement of gillnets by alternative gear such as baited pots and in some cases bottom set longlines.

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

69.1. Have relevant government authorities developed and implemented regulations on the trade and application of agrochemicals known to have a direct or indirect adverse effect on waterbirds?

Yes and being implemented

Please provide details

>>> Trade and application is an EU issue and the answer should be given by REACH, E.g. some Agrochemicals -like certain Neonicotinoids, were prohibited - and those waterbirds using insects as food will profit by this measure.

69.2. Is the use of such agrochemicals regulated around nationally and internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds, particularly in wetlands, also taking into account run-offs from agriculture affecting

aquatic ecosystems?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Cf. the previous answer:

Furthermore : The Habitats Directive includes the prohibition of detrimental effects concerning Natura 2000 sites. Therefore the responsible authorities have sufficient possibilities of regulation in case of deterioration of the conservation situation in such sites.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Yes was chosen above, because "not applicable" was unfortunately missing and should have been added:

The Birds Directive protects sufficiently the European wild living birds:

There is no allowed avicide use in Germany.

Illegal use of chemicals to kill birds is known to be a problem for raptors in Germany. However, according to the German Committee against Bird Slaughter not an issue for waterbirds in Germany.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> This is e.g. part of the professional education of the respective target groups. However, "waterbirds" are only a small part of the issue and such risks are covered by addressing risks in a larger context (e.g. "risks for the environment").

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

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> However, in this and the former reporting period, there was in Germany a need to focus on more endangered taxa - in particular insects.

However, even without stressing cultural or ecosystem services, some waterbird species played an important role in policy and decision-making processes: in particular in conflicts between offshore wind energy projects and conservation of waterbirds (e.g. wintering divers) - and this already since earlier reporting periods .

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))

>>> There are two major components of breeding bird monitoring in Germany

1. Common Breeding Bird Monitoring

This monitoring programme targets the common and widespread species, covering by its design (1x1 km squares) only few waterbird species (e.g. Mallard)

2. Monitoring of Rare Breeding Bird Species

This monitoring programme targets all the semi-rare to rare species as well as all colonial breeding species (which may be quite abundant). Most AEWA species are covered by this programme.

The programme is up to now (and for most species it will remain) sort of an “umbrella” with several specific programmes targeting single species or species groups such as for Cormorant, White Stork, Common Crane, White-tailed Sea Eagle or meadow birds.

A stand-alone programme contributing also to the Monitoring of Rare Breeding Bird Species is the monitoring of coastal breeding bird species as part of the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Programme for the Wadden Sea (TMAP) which is run by the Common Wadden Sea Secretariat and the responsible federal state agencies in the three National Parks of Schleswig-Holstein, Hamburg and Lower Saxony. TMAP also includes the monitoring of breeding success in some species.

The monitoring of breeding bird species is coordinated at the national level by the Federation of German Avifaunists (DDA) in close cooperation with its member organisations, the federal state agencies and expert groups. Quite a substantial part of the breeding bird monitoring is done by volunteers.

At the national level the coordination by the DDA is financed via the Administrative Agreement on bird monitoring in Germany (“Verwaltungsvereinbarung Vogelmonitoring”; cf. question 54).

So far not all AEWA species are adequately covered by the various breeding bird programmes (therefore classified as “partial”). To improve the situation in the upcoming years, two Research and Development Projects are currently being conducted by the DDA with funds from the German government:

1. Bird monitoring in Special Protection Areas („Vogelmonitoring in EU-Vogelschutzgebieten“). The projects focuses on establishing and harmonising monitoring standards in EU-SPA esp. targeting trigger species which are mostly semi-rare to rare breeding bird species. Among these are also waterbirds.

2. Speeding up data flow in bird monitoring (“Beschleunigung des Datenflusses im Vogelmonitoring: Konzeptentwicklung“)

The main aim of the project is to improve the data flow especially in the two above mentioned components of breeding bird monitoring. Among the target species is the Grey Heron (*Ardea cinerea*). The project shall overall make participation in bird monitoring more attractive and will hopefully lead to an increase in volunteers especially in the rare breeding birds programme and thus improve coverage.

