



Secretariat provided by  
the United Nations Environment Programme  
(UNEP)

Agenda item: 16  
Doc: AEW A/MOP 3.13  
Date: 17 October 2005  
Original: English

---

**3<sup>rd</sup> SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT ON THE  
CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS (AEWA)**  
*23 – 27 October 2005, Dakar, Senegal*

---

PRELIMINARY SYNTHESIS OF INFORMATION PROVIDED BY AEW A PARTIES  
THROUGH NATIONAL REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT  
FOR THE TRIENNIUM 2003-2005

*Prepared by the Secretariat*

**AEWA Contracting Parties (as of 01 October 2005) (51; 43%)**

**Africa (20; 38%):** Benin, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritius, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda

**Eurasia (31; 48%):** Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (the FYR), Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan

**Parties to AEW A that have provided National Reports (as of 30 September 2005)  
(23; 47% of due reports)**

**Africa (6; 32% of due reports):** Congo, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania

**Eurasia (17; 57% of due reports):** Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Jordan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (the FYR), Monaco, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan

**Parties that have provided National Reports after 01 October 2005 (4; 8% of due reports; as of 17 October 2005)**

**Africa (1; 5% of due reports):** Mauritius

**Eurasia (3; 10% of due reports):** Ireland, Moldova, Slovakia

**Parties yet to provide National Reports (22; 45% of due reports; as of 17 October 2005)**

**Africa (12; 63% of due reports):** Benin, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Togo, Uganda

**Eurasia (10; 33% of due reports):** Finland, France, Georgia, Israel, Lebanon, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Syria, Ukraine

**AEWA Signatory States that have provided National Reports (as of 30 September 2005) (2)**

**Africa (1):** Morocco

**Eurasia (1):** Belgium

**AEWA Parties as of 01 October 2005 that were not required to provide National Reports (2)**

**Africa (1):** Ghana

**Eurasia (1):** the European Union

*Note: Contracting Parties shall submit National Reports to each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties (not later than one hundred and twenty days before its opening) in the format agreed by MOPI for national reporting. This synthesis is based on the reports provided by Contracting Parties by 30 September 2005, i.e. 23, and by Signatories, i.e. 2, in total 25 National Reports. This is only a preliminary synthesis and does not provide a full review of the implementation of the Agreement reported by parties. A more thorough paper will be produced at the beginning of 2006 following submission of reports by further parties as requested by draft resolution 3.4.*

*This synthesis reflects only those parts of the national reporting format that are easily quantifiable. Descriptive sections will be analyzed and summaries will be added to the next more thorough version of this paper in 2006.*

*This paper is based on the interpretation by the Secretariat of information provided by parties and signatories in their National Reports. If any discrepancies are found, you are kindly requested to communicate this to the Secretariat.*

## SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS

Specific and general policies and/or legislation is in place in the majority of parties on issues such as (1) protection and conservation of species covered by the Agreement (Table 1, columns A and B) and their supporting important areas, (2) prohibition and regulation of taking of and trade in birds listed in columns A and B of the Action Plan, (3) prohibition or regulation of methods of taking, (4) sustainable hunting of asterisk-marked species listed in column A, (5) prohibition of the introduction of non-native waterbird species, and (6) identification, rehabilitation and restoration of wetlands important for waterbirds.

Particularly good progress was noted in the majority of parties and signatories in the production of inventories of important habitats for species covered by the Agreement, as well as the strategic review of sites to develop a national network of important sites or areas for species covered by the Agreement.

Hunting levels have been well covered by monitoring systems throughout the Agreement area. Environmental Impact Assessments are conducted in nearly all countries for activities that are likely to negatively affect protected areas or areas important for species covered by the Agreement.

## FUTURE PRIORITIES

The minimal number of countries that reported policies and/or legislation missing or under preparation for issues such as (1) protection and conservation of species covered by the Agreement (Table 1, columns A and B) and their supporting important areas, (2) prohibition and regulation of taking of and trade in birds listed in columns A and B of the Action Plan, (3) prohibition or regulation of the methods of taking, (4) setting taking limits for waterbirds and monitoring these limits, (5) sustainable hunting of asterisk-marked species listed in column A, (6) regulation of the exemptions to the provisions set out in paragraphs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, (7) the re-establishment of waterbird species, and (8) prohibition of the introduction of non-native waterbird species, should strive to fill gaps in legislation as soon as possible.

