



# Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2012-2014

The format for reports on the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) for the period 2012-2014 was approved at the 9th meeting of the Standing Committee (18-19 September 2013, Trondheim, Norway) by Doc StC 9.11. This format has been constructed following the AEWA Action Plan, the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017 and resolutions of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP).

In accordance with Article V.1(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 not later than 120 days before the session of the MOP. The 6th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP6) is taking place on 9-14 November 2015 in Bonn, Germany; therefore the deadline for submission of National Reports is 12 May 2015.

The AEWA National Reports 2012-2014 will be compiled and submitted through the CMS Family Online Reporting Facility, which is an online reporting tool for the whole CMS Family. The CMS Family Online Reporting System was developed in 2010-2011 by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in close collaboration with and under the guidance of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat.

To contact the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat please send your inquiries to [aewa\\_national\\_reporting@unep.de](mailto:aewa_national_reporting@unep.de)

## 1. General Information

### Name of reporting Contracting Party

> Denmark

### Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

> 01-01-2000

### List any reservations that the Contracting Party has made (if any) upon deposition of its instruments of accession on provisions of the Agreement or its Action Plan in accordance with Article XV of AEWA

> None

## 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

> Danish Ministry of Environment, Nature Agency

Name and title of the head of institution

> Hanne Kristensen, Director-General

Mailing address - Street and number

> Haraldsgade 53

P.O.Box

> N/A

Postal code

> 2100

City

> Copenhagen

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +45 7254 3000

Fax

> N/A

E-mail

> nst@nst.dk

Website

> <http://naturstyrelsen.dk/>

### Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

> Niels K. Nielsen

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Danish Ministry of Environment, Nature Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

> Haraldsgade 53

P.O.Box

> N/A

Postal code

> 2100

City

> Copenhagen

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +45 7254 2427

Fax

> N/A

E-mail

> nin@nst.dk

Website

> <http://naturstyrelsen.dk/>

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

Name and title of the TC NFP

> Thomas Eske Holm

Affiliation (institution, department)

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

Mailing address - Street and number

> Grenåvej 14

P.O.Box

> N/A

Postal code

> 8410

City

> Grenå

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +45 8715 8761

Fax

> N/A

E-mail

> teh@bios.au.dk

Website

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

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

Name and title of the CEPA NFP

> None appointed

Affiliation (institution, department)

> N/A

Mailing address - Street and number

> N/A

P.O.Box

> N/A

Postal code

> N/A

City

> N/A

Country

> N/A

Telephone

> N/A

Fax

> N/A

E-mail

> N/A

Website

> N/A

### **Designated National Respondent (DNR) in charge of the compilation and submission of the AEWA National Report 2012-2014**

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 2012-2014**

Please list the names and affiliations (institution, organisation) of the other contributors to this report

Please list the names and affiliations (institution, organisation) of the other contributors to this reports

> Preben Clausen, Thomas Kjær Christensen, Anthony David Fox, Thomas Eske Holm, Jesper Madsen, Rasmus

Due Nielsen, Ib Krag Petersen and Ole Roland Therkildsen

DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy

and Department of Bioscience,

Aarhus University

Grenåvej 14

8410 Rønne

Denmark

## Status

### 3. Non-native Waterbird Species Status

#### Are there non-native waterbird species occurring in your country?

If you respond **negatively** to this question, please skip this chapter and proceed to chapter 4. Species Conservation. If you respond **positively** to this question, please select from the drop-down list below only the **non-native** species that occur in your country and fill out the required information.

Yes

#### AEWA Species - *Alopochen aegyptiacus* / Egyptian Goose

##### English Common name(s):

Egyptian Goose

##### French Common name(s):

Oie d'Égypte, Oulette d'Égypte



#### Confirmation of species occurrence

Please confirm the occurrence of the species in the country

The species occurs in the country

#### Native or non-native species

Please confirm whether the species is non-native to your country

Non-native

#### Species Status

Please select whether status will be reported for breeding or non-breeding/wintering population

Both options can be selected

Breeding

Non-breeding/wintering

#### Species Status - Breeding

#### Latest population estimate

Year

> 2014-2015

Population unit

Pairs

Minimum

> 8

Maximum

> 32

## Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

## Population data quality

Moderate

## Source of information

> Current breeding population estimate uncertain, but the species has so far been recorded in 32 5kmx5km quadrats as confirmed (8) probable (8) and possible (16) early in the second year of the Third Danish breeding bird atlas(DOFbasen.dk accessed 24 April 2015).