In 2015 a new breeding bird atlas in Germany has been published updating population sizes of all breeding bird species.

Gedeon, K., C. Grüneberg, A. Mitschke, C. Sudfeldt, W. Eikhorst, S. Fischer, M. Flade, S. Frick, I. Geiersberger, B. Koop, M. Kramer, T. Krüger, N. Roth, T. Ryslavy, S. Stübing, S. R. Sudmann, R. Steffens, F. Vökler & K. Witt (2014): Atlas Deutscher Brutvogelarten. Atlas of German Breeding Birds. Stiftung Vogelmonitoring Deutschland und Dachverband Deutscher Avifaunisten, Münster.

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In some of the before mentioned protocols information on breeding success is collected on waterbirds. Through various ringing projects also information on mortality can be derived for some waterbird species.

Covering the passage period

Partially

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

>>> The Monitoring of Migratory and Wintering Waterbirds (MMWW) is the umbrella across all monitoring programmes for waterbirds in Germany. Basically it comprises all programmes and monitoring activities mentioned below. The several protocols allow for the differences in behaviour and the ecology of the species

being taken into account.

The main programme of the MMWW, the waterbird census, covers all waterbird species and runs at most sites from September to April, at more and more sites year round. Nevertheless not all internationally and nationally important sites are fully covered during passage migration. The best coverage is achieved during the International Waterbird Census in January.

The waterbird census is accompanied by specific protocols filling gaps for several species. The most important ones are

- swan and goose counts
- roost counts of crane (run by Kranichschutz Deutschland)
- roost counts of cormorant

These programmes are mainly conducted by volunteers.

The monitoring of migratory and wintering waterbird species as part of the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Programme for the Wadden Sea (TMAP) also contributes in an indispensable way to the MMWW. It is run by the Common Wadden Sea Secretariat and the responsible federal state agencies in the three National Parks of Schleswig-Holstein, Hamburg and Lower Saxony. It runs year-round on a bi-monthly basis at a subset of sites. Almost full coverage is being achieved in January and in one additional month. For some species special efforts are made to reach full coverage, e.g. for Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) in March and May, Sanderling (*Calidris alba*) and Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla*) in May, Common Shelduck (*Tadorna tadorna*) during wing moult in July (aerial survey).

Every 6 years internationally coordinated censuses take place in October for Golden Plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*) and recently also Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*), coordinated by the International Wader Study Group. It is aimed to achieve full coverage during these censuses.

Between mid-February and mid-March complete censuses of Bewick's Swans (*Cygnus bewickii*) are conducted every fortnight in Schleswig-Holstein since 2016. Schleswig-Holstein is the most important early spring staging site of the NW European population (which is listed in AEWa Table 1, Column A).

The Seabirds at Sea programme, run by the Research and Technology Centre (FTZ), Kiel University, covers the German offshore areas including the Exclusive Economic Zone. This programme is to a large part funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation as part of the Marine Biodiversity Monitoring of BfN/FTZ covering German offshore areas during passage and wintering and also the moulting period of some species (Common Scoter, Velvet Scoter). This programme contributes in an indispensable way to waterbird monitoring in Germany and provides statistically robust estimates of population size and trend estimates for seaducks, divers, alcids and other mainly offshore staging and wintering species.

Furthermore areas off the Wadden Sea in Schleswig-Holstein are covered by a special seabird monitoring financed by the National Park Administration Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea and conducted since 2004 by the Seabirds at Sea team.

In all these programmes besides totals per count unit optionally (and if possible) information on age and/or sex ratio is collected.

In Germany, nowadays about 150 species are covered by the various programmes for monitoring migratory and wintering waterbirds, and for a substantial number of these species trends and population estimates can be derived from these counts.

In 2017 the issue of the annual report "Birds in Germany" focused on the monitoring of migratory and wintering waterbirds intending to get more volunteers involved (esp. observers from the online portal for bird observations ornitho.de) in waterbird monitoring in Germany.

Wahl, J., R. Dröschmeister, C. König, T. Langgemach & C. Sudfeldt (2017): *Vögel in Deutschland - Erfassung rastender Wasservögel*. DDA, BfN, LAG VSW, Münster.