In some cases where such policies and legislation are already on place, a lack of effective implementation and enforcement, for various reasons, has been recognized. Parties should strive to make use of the policies and legislation approved by them and provide necessary resources where these are lacking.

Single Species Action Plans (SSAPs) should receive much more attention at all levels, i.e. identification of species in need of SSAPs, preparation of plans and particularly their implementation. A more detailed analysis for MOP4 is necessary, as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (e) of the Action Plan (International review on the stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans).

More detailed analysis based on better information should be prepared for MOP4 as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (c) of the Action Plan (International review on the networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the management measures taken in each site). At the same time the need for identifying sites in need of management, preparing management plans and implementing them was noted.

Parties should endeavor to standardize, and where possible unify, regionally or internationally, monitoring of hunting levels.

EIA, being a fundamental tool for identification of potentially harmful activities and prevention of deterioration of conditions in and destruction of sites important for waterbirds, should be developed and implemented in all parties and in all cases where there is any suspicion of potential risk. EIA should be applied to high standards.

## SPECIES CONSERVATION

### **Legal measures**

*National policy/strategy or legislation to protect and conserve species covered by the Agreement (Table 1, columns A and B) and their supporting important areas is in place (question 2.1):*

**Summary:** Only two parties (8%; one African and one Eurasian) reported that they have developed special policy/strategy or legislation, while in the majority of reporting parties and signatories (80%), protection of waterbirds and their supporting sites is covered by general nature conservation policy/legislation. One party (4%) is currently developing its waterbird conservation policy/legislation, but two Eurasian countries (8%) reported that in general they do not have such a legal instrument in place (Monaco and Macedonia, the FYR).

**Conclusions:** National policies or legislation to protect waterbirds and their important sites are in place in nearly all parties and signatories.

**Priorities:** The small number of parties that reported no policy/legislation in place or being developed should strive to finalize and introduce legal instruments as soon as possible.

*Legal measures or practices developed to prohibit or regulate the taking of, and trade in birds listed in columns A and B of Table 1 (where utilization or trade contravenes the provisions set out in paragraphs 2.2.1 (a) and 2.1.2 of the Action Plan) (question 2.2 (a)):*

**Summary:** Only nine reporting parties and signatories (36%; four African and five Eurasian) have fully developed legal measures to prohibit or regulate the taking of and trade in birds listed in columns A and B of the Action Plan. Nearly half of parties and signatories (12), however, have partially introduced such legal measures (48%; two African and 10 Eurasian). Only one African country (4%) reported no legal measures in place, while three Eurasian countries (12%) did not respond to this question.

**Conclusions:** Generally the majority of parties and signatories have developed (fully or partially) legal measures and practices to prohibit and regulate the taking of and trade in birds listed in columns A and B of the Action Plan.

**Priorities:** Parties and signatories with partial legal measures or practices should review them and consider appropriateness for further development. Countries with no such legal measures or practices in place should develop and introduce such as soon as possible.

*Legal measures or practices developed to prohibit or regulate methods of taking (question 2.2 (b)):*

**Summary:** Regarding legal measures or practices to prohibit or regulate methods of taking, the situation is very similar to that described in the previous section. The only slight difference is that one more country (8%, one African and one Eurasian) reported legal measures not in place. At the same time fewer parties and signatories (11; 44%; two African and nine Eurasian countries) have partially developed such legislation or practices.

**Conclusions:** Although the majority of parties and signatories have either fully or partially developed legislation or practices to prohibit or regulate the methods of taking, some countries have not yet introduced regulatory measures to deal with the methods of taking of waterbirds.

**Priorities:** Parties and signatories with partial legal measures or practices should review them and consider the appropriateness of further development. Countries with no such legal measures or practices in place should develop and introduce these as soon as possible.

*Legal measures or practices developed to regulate the setting of taking limits and monitoring these limits (question 2.2 (c)):*

**Summary:** Only six parties and signatories (24%; four African and two Eurasian countries) reported that they have fully developed legal measures or practices to regulate the setting of taking limits and monitoring these limits. Another seven countries (28%; one African and six Eurasian) reported partial measures or practices in place. The same composition of countries (7; 28%; one African and six Eurasian) have not developed any. A high proportion of parties and signatories (6; 20%; one African and five Eurasian) have not provided any information on this question.