This contrasts to no breeding attempts recorded during previous atlas surveys in 1971-74 and 1993-1996.

Grell, M. (1998). Fuglenes Danmark. Dansk Ornitologisk Forening/GADs forlag. 825 pp.

## Previous population estimate

### Year

> 2004-2007

### Population unit

Pairs

### Minimum

> 20

### Maximum

> 20

## Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

## Population data quality

Good

## Source of information

> Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

## Population trend

### Population trend

Increasing

### Trend data quality

Good

## Source of information

> Breeding population definitely increasing in parallel with non-breeding season numbers (see details below).

Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. - Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Species Status - Non-breeding/wintering

### Latest population estimate

#### Year

> 2005-2014

#### Population unit

Individuals

#### Minimum

> 300

Maximum

> 500

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

Population data quality

Good

Source of information

> Numbers of individuals (estimated as sum of maxima recorded per 10x10 km<sup>2</sup> grids) have increased from less than 300 to more than 500 during 2005-2014. Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Previous population estimate

Source of information

> No details given about non-breeding population in last national report.

Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

No information

No information

## Population trend

Population trend

Increasing

Trend data quality

Good

Source of information

> Details above about increasing numbers. Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Species Status - Field for additional information (optional)

Optionally you can provide additional information on the status of the species in the country

> The Egyptian Goose is one of three species of waterbirds currently considered as invasive in Denmark according to the Danish National Action Plan for Invasive Species (link below).

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

[Danish National Action Plan for Invasive Species.](#)

## Legal Status

Does the species have any legal status?

Yes

## National Red List Status

Does the species have any National Red List Status?

No

## Risk or potential risk posed by the non-native species

Please select all relevant risks from the list below

Other

Please specify the type of risk

> Threats posed by Egyptian Geese on native waterbirds and/or their habitats in a Danish context are unknown.

Please provide details and references, where available

> Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.



## Alien Species - *Oxyura jamaicensis* / Ruddy Duck

### English Common name(s):

Ruddy Duck

### French Common name(s):

Érismature rousse, Érismature rousse, Érismature roux



### Confirmation of species occurrence

Please confirm the occurrence of the species in the country

The species occurs in the country

### Native or non-native species

Please confirm whether the species is non-native to your country

Non-native

### Species Status

Please select whether status will be reported for breeding or non-breeding/wintering population

Both options can be selected

Breeding

Non-breeding/wintering

### Species Status - Breeding

### Latest population estimate

Year

> 2009-2014

Population unit

Pairs

Minimum

> 0

Maximum

> 0

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

Population data quality

Good

Source of information

> Last (and single confirmed breeding) in 2006-2008. None since then.

Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. - Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Previous population estimate

Year

> 2004-2007

Population unit

Pairs

Minimum

> 1

Maximum

> 1

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

Population data quality

Good

Source of information

> Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

## Population trend

Population trend

Declining

Trend data quality

Good

Source of information

> Only breeding pair disappeared.

## Species Status - Non-breeding/wintering

### Latest population estimate

Year

> 2005-2014

Population unit

Individuals

Minimum

> 10

Maximum

> 60

Source of information

> Numbers of individuals (estimated as sum of maxima recorded per 10x10 km<sup>2</sup> grids) have declined from more than 60 to less than 10 during 2005-2014.

Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. - Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Previous population estimate

Year

> 0

Population unit

Individuals

Minimum

> 0

Maximum

> 0

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

Population data quality

Good

Source of information

> Previous information given by Krabbe et al. (2012) probably underestimated numbers. Please refer to text above under Latest population estimate, based on Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

## Population trend

Population trend

Declining

Trend data quality

Good

Source of information

> Details given above. Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Species Status - Field for additional information (optional)

Optionally you can provide additional information on the status of the species in the country

> The Ruddy Duck is one of three species of waterbirds currently considered as invasive in Denmark according to the Danish National Action Plan for Invasive Species.

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

[Danish National Action Plan for Invasive Species.](#)

## Legal Status

Does the species have any legal status?

Yes

## National Red List Status

Does the species have any National Red List Status?

No

## Risk or potential risk posed by the non-native species

Please select all relevant risks from the list below

Other

Please specify the type of risk

> We judge none of the threats mentioned above are irrelevant, given the low numbers of the species, and the absence of breeding White-headed Ducks in Denmark.

Please provide details and references, where available

> Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Alien Species - *Branta canadensis* / Greater Canada Goose

### English Common name(s):

Canada Goose

### French Common name(s):

Bernache du Canada



### Confirmation of species occurrence

Please confirm the occurrence of the species in the country

The species occurs in the country

### Native or non-native species

Please confirm whether the species is non-native to your country

Non-native

### Species Status

Please select whether status will be reported for breeding or non-breeding/wintering population

Both options can be selected

Breeding

Non-breeding/wintering

### Species Status - Breeding

### Latest population estimate

Year

> 2014-2015

Population unit

Pairs

Minimum

> 7

Maximum

> 11

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

Population data quality

Poor

Source of information

> Current breeding population estimate uncertain, but the species has so far been recorded in 11 5kmx5km quadrats as confirmed (7) and probable (4) early in the second year of the Third Danish breeding bird atlas(DOFbasen.dk accessed 24 April 2015).

This contrasts to 12 and 34 quadrats in total (confirmed, probable or possible) recorded during previous atlas surveys in 1971-74 and 1993-1996. (DOFbasen.dk accessed 24 April 2015). The current Atlas III data are thus premature to use for a judgement of the current breeding population size.

## Previous population estimate

Year

> 2004-2007

Population unit

Pairs

Minimum

> 20

Maximum

> 20

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely escapes from collections

Population data quality

Moderate

Source of information

> Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

## Population trend

Population trend

Increasing

Trend data quality

Good

Source of information

> Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift. using an alternative approach with 10x10 km grid squares reports on increasing numbers reported during the breeding season 2005-2014, suggesting more birds have breed in recent years. This fits with a generally southern breeding time distribution of birds, and an expanding breeding population in Schleswig-Holstein (Germany).

## Species Status - Non-breeding/wintering

### Latest population estimate

Year

> 2013

Population unit

Individuals

Minimum

> 17790

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely natural vagrants

Population data quality

Good

Source of information

> Based on national mid-winter count of geese, January 2013. Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Previous population estimate

Year

> 2009

Population unit

Individuals

Minimum

> 15951

Occasional records

Both options can be selected

Occasionally recorded, most likely natural vagrants

Population data quality

Good

Source of information

> Based on national mid-winter count of geese, January 2009. Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

## Population trend

Population trend

Fluctuating

Trend data quality

Good

Source of information

> Two different datasets suggest an increase followed by a levelling off - or an increase followed by recent decline. Nevertheless, numbers are far higher today than 30 years ago, when the counts started. Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

## Species Status - Field for additional information (optional)

Optionally you can provide additional information on the status of the species in the country

> The Greater Canada Goose is one of three species of waterbirds currently considered as invasive in Denmark according to the Danish National Action Plan for Invasive Species.

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

[Danish National Action Plan for Invasive Species](#)

## Legal Status

Does the species have any legal status?

Yes

## National Red List Status

Does the species have any National Red List Status?

No

## Risk or potential risk posed by the non-native species

Please select all relevant risks from the list below

Damage to man-made habitats or crops

Other

What types of habitats or crops have been affected?