In 2016 the online reporting of the Waterbird Census started (currently >3,000 count units online) as the first programme of the MMWW aiming at bringing the other protocols - if applicable - online in the upcoming years. This shall greatly speed up data availability and hopefully further improve coverage esp. during passage as well as during the moulting period.

These MMWW is also covered by the Administrative Agreement on bird monitoring in Germany ("Verwaltungsvereinbarung Vogelmonitoring"; cf. question 54).

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In all the before mentioned programs besides totals per count unit optionally (and if possible) information on age and/or sex ratio is collected. For some geese and swans juveniles percentages in staging and wintering flocks are collected annually. Through various ringing projects also information on mortality can be derived for some waterbird species.

Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

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

Please provide details.

>>> The wintering period is covered as part of the Monitoring of Migratory and Wintering Waterbirds. Most of the details on this have been outlined in the previous section covering the passage period. Hence only additional information which is specific for the core wintering period is provided here.

In the German Wadden Sea during January a complete census is conducted as part of the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Programme for the Wadden Sea (TMAP) with additional efforts also inland to cover wintering geese and swans.

During the January count (International Waterbird Census) virtually all internationally and nationally important sites are covered, thus coverage is regarded as “fully”.

As part of the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Programme for the Wadden Sea (TMAP) aerial surveys are conducted annually in the entire German Wadden Sea especially targeting Common Eider (*Somateria mollissima*).

On an annual basis aerial surveys are conducted also in the Baltic Sea off the coast of Schleswig-Holstein with a special focus on wintering seaducks. In the North Sea on an annual basis the Inner German Bight is surveyed in January/February on behalf of the National Park Administration Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea. On a 3-year and currently bi-annual basis the entire offshore area of the North Sea as well as the Baltic is covered by the Seabirds at Sea team as part of the seabird monitoring of the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation during January/February.

In winter 2016 (Jan/Feb) Germany took part in an internationally synchronized offshore survey with a focus on seaducks, but covering also all other waterbird species present. Counts were carried out in the offshore areas of the Baltic Sea and the North Sea.

Every 5–6 years internationally coordinated censuses take place in January for Bewick’s Swan (*Cygnus bewickii*) and Whooper Swan (*Cygnus cygnus*) as well as Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo*). The swan censuses are coordinated by the Wetlands International/IUCN-SSC Swan Specialist Group, the Cormorant roost counts are coordinated by the Wetlands International/ IUCN-SSC Cormorant Research Group. It is aimed to achieve full coverage during these censuses.

Since 2011 Germany participates in the annual Bewick’s Swan (*Cygnus bewickii*) breeding success counts in early December (as increasing numbers of Bewick’s Swans stay in Germany already at this time of the year).

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> See section under “passage”.

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

Which country(ies) were supported?

>>> Several African states in the framework of IKI projects.

Furthermore some Westafrican states due to the Waddensea Flyway initiative sharing with the Waddensea East Atlantic Flyway populations of waterbirds.

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

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In many cases the monitoring protocols were developed before the AEWA Guidelines were adopted by the MOP in 2002.

The protocols for bird monitoring in Germany were revised and optimized during a Research and Development project from 2003 to 2007. During this process the AEWA Conservation Guidelines No. 9 were consulted. Protocols fully comply with the AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol.

A publication summarizing breeding as well as non-breeding monitoring protocols in Germany has been published in 2012:

Sudfeldt, C., R. Dröschmeister, J. Wahl, K. Berlin, T. Gottschalk, C. Grüneberg, A. Mitschke & S. Trautmann (2012): Vogelmonitoring in Deutschland – Programme und Anwendungen. Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt 119, Landwirtschaftsverlag, Münster.

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

>>> In 2008 the German and the federal state governments agreed on the Administrative Agreement on bird monitoring in Germany ("Verwaltungsvereinbarung Vogelmonitoring") to jointly support the Federation of German Avifaunists (DDA) to run the volunteer-based bird monitoring in Germany covering breeding as well as non-breeding birds. This explicitly includes the Monitoring of Migratory and Wintering Waterbirds, data of which is fed into the International Waterbird Census and international censuses of selected waterbird species (cf. 49). The agreement has proven to be the basis for trustful collaboration between administrative authorities and non-governmental organizations.