**Conclusions:** Legal measures or practices to regulate the setting of taking limits for waterbirds and monitoring these limits are still poorly developed and introduced within the Agreement area. More African than Eurasian countries report such measures or practices in place.

**Priorities:** Setting taking limits and monitoring them is considered to be a high priority action and over the next triennium parties should provide more resources for developing and enforcing legislation in this respect.

*Legal measures or practices developed to regulate the sustainable hunting of species listed in categories 2 and 3 (and marked by an asterisk) in column A only (question 2.2 (d)):*

**Summary:** A relatively high number of reporting parties and signatories have fully (12; 48%; four African and eight Eurasian countries) or partially (5; 20%; one African and five Eurasian countries) developed legislation to regulate the sustainable hunting of column A asterisk-marked species. For four Eurasian countries (16%) this question was not applicable, because all species from column A are protected by national legislation and no hunting is allowed. Only one African country (4%) has no such legal measures in place. Three countries (12%; one African and two Eurasian), however, did not respond to this question in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** The sustainable hunting of asterisk-marked species listed in column A is well covered by legal measures in both African and Eurasian regions either fully or partially.

**Priorities:** Parties and signatories with partial legal measures or practices should review them and consider the appropriateness of further development. Countries with no such legal measures or practices in place should develop and introduce these as soon as possible, if applicable.

*Legal measures or practices developed to regulate the exemptions to the provisions set out in paragraphs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 (question 2.2 (e)):*

**Summary:** The majority of reporting parties and signatories (12; 48%; three African and nine Eurasian countries) have only partially developed and introduced legislation to regulate the exemptions in the above-mentioned paragraphs of the Action Plan. Another six countries (24%; two African and four Eurasian) have no legislation in place on this subject. The smallest group of three Eurasian countries (12%) have fully developed and introduced such regulation measures. Two African and two Eurasian countries (16%) have not provided information in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** Legislation to regulate the exemptions to the provisions set out in paragraphs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 are poorly developed within the Agreement area, in most countries only partially or not at all.

**Priorities:** Parties and signatories with partial legal measures or practices should review them and consider the appropriateness of further development. Countries with no such legal measures or practices in place should develop and introduce these as soon as possible.

### **Single Species Action Plans**

*Formal International (category 1, species marked with an asterisk) or National (column A) Single Species Action Plans for species listed in Table 1, column A are being implemented (question 2.3 (c)):*



**Summary:** SSAPs for a small number of species (1-2) are being implemented in seven reporting parties and signatories (28%; one African and six Eurasian countries). SSAPs for more species (3-5 or 6-10) are being implemented respectively in three countries (12%; one African and two Eurasian) and in two Eurasian countries (8%). Yet a relatively large number of parties and signatories (7; 28%; two African and five Eurasian countries) do not implement any SSAP. The largest group of countries (9; 36%; three African and six Eurasian ones) has not given information in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** The general impression is that there is little effort within the Agreement area to implement SSAPs for waterbirds. Very few countries have invested considerable effort in this respect, i.e. implementing SSAPs for several species. The least progress has been made in Africa.

**Priorities:** As a general priority the need for more countries to implement more SSAPs should be stressed. However, it should be noted that the number of SSAPs being implemented is a function of the number of SSAPs prepared and approved and the number of species in need of SSAPs. Therefore a more detailed analysis for MOP4 is necessary as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (e) of the Action Plan (International review on the stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans).

*Formal International (category 1, species marked with an asterisk) or National (column A) Single Species Action Plans for species listed in Table 1, column A in preparation (question 2.3 (b)):*

**Summary:** The situation regarding the SSAPs in preparation is slightly better. SSAPs for a small number of species (1-2) are in preparation in seven reporting parties and signatories (28%; three African and four Eurasian countries). SSAPs for more species (3-5 or 6-10) are in preparation respectively in four Eurasian countries (16%) and in three Eurasian countries (12%). Five parties and signatories (20%; one African and four Eurasian countries) are not preparing any new SSAP. A relatively large group of countries (6; 24%; three African and three Eurasian) has not given information on the preparation of SSAPs in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** Although slightly more countries are preparing more SSAPs than are implementing them, the attention being paid to this activity is lower than it should be. The most work is being done in the Eurasian region, while in Africa preparation of SSAPs is a poorly implemented activity.