> Non-breeding wintering Canada Geese may be damaging crops (winter-sown cereals and oil-seed raps)

together with Whooper Swan, they very often feed together with. The information about goose/swan damage to agricultural crops in Denmark is, however, out-dated (last assessment was made and published in 1997). Breeding numbers are probably still so low, that their impacts on other breeding waterbirds and/or their habitats are neglectable, according to Fox, A.D., Heldbjerg, H. and Nyegaard, T. (draft manuscript): Invasive alien birds in Denmark. – Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift.

Is this widespread or localized?

Localised

Please provide details and references, where available

> Expert judgement. See below.

Please specify the type of risk

> Crop damage through direct grazing impacts, trampling, and/or out-pulling of plants, causing invasion of weeds, and lower production of crops.

Please provide details and references, where available

> Madsen, J. and Laubek, B. (1997). Markskader forvoldt af gæs og svaner - en litteraturudredning. - Faglig rapport fra DMU, nr. 208. 28 pp.

# Pressures and Responses

## 4. Species Conservation

### 4.1 Legal Measures

#### 1. Please indicate which modes of taking are prohibited in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b))

Please select from the list below.

- 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

Please specify

> Only rifles, shotguns and bow and arrow are allowed for hunting.

Please provide further details, including the relevant legislation

> The Hunting and Game Management Act no 735 of 14/06/2013 and associated regulatory orders

#### 2. 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))

- No

#### 3. Were any exemptions granted to the prohibitions laid down in paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the AEWA Action Plan? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.3)

- Yes

**Please provide information on each species for which exemption was granted**

#### **Exemption for *Anser fabalis* / Bean Goose**

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

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

Number of individuals for which exemption was granted

> 28

Number of eggs for which exemption was granted

> 0

Year when the exemption was granted

> 2013

Additional information on this exemption (alternatively provide a web link or attach a file)

> Not recognised to subspecies level. Likely to be other than subspecies in Column A

#### **Exemption for *Larus fuscus* / Lesser Black-backed Gull**

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

Number of individuals for which exemption was granted

> 45

Number of eggs for which exemption was granted

> 0

Year when the exemption was granted

> 2012-2013

Additional information on this exemption (alternatively provide a web link or attach a file)

> Not recognised to subspecies level. Likely to be other than subspecies in Column A

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

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

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

## **4.2 Single Species Action Plans**

### **4. Please report on the progress of turning the International Single Species Action Plans (ISSAP), for species whose populations are listed on Column A of Table 1, developed under or recognised by AEWA, into National Single Species Action Plans (NSSAP). (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.2)**

#### **Please report on each relevant ISSAP for Denmark**

National Single Species Action Plan for *Crex crex*

(Corncrake)

NSSAP in place and being implemented

When was the plan approved and published? Please provide a web link or attach a file, if available. Please provide contact details for any person or organisation coordinating its implementation. Please list any activities and/or achievements over the past triennium.

> Action plan for the conservation of endangered species of birds Corncrake *Crex crex*. Ministry of Environment and Energy. Forest and Nature Agency 2000.

<http://eng.naturstyrelsen.dk/media/nst/Attachments/engsnarreeng1.pdf>

Field for additional information (optional)

> The Corncrake was redlisted as extinct in the Danish 1997 redlist. Since then the species has returned to the country, in highly variable numbers. Nyegaard et al. 2014 thus reports on between 72 and 529 singing males between 1998 and 2011, without any obvious trend.

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

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

National Single Species Action Plan for *Gallinago media*

(Great Snipe)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> Great Snipe is only seen occasionally in Denmark during migration. Thus, the development of a specific NSSAP for the Great Snipe in Denmark is not considered a priority issue for the time being.

Field for additional information (optional)

> See above

National Single Species Action Plan for *Oxyura leucocephala*

(White-headed Duck)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> White-headed Duck has not yet been found in Denmark.