Internationally

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Germany supports the IWC with its membership in Wetlands International.

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

>>> Germany supports AEWA with an annual Voluntary contribution
This could be used for this Fund too, if there are no higher and other priorities.

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)

>>> For Germany this task is seen as not more needed within the EU: Within REACH the EU intends to phase out the use of lead fishing weights:

In the past, the impact of lead used by anglers on fresh water ecosystems has been regarded as marginal. But with the proposal of the European Chemicals Agency in February 2021 for EU-wide restrictions on lead in many outdoor sports including fishing (fishing sinkers and lures), may lead to a fundamental change in the use of lead in this sector. The report was made at the request of the European Commission.

Pressures and Responses

8. Education and Information

8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

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

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

Yes, being implemented

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

>>> • Since 1998, numerous training courses leading to qualification as a “certified nature and landscape manager”.

- Training programmes are available from state-supported providers of environmental and conservation training. Such providers are organised within the “Federal Working Group of State-Supported Educational Institutions for Nature Conservation and Environmental Protection”
- As part of their environmental education programmes, large protected areas such as national parks and biosphere reserves, as well as large NSGs and nature parks, carry out measures to inform visitors and sensitise them to the natural environment and to promote public awareness.
- Germany’s national parks, biosphere reserves and nature parks operate hundreds of nature and information centres, offering nature walks and tours.
- The “Multimar Wattforum” is one of Germany’s newest and most modern information centres and presents the Waddensea habitat
- The Federal State of Hesse is especially active in protecting the Black Stork (*Ciconia nigra*) for which numerous public awareness raising activities are taking place. The main focus is on educational activities, in particular a dialogue with forest owners.
- In May 2005, a large travelling exhibition entitled “In the Realm of the Black Stork” was developed.
- Another focus of public information and outreach activities is the production and distribution of brochures. The State Agency for the Environment, Measurement and Nature Conservation of the Federal State of Baden-Württemberg (Landesanstalt für Umwelt, Messungen und Naturschutz Baden-Württemberg - LUBW), acting on behalf of the Ministry for Food and Rural Areas (Ministerium für Ernährung und Ländlichen Raum), has produced free brochures which also contain information on species listed in AEWA.
- The DDA’s Birdrace is an example of how awareness raising and fundraising can be successfully combined.
- The migratory bird days in the Wadden Sea National Park of Lower Saxony (celebrated annually in autumn) are an excellent example of raising awareness for the conservation of migratory bird species.
- In 2017 the issue of the annual report “Birds in Germany” focused on the monitoring of migratory and wintering waterbirds intending to get more volunteers involved in waterbird monitoring (esp. observers from ornitho.de) and raising awareness for waterbird conservation in general (cf. 49). Birds in Germany is distributed among volunteers participating in bird monitoring in Germany and is available as PDF from BfN’s and DDA’s websites

Contact to all professional Academies:

Bundesweiter Arbeitskreises der staatlich getragenen
Bildungsstätten im Natur- und Umweltschutz (BANU)
c/o Naturschutz-Akademie Hessen (NAH)
Friedenstraße 26
35578 Wetzlar
Telefon 06441/92480-0
Telefax 06441/92480-48
info@na-hessen.de

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

No

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

Yes

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

Government

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

No

Please explain reasons

>>> However, created an AEWA Webpage on the BMU Website, which will be updated in 2021 - before the AEWA MOP.

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

There is some cooperation

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> There was an intense and good cooperation concerning an endangered Mediterranean salt marsh site (which was addressed in an AEWA document). With relevance for CEPA issues was e.g. at the end of 2020 a contact in the framework of the anniversary of Ramsar (February 2021). Furthermore Salina Ulcinij was a field of good cooperation.

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

>>> However, at least in former reporting periods training was fostered ("WOW" cf. above) and in this reporting period at least some interns were trained, concerning AEWA too.

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

Yes

Please describe the activity/activities briefly and upload any sample materials, links or photos available related to the activity/event.

>>> Since several years Germany is giving a financial contribution to realize the World migratory bird day and is supporting the respective AEWA webpage with contributions.