**Priorities:** As a general priority the need for more countries to prepare more SSAPs should be stressed. However, it should be noted that the number of SSAPs in preparation is a function of the number of SSAPs already prepared and approved and the number of species in need of SSAPs. Therefore a more detailed analysis for MOP4 is necessary as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (e) of the Action Plan (International review on the stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans).

*Formal International (category 1, species marked with an asterisk) or National (column A) Single Species Action Plans for species listed in Table 1, column A that were proposed (question 2.3 (a)):*

**Summary:** The situation regarding the proposed SSAPs is similar to that of SSAPs in preparation and being implemented. Five reporting parties and signatories (20%; two African and three Eurasian countries) have proposed SSAPs for a small number of species (1-2). SSAPs for more species (3-5 or 11-20) were proposed in two countries for each numerical category (8%; one African and one Eurasian). In the largest group of countries (9; 36%; two African and seven Eurasian) no new SSAPs were proposed. The second largest group of countries (7; 28%; one African and six Eurasian) has not given information in their National Reports on the number of proposed SSAPs.

**Conclusions:** Answers given to this third question in the National Report format relating to the SSAPs once again reveal that the issue of SSAPs is not receiving enough (and equal) attention throughout the Agreement area.

**Priorities:** It should be noted that the number of proposed SSAPs is a function of the number of SSAPs already prepared and approved and the number of species in need of SSAPs. Therefore a more detailed analysis for MOP4 is necessary as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (e) of the Action Plan (International review on the stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans).

### **Re-establishments**

*National policy on species re-establishments in place (question 2.5):*

**Summary:** A fairly large number of reporting parties and signatories (11; 44%; four African and seven Eurasian countries) have developed national policy on re-establishment of waterbirds. However, nearly the same proportion of countries (9; 36%; one African and eight Eurasian) reported no policy in place. Two countries (8%; one African and one Eurasian) considered this question not applicable to them, because policy on re-establishments of waterbirds was not necessary. Another three countries (12%; one African and two Eurasian) have not reported on this issue in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** The issue of re-establishment is not ranked as high priority amongst the parties, and less than half of them have developed policies on the issue.

**Priorities:** A substantial number of parties should work on developing their national policies on re-establishment of waterbird species, if applicable, and are recommended to liaise with parties that have already introduced such policies and learn from their experiences.

## **Introductions**

*Legal measures to prohibit the introduction of non-native species in place and implemented (question 2.6):*

**Summary:** The largest group of reporting countries and signatories (9; 36%; two African and seven Eurasian countries) has reported legal measures developed and fully implemented. Another group of seven Eurasian countries (28%) has only partially implemented their legal measures to prohibit introduction of non-native waterbird species, while one Eurasian country (4%) has developed, but not yet implemented, its legislation on this issue. Development of legal measures is in progress in three countries (12%; one African and two Eurasian). No drafting of legislation has taken place yet in five countries of the Agreement area (20%; four African and one Eurasian).

**Conclusions:** Some good progress has been made in the development and implementation of national legal measures to prohibit the introduction of non-native waterbird species, particularly in the Eurasian region. However, taking into account that the introduction of non-native species is considered to be amongst the major threats for some waterbird species, it has not received sufficiently rigorous attention throughout the Agreement area.

**Priorities:** Prevention of introduction of non-native waterbird species and eradication of already established populations of non-native species, being a threat to a number of native species, should receive the necessary attention and all parties should develop and fully implement pertinent legal and other measures in the short term.

## HABITAT CONSERVATION

### **Habitat inventories**

*Inventories of important habitats for species covered by the Agreement developed and published (question 3.1):*

**Summary:** A fairly large number of parties and signatories have developed and published either specific AEWA species inventories (12; 48%; four African and eight Eurasian countries) or other similar inventories (9; 36%; one African and eight Eurasian countries). Inventories are currently being developed in one African and one Eurasian country (8%). Only one African country (4%) has reported neither an existing nor a developing inventory, while one Eurasian country (4%) has not responded to this question.

**Conclusions:** Generally parties and signatories have good knowledge of important habitats for waterbirds in their territory. A few gaps still exist where countries are either developing their inventories or have not yet started to do so.