Field for additional information (optional)

> See above

National Single Species Action Plan for *Platalea leucorodia*

(Eurasian Spoonbill)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> The currently six areas with breeding colonies or large post-breeding concentrations of feeding and roosting Eurasian Spoonbill are all strongly protected as game reserves with public access prohibited in the breeding period. Moreover, all six areas are appointed as Natura 2000 sites (Special Protection Areas for Birds) and Ramsar sites, including the designation of the Eurasian Spoonbill as a priority species in five of these. Thus, the development of a specific NSSAP for the Eurasian Spoonbill in Denmark is not considered a priority issue for the time being.

Field for additional information (optional)

> Spoonbill numbers have been steadily increasing in Denmark from 2 pairs in 1996 to 112 pairs in 2012, and have also spread to more sites during this period, see Nyegaard, T., Meltofte, H., Tofft, J. and Grell, M. (2014). Truede og sjældne ynglefugle i Danmark 1998-2012. DOFT 108: 1-144.

This led to inclusion of two more SPA's in the list of designated sites under the last revision of designations in 2013, now involving five SPA's. The previous designation involved three SPA's, as mentioned in the last national report. Krabbe, E., Clausen, P. and Eskildsen, A. (2012): Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2009-2011. Denmark. 411 pp.

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

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

National Single Species Action Plan for *Anser brachyrhynchus*

(Pink-footed Goose)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> A NSSAP is not anticipated at the moment. Nationally, regulation of hunting is coordinated and managed to ensure appropriate national agreement and actions to meet the needs of the adaptive harvest management at the flyway level.

The Danish Hunters Association and the Danish Ornithological Society participate in the meetings of the International working group. Matters of importance are coordinated before meetings here.

Progress of the International SSAP is monitored by all range states, under coordination by staff from DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy - Department of Bioscience.

Johnson, F.A., Madsen, J. and Jensen, G.H. (2014). Adaptive Harvest Management for the Svalbard Population of Pink-Footed Geese. 2014 Progress Summary. Aarhus University, DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 22 pp. Technical Report from DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy No. 40.

Madsen, J., Cottaar, F., Amstrup, O., Asferg, T., Bak, M., Bakken, J., Christensen, T.K., Hansen, J., Jensen, G.H., Kjeldsen, J.P., Kuijken, E., Nicolaisen, P.I., Shimmings, P., Tombre, I. & Verscheure, C. (2014). Svalbard Pink-footed Goose. Population Status Report 2013-14. Aarhus University, DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, 14 pp. Technical Report from DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy No. 39.

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

[Johnson et al. 2014](#)

[Madsen et al. 2014](#)

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

National Single Species Action Plan for *Cygnus columbianus bewickii*

(Bewick's Swan)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> No NSSAP for Bewick's Swan has been developed. It is not a priority at the moment. Most key sites for Bewick's Swan in Denmark are protected areas.

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

#### National Single Species Action Plan for *Limosa limosa*

(Black-tailed Godwit)

NSSAP in place and being implemented

When was the plan approved and published? Please provide a web link or attach a file, if available. Please provide contact details for any person or organisation coordinating its implementation. Please list any activities and/or achievements over the past triennium.

> Action plan for threatened meadow birds, including Black-tailed Godwit, approved and published in 2005. Coordinator: Danish Nature Agency. See English summary page 47-48. The plan has to a very large extent been implemented by 2012.

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

[Action plan 2005 for threatened meadow birds](#)

Field for additional information (optional)

> Despite implementation of the National Action Plan, it has so far not proved efficient in reversing breeding population trends for Black-tailed Godwits in Denmark, but at least the population size has been reasonably stable in recent years. See Nyegaard, T., Meltofte, H., Tofft, J. and Grell, M. (2014). Truede og sjældne ynglefugle i Danmark 1998-2012. DOFT 108: 1-144.

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

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

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

Yes

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

##### **National Single Species Action Plan for *Phalacrocorax carbo* / Great Cormorant**

For *Phalacrocorax carbo* / Great Cormorant

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> The National Action Plan for Cormorant (2010) is set out with the aim to stabilize the breeding population and stop further spread of breeding colonies in the country, and to reduce conflicts between cormorants, fishermen, and aquaculture in Denmark. A revision of the plan is underway. Breeding populations are monitored on an annual basis, and the national population has stabilized in recent years (2010-2014), after a previous decline, according to the most recent breeding population report for 2014: Bregnballe, T. and Therkildsen, O.R. (2014). Danmarks ynglebstand af skarver i 2014. Aarhus Universitet, DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 24 s. - Teknisk rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 41.