Furthermore there is a variety of events celebrating the World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) every year in Germany. The events offered by NGOs and National Park administrations range from excursions, presentations, exhibitions to festivals and concerts. A "Migratory Bird Day Aviathlon" was announced for the first time in 2013. In this contest as part of the annual "Migratory Bird Days" in the Wadden Sea National Park of Lower Saxony islands and regions on the main land compete against each other for one week becoming the region where most bird species (mainly migratory) have been observed. The region with the largest number highest number of species observed during the bird migratory days. Already since several years, the Wadden Sea National Park of Lower Saxony has established a webpage for the WMBD (see link below). Here, programmes of the events, short documentaries and a lot more can be found on past and future WMBDs.

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)

Yes

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

Please provide details in the corresponding box below

National Level Funding and Support

>>> The Federal Environment Ministry funds nature conservation Trial and Development Projects (Erprobungs- und Entwicklungsvorhaben) which include promoting the acceptance of nature conservation by communication, information and participation.

International Funding and Support (through the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat)

>>> cf. answers above

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

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

>>> Each budgetary year – early in advance – a budgetary planning of the resources needed takes place. Due to limited budgetary means the AEWA Strategic Plan is in this context as such not under the priorities. This does not exclude, that special projects covered by the AEWA Strategic Plan receive a specific funding, if they appear in a special national interest.

However, due to budgetary effects of the Corona virus the issue is currently not, where money is needed but where money could be saved. In so far an assessment of the resources needed for the delivery of the AEWA Strategic plan would be an unnecessary waste of time in the awareness that anyhow these resources are not available.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> --

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

>>> Not in this reporting period and attempts of previous reports were not successful :

In former reporting periods contacts with delegates from Russia, Poland or Austria during international events took place concerning AEWA accession. However, in this reporting period no such attempts were realized, i.a. due to lack of face to face meetings during the corona period and therefore missing possibilities of otherwise possible informal talks.

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

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

Yes, it is operational on a regular basis

Please provide details

>>> The National Strategy on Biological Diversity and the related coordination mechanism help to implement AEWA too. Furthermore the national implementation of the EU Habitats Directive and the EU Bird Directive serve AEWA too. Both directives are implemented in national legislation, legally binding and obligatory instruments of nature conservation authorities in Germany.

As a coordination body between the Federal government and the German Länder the so called LANA = Länderarbeitsgemeinschaft Naturschutz) and its working groups are an essential coordination mechanism. In particular the LANA Working Group "Arten- und Biotopschutz" was regularly consulted concerning AEWA issues in particular goose management items.

Are priority capacity gaps addressed by the coordination mechanism?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> In the respective LANA Working Group meetings sometimes gaps are addressed. However, they usually do not address intellectual capacity gaps in particular, but gaps due to limited staff, time and finances.

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

Medium

Please provide details and the reasons for the lower effectiveness

>>> Due to differences of AEWA implementation of the 16 different German Länder the situation is

heterogeneous – however, in general it is supportive for species protection issues under AEWA.

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

Yes

Please provide details; attach the assessment or provide a weblink, if available

>>> This assessment is still not yet settled and still going on. Due to the greatly increased capacity and data needs in AEWA (and its actions such as the EGMP) an increasing amount of personnel capacity is needed and must be counterweighted to the benefit for species conservation work. So far in general the assessment is that AEWA needs too much capacity for non-protected and abundant species, whereas a switch to more engagement for threatened species would be desirable.

Have you developed a prioritized national action plan to fill significant capacity gaps in your country?

Yes, and it is being implemented

Please provide details; attach the plan or provide a weblink, if available

>>> Yes, already several years ago on Directorate level for BMU/BFN: AEWA was not under the highest priorities.

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)

Yes

Please provide details on each twinning arrangement

>>> In 2014 a Memorandum of Understanding between the Waddensea states and Mauritania was signed during a Ministerial conference which is the basis of a site twinning cooperation.

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

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Germany has agreed on the National Strategy to implement the CBD requirements - this strategy includes respective benefits for AEWA issues too. Furthermore the German AEWA officer was involved in liaising the Aichi Targets under the strategic plan of CMS - the mother convention of AEWA.