**Priorities:** Inventories of important habitats for waterbirds, providing fundamental knowledge for efficient conservation, should be completed as soon as possible in all parties.

*Strategic review of sites to develop a national network of important sites or areas for species covered by the Agreement undertaken (question 3.2):*

**Summary:** An exceptionally high number of reporting parties and signatories (19; 76%; six African and 13 Eurasian countries) have undertaken such reviews, while another two Eurasian countries (8%) have undertaken similar reviews. Two Eurasian countries (8%) have reported that they are currently developing strategic reviews of sites to establish a network. Only one Eurasian country (4%) has no such strategic review in place or under development, while one African country (4%) has not provided information on this issue in its National Report.

**Conclusions:** Generally parties and signatories have good knowledge of important sites for waterbirds on their territory. Only a few gaps still exist where countries are either developing their inventories or have not started yet.

**Priorities:** The limited number of countries with no strategic reviews of sites to establish a network of important sites should undertake steps within the short term to launch and complete such reviews. Where already started, the reviews should be finalized within the next triennium.

## **Conservation of areas**

*Management planning process for protected sites developed (question 3.4):*

**Summary:** In the majority of reporting parties and signatories a management planning process for protected sites is either in place (12; 48%; five African and seven Eurasian countries) or is being developed (seven Eurasian countries; 28%). Only two Eurasian countries (8%) neither have developed nor are developing such a planning process yet, while another four countries (16%; two African and two Eurasian) have not provided information on this issue in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** While in many countries the management planning process for protected sites has been established for long time and has a good tradition, yet a fairly large number of parties are only now starting with the development of such a process. Some of them have not commenced development of the planning process, which is considered to be a fundamental step towards the effective conservation of sites.

**Priorities:** All parties that have started developing a management planning process for protected sites should finalize this as soon as possible and put it into practice. The same priority should apply to those countries that have not commenced development of the process.

*Number of protected sites with management plans being implemented (question 3.5 (c)):*

**Summary:** In two countries (8%; one African and one Eurasian) management plans are being implemented for 3-6 sites. The same composition of countries implements management plans for 6-10 sites. Only one African country (4%) reported that it implements management plans in 11-20 sites, while two Eurasian countries (8%) are implementing plans for more than 20 sites. Six parties and signatories (24%; one African and five Eurasian countries) have reported no implementation of any management plan, and seven countries (28%; two African and five Eurasian) have not provided any information in their National Reports. Another three countries (12%; one African and two Eurasian countries) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

**Conclusions:** The incompleteness of information provided by parties and signatories makes it difficult to draw conclusions. However, it is evident that a relatively high number of parties and signatories are still not managing any or managing just a very small number of their sites important for migratory waterbirds.

**Priorities:** More detailed analysis based on better information should be prepared for MOP4 as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (c) of the Action Plan (International review on the networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the management measures taken in each site). However, the need for parties to introduce management plans for as many sites as possible over the next triennium should already be outlined as a priority.

*Number of protected sites with management plans in preparation (question 3.5 (b)):*

**Summary:** Three reporting Eurasian countries (12%) are preparing management plans for 1-2 sites. In two countries (8%; one African and one Eurasian) management plans are in preparation for 3-6 sites. The same composition of countries are preparing management plans for 6-10 sites. Only one Eurasian country (4%) reported that it is preparing management plans for 11-20 sites, and another Eurasian country (4%) is preparing plans for more than 20 sites. Two African countries (8%) have reported no preparation of a management plan, and seven countries (28%; two African and five Eurasian) have not provided any information in their National Reports. Another four countries (16%; one African and three Eurasian countries) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

**Conclusions:** The incompleteness of information provided by parties and signatories makes it difficult to draw conclusions. Moreover it should be pointed out that the number of sites with management plans in preparation is a function of the number of sites with management plans in place and the number of sites to be managed. However, we may observe that in a number of countries, mainly in Eurasia, considerable efforts have been invested in preparing management plans for many waterbird sites. At the same time there are yet countries where no management plans are being drafted or management plans are in preparation for a very small number of sites.

**Priorities:** More detailed analysis based on better information should be prepared for MOP4 as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (c) of the Action Plan (International review on the networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the management measures taken in each site). However, already now as a priority for parties should be outlined the need over the next triennium to draft management plans for as many sites as possible.