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

[Breeding population 2014 report](#)

[Danisk National Action Plan for Cormorant 2010](#)

##### **National Single Species Action Plan for *Pluvialis apricaria* / Eurasian Golden Plover**

For *Pluvialis apricaria* / Eurasian Golden Plover

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> There is no official National Action Plan for this species but a Proposed Action plan for Golden Plover from Danish Ornithological Society/Birdlife Denmark from 2002 has to some extent been used as "action plan" for the species. Henning Heldbjerg & Michael B. Grell (2002): Forslag til forvaltningsplan for den danske ynglebstand af Hjejle *Pluvialis apricaria*.

The breeding population of Golden Plovers in Denmark is in the Danish Red list as Critically Endangered. For population trend and status see Nyegaard, T., Meltofte, H., Tofft, J. and Grell, M. (2014). Truede og sjældne ynglefugle i Danmark 1998-2012. DOFT 108: 1-144.

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

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

[Proposed Action plan 2002 for Golden Plover](#)

### **National Single Species Action Plan for *Calidris alpina* / Dunlin**

For *Calidris alpina* / Dunlin

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> Action plan 2005 for threatened meadow birds, including the Dunlin, is under implementation. In contrast to Black-tailed Godwit, this Action Plan has, however, not been able to stop the declining trend for the breeding population of the species in the Denmark. See Nyegaard, T., Meltofte, H., Tofft, J. and Grell, M. (2014). Truede og sjældne ynglefugle i Danmark 1998-2012. DOFT 108: 1-144.

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

[Action plan 2005 for threatened meadow birds](#)

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

### **National Single Species Action Plan for *Philomachus pugnax* / Ruff**

For *Philomachus pugnax* / Ruff

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> Action plan 2005 for threatened meadow birds, including the Ruff, is under implementation. In contrast to Black-tailed Godwit, this Action Plan has, however, not been able to stop the declining trend for the breeding population of the species in the Denmark.

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

[Action plan 2005 for threatened meadow birds](#)

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

### **6. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines for the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans for migratory waterbirds?**

No

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

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

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

> No further information.

### **4.3 Emergency Measures**

#### **7. 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

#### **8. Are there any other emergency measures, different from the ones reported above, but were developed and are in place in your country?**

No

#### **9. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds?**

Not applicable

Please explain

> As no emergencies were evident during 2012-2014, this is not relevant. Denmark has an emergency plan for seabirds in relation to oilspills.

### **Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.3. Emergency Measures**

> None.

## **4.4 Re-establishments**

### **10. Is your country maintaining a national register of re-establishment projects occurring or planned to occur wholly or partly within your country? (Resolution 4.4)**

No

Please explain the reasons

> No re-establishment project for waterbirds has occurred

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

Yes

Please provide details

> See above.

### **12. Has your country considered, developed or implemented re-establishment projects for any species listed on AEWA Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.4)**

No

### **13. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on the translocation of waterbirds for conservation Purposes?**

Not applicable

Please explain

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

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

> None.

## **4.5 Introductions**

### **14. 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

> According to Ministry of Environments Danish Nature Protection Act no. 951 of 03/07/2013 paragraph 31, it is prohibited to release non-native species in nature in Denmark without permission from the Minister of Environment. Enforced by Danish Nature Agency

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

### **15. 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

> Statutory order prohibiting new holdings and outfasing old holds of racoon dogs. General rules apply for zoo and keeping of animals in general under the ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries.

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

### **16. Does your country have in place a National Action Plan for Invasive Species (NAPIS) (in the framework of other MEAs, such as CBD, Bern Convention, and GISP (Global Invasive Species Programme) (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 1, Target 5)?**

Yes, and being implemented

Has consideration been given to waterbirds in the NAPIS?