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

>>> Tasks concerning the National CBD strategy and respective development goals are on German Federal level under the auspices of colleagues in another neighboring division in the Federal Ministry of Environment (BMU). They are in charge of coordination, which concerns the cooperation with the respective BMU division in charge of AEWA and even more the issue of cooperation with the German Länder in charge of 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

>>> The possibilities here are limited, because relevant tasks are in principle under the auspices of the German Länder.

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

92.1 NBSAP

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The German NBSAP covers the interests of "MEA"s serving Nature protection like CMS & Family, however the huge variety of Conventions and Agreements is not specified.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> ---

92.2 Other strategic plans and policies

Yes

Please name the other strategic planning processes

>>> During the reporting triennium a "Strategy for Insect Protection" was developed and 2019 presented to the German Parliament. For those birds under AEWA, which need insects as a food resource, this strategic instrument is helpful. Based on this Strategy an "Action Plan for Insects Protection" was developed during the reporting triennium.

Please provide details

>>> Cf. the publication of the Strategy: <https://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/19/130/1913031.pdf>

Sustainable Development Goals

Yes

Please provide details

>>> AEWA relevance for SDG implementation was promoted. In the framework of IKI projects (IKI - International climate initiative) the German Ministry of Environment (BMU) promotes in close cooperation with the Ministry in charge of development issues (BMZ) projects of AEWA relevance in the context mentioned above. cf. e.g. https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/news/article/waterbirds_and_climate_change_adaptation or in this report the answer under 99b. An AEWA Project in the frame of the International Climate Initiative "IKI" concerning wetlands in Africa was supported in cooperation with the Development Ministry (BMZ)..

Aichi Targets

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Under the auspices of Division N I 4 in the BMU.

Strategic Plan for Migratory Species

Yes

Please provide details

>>> As a first step the situation of CMS Annex I species was analyzed and reported to CMS.,

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

>>> The UNEP Group of Executive Secretaries of the Nature Protection MEAs is already a good forum for a linking between respective MEAs under the UNEP umbrella. This group might dedicate attention to the subject too, how to involve other nature protection MEAs not falling under the UNEP umbrella to make the joint work for all concerned more efficient and effective. Germany welcomes the activities of the respective secretariats liaising services of CMS and AEWA for a mutual benefit.

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

>>> Germany is offering each year 25.600,- € voluntary contribution to AEWA. Furthermore the AEWA MoPs 2015 are supported by even higher higher extraordinary support (Should there be any unspent granted money left, this might be used for the Small Grants Fund (after German approval of a request by the AEWA secretariat).

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> ---

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

>>> cf. answer question 73 and at least two IKI projects concerning AEWA.

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

No and has not been prioritised

Please explain the reasons

>>> However, a JPO for CMS was prioritized to foster cooperation concerning migratory species in Africa. Even if mammals (in particular carnivores) were foreseen as central part of work the Land Bird Action Plan, Raptors MoU and the cooperation with AEWA concerning African issues were mentioned too.

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

>>> cf. previous answers concerning the WaddenSea Flyway Initiative and respective AEWA IKI projects or Volycon help.

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.

Yes

Please describe the resources provided

>>> cf. answers above (Capacity building by the Waddensea Flyway Initiative) or coverage of travel costs to AEWA MoPs too or answer to question 74.1 !

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?

Yes

Please describe each cooperation arrangement

>>> Cooperation with CAFF on waterbird issues including AEWA waterbirds in the framework of the CWSS-cooperation reaching out to African states of the West Palaeartic Flyway.(and cf. previous answer on cooperation with Africa).

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

>>> The government uses the variety of existing and legal financing mechanisms to support goals of the AEWA strategic Plan. There is therefore no need seen to create additional "innovative mechanisms." However, the issue of e.g. site related species measures is in Germany an issue falling in principle in the competency of the German Länder.

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?

Yes

Please describe each synergetic arrangement and benefits acquired

>>> Synergies between AEWA and IKI - cf. answer to question 93.

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

>>> In Germany, there are only limited numbers of research projects dealing explicitly with the impact of climate change on individual waterbird species. In contrast, research focuses on the investigation of the impacts of climate change on important habitats, ecosystems and conservation areas. Insights gained in these studies enable the conservation of species by protecting their habitats.