*Number of protected sites with proposed management plans (question 3.5 (a)):*

**Summary:** In two countries (8%; one African and one Eurasian) management plans were proposed for 1 or 2 sites. In the same composition of countries management plans were proposed for 3 to 5 sites. One Eurasian country (4%) per each of the following three numerical category reported that management plans were for 6 to 10, for 11 to 20 sites, and for more than 20 sites. Four countries (16%; two African and two Eurasian ones) have reported no any proposed new management plan, and seven countries (28%; two African and five Eurasian) have not provided any information in their National Reports. Another four countries (16%; one African and three Eurasian countries) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

**Conclusions:** The incompleteness of information provided by parties and signatories makes it difficult to draw conclusions. Moreover it should be noted that the number of sites with proposed management plans is a function of the number of sites with

management plans in place, the number of sites with management plans in preparation and the number of sites to be managed.

**Priorities:** More detailed analysis based on better information should be prepared for MOP4 as envisaged by paragraph 7.4 (c) of the Action Plan (International review on the networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the management measures taken in each site).

### **Rehabilitation and restoration**

*Policy for the identification, rehabilitation and restoration of wetlands important for species covered by the Agreement in place (question 3.7):*

**Summary:** A fairly large number of reporting parties and signatories (15; 60%; four African and 11 Eurasian countries) already have such policy in place, although some of them (e.g. Morocco) reported that they were not implemented yet due to shortage of resources. Two Eurasian countries (6%) reported that they are currently developing their policies for identification, rehabilitation and restoration of wetlands. While four countries (16%; two African and two Eurasian) have not yet drafted such policies, the UK reported that they have already implemented such restoration activities. Two countries only (8%; one African and one Eurasian) have not answered this question in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** Generally policies for the identification, rehabilitation and restoration of wetlands important for waterbirds are well established in parties and signatories throughout the Agreement area. However, this does not necessarily imply that they are being implemented, while countries with no policies in place may rehabilitate and restore wetlands.

**Priorities:** Parties should strive to launch the development of policies if they are not in place or are in preparation, or to finalize policies if currently being prepared. At the same time, the need not only to formally approve a policy, but also to implement it as far as possible is recognized. This should be a higher priority.

## MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN ACTIVITIES

### **Hunting**

#### *Monitoring of hunting levels in place (question 4.2)*

**Summary:** The majority of reporting parties and signatories (18; 72%; four African and 14 Eurasian countries) have developed monitoring systems for hunting levels. Another three countries (12%; two African and one Eurasian) are implementing partial monitoring, and one Eurasian country (4%) is currently developing its monitoring system. Three countries (12%; one African and two Eurasian) have not reported on this issue in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** Generally monitoring systems for hunting levels are well established either fully or partially within the Agreement area, or are being developed for several countries. However, in practice it is known that often monitoring systems of hunting levels are inconsistent throughout the Agreement area.

**Priorities:** Parties should endeavor not only to introduce full monitoring of hunting levels, but also to develop similar systems to other countries with already well-established monitoring.

### **Other human activities**

#### *Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of activities potentially affecting protected areas or areas important for species covered by the Agreement carried out (question 4.6)*

**Summary:** Nearly all parties and signatories (21; 84%; five African and 16 Eurasian countries) have reported that EIA are carried out in cases when waterbird sites are potentially affected. However, in some cases poor standards of EIA procedure and formal assessment were reported (in practice it is known that these are not just isolated cases). In one African country (4%) EIA procedures are being developed and in another African country (4%) EIAs are not necessarily carried out. Two Eurasian countries (8%) have not provided information on this issue in their National Reports.

**Conclusions:** EIA are carried out in nearly all countries within the Agreement area for activities potentially affecting sites important for waterbirds. However, this is not a prerequisite for rigorous assessment in some countries.

**Priorities:** All parties should strive to implement EIA in all cases when waterbird sites could be potentially affected by some activities. Where no EIA procedures are in place, these should be developed. In addition, all parties should endeavor to ensure that EIA is not only conducted for formal reasons, but plays role in a rigorous assessment that is capable of revealing potentially harmful activities and preventing deterioration of conditions in or destruction of sites important for waterbirds.