For selected references on research on waterbirds and climate change see question 27.

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

<https://www.bfn.de/themen/klimawandel-und-biodiversitaet/forschungsvorhaben.html> - Projects funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation

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 influence of climate change on migratory waterbirds in the Wadden Sea was highlighted in "Migratory Waterbirds in the Wadden Sea 1987- 2008 – Trend, Phenology, Distribution and Climate Aspects" (Wadden Sea Ecosystem No.30).

At regular intervals, the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Group issues assessment reports of the Wadden Sea. The latest assessment report, Quality Status Report, was issued in 2017 at the online platform <http://qsr.waddensea-worldheritage.org>. In many aspects of the QSR climate change related issues are highlighted, e.g. in chapters "Geomorphology and climate", "Habitats and communities" and "Species". Recently also the Monitoring report for the Trilateral Climate Change Adaptation Strategy was published: Wadden Sea Board - Task Group Climate (2017): Trilateral Climate Change Adaptation Strategy. Monitoring Report for the Trilateral Cooperation on the Protection of the Wadden Sea. Common Wadden Sea Secretariat, Wilhelmshaven, Germany.

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

>>> Rabitsch et al. (2011) carried out a comprehensive investigation of the vulnerability of animals to climate change in Germany. In total 515 species were selected, thereof 143 bird species. Based on criteria defined, a climate change sensitivity analysis was conducted.

Rabitsch W., Winter M., Kühn E., Kühn I., Götzl M., Essl F. & Gruttke H. (2011) Auswirkungen des rezenten Klimawandels auf die Fauna in Deutschland. Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt Heft 98 published by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)

For the breeding birds in the Wadden Sea recently the framework for an action plan was drafted:

Koffijberg, K., J. Frikke, B. Hälterlein, G. Reichert & H. Andretzke (2016): Breeding birds in trouble: A framework for an action plan in the Wadden Sea. Common Wadden Sea Secretariat, Wilhelmshaven, Germany.

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

>>> cf. question 27

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).

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

>>> There is no special action plan dealing explicitly with the adaptation of waterbirds to climate change. The national strategy on biological diversity ("Nationale Strategie zur biologischen Vielfalt") contains a subsection with the topic 'Biodiversity and Climate Change' listing procedures for proactive adaptations to climate change.

In the Wadden Sea there is a Trilateral Climate Change Adaptation Strategy which is not specifically targeting waterbirds but it is one of the most crucial ecosystems for some migratory waterbirds in Germany.

f. Other undertaken or planned relevant activities.

Yes

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

>>> Cf. the project mentioned under 99 b, which is planned to start in April 2021.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> All efforts which are made in order to help ecosystems and habitats of waterbird to adapt to climate change comply with the criteria of the AEWA Guidelines.

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

>>> During the winter 2020/2021 there have been recorded over 650 cases of HPAI in wild birds in Germany so far (March 2021). The highest numbers were among Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) and Eurasian Wigeon (*Mareca penelope*). The risk of spreading of HPAI in waterbird populations is considered high according to the Friedrich-Loeffler-Institute. According to Landesbetrieb für Küstenschutz, Nationalpark und Meeresschutz Schleswig-Holstein (LKN.SH) there have been recorded over 16.000 dead or dying waterbirds since Oct. 2020 around the Wadden Sea coast of Schleswig-Holstein.

List required further guidance or information

>>> No further guidance or information needed

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> In Germany the most important institute for research and monitoring of zoonosis diseases is the Friedrich-Löffler-Institute. They have a specific webpage, where they document avian influenza and its propagation in case of outbreaks.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[FLI-Risikoeinschaetzung_HPAIV_H5N8_2021-02-22-bf.pdf](#)

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

<http://>

<https://www.fli.de/de/aktuelles/tierseuchengeschehen/aviaere-influenza-ai-gefluegelpest/>

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

>>> Virological research and literature underlines, that wild birds – in particular water birds – are a main reservoir for Influenza-viruses, which can infect domestic animals or even human populations (e.g. TOBLER/ACKERMANN/FRAEFEL (2016): “Allgemeine Virologie”.

However, this does not exclude vice-versa infections of wild birds by domestic fowl.

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

>>> 14.5..2021