Not

Field for additional information (optional)

> Neither the Ruddy Duck nor the Egyptian Goose, have been given special consideration in our national action plan for invasive species, since they are both accidental, and do not represent an actual ecological problem. However, both species can be hunted all year through. Sittings of Ruddy Ducks may be subject to special enforcement of eradication. Neither the Greater Canada Goose is given special attention.

**17. Has your country considered, developed or implemented programmes to control or eradicate non-native species of waterbird so as to prevent negative impacts on indigenous species? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.3)**

No

Please explain the reasons

> See above

**18. Has your country considered, developed or implemented programmes to control or eradicate other non-native species (in particular aquatic weeds) so as to prevent negative impacts on migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.3 and Resolution 5.15)**

Yes

Please list the species for which relevant action has been undertaken

> Action Plan for american mink. Action plan for racoon dog.

Please provide further information for each relevant programme

> N/A

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

No

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

> Until this point it has not been considered necessary. Revision of national action plan on invasive species under way and in this respect this will be reconsidered.

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.5. Introductions**

> None.

## Pressures and Responses

### 5. Habitat Conservation

#### 5.1 Habitat Inventories

##### **20. 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)**

Yes

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

> 113 areas, mainly internationally important wetlands, have been designated as Special protection Areas (SPA's) according to the EU Birds Directive. 28 of these are internationally important sites according to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar sites). All habitats that are relevant to breeding and staging waterbirds, and prioritised habitats under the EU Habitats Directive. This work is part of the Natura 2000 network planning programme (see website), that was finished by the end of 2011 (first planning cycle 2009-2015), and currently under revision (second cycle 2016-2021). A monitoring programme NOVANA provides more detailed data about threats and management status of the mapped areas.

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

[Natura 2000 planning website](#)

Field for additional information (optional)

> No additional info

##### **21. If your country has identified or is currently identifying the networks of sites of international and national importance, have you used the AEWA Guidelines on the preparation of site inventories for migratory waterbirds?**

No

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

> These areas were identified before the AEWA guidelines using EU Birds Directive and national implementation

Field for additional information (optional)

> No additional info.

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

> No additional info.

#### 5.2. Conservation of Areas

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

For one or more single sites

Yes

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

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

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

For the national protected area network

No

**23. 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 2009-2017, Objective 1, Target 1.2)**

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

- Reporting on designation and management of internationally important sites
- Reporting on designation and management of nationally important sites
- 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**

Total number

> 113

Total area (ha)

> 1478169

Out of the above total: number of protected sites

> 113

Out of the above total: protected area (ha)

> 1478169

Number of protected sites with management plans in place which are being implemented

> 113

Area under protection (in ha) covered by management plans which are being implemented

> 1478169

**All sites of national importance**

Total number

> 126000

Total area (ha)

> 178000

Out of the above total: number protected sites

> 126000

Out of the above total: protected area (ha)

> 178000

Number of protected sites with management plans in place which are being implemented

> 85400

Area under protection (in ha) covered by management plans which are being implemented

> 86630

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

- No

**24. Has your country developed a national action plans for filling gaps in designation and/or management of internationally and nationally important sites? (Resolution 5.2)**

- Yes

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

> SPAs and is fulfilling its obligations towards EUs Brd Directive in appointing areas

**25. Has your country developed a strategic plan (independently or as part of your country's overarching biodiversity or protected area policy document) to maintain or increase the**



**resilience of the ecological network (for waterbirds), including resilience to climate change, and to conserve range and ecological variability of habitats and species? (Resolution 5.2, AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 1, Target 1.2)**

No

Please explain the reasons

› Nature management plans are updated for the protected sites with regular year-intervals. The matter of resilience may be part of these plans if relevant

**26. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on the management of key sites for migratory waterbirds?**

No

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

› These areas were identified before the AEWA guidelines. Natura 2000 guidelines

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

No

Please explain the reasons

› These areas were identified before the development of the CSN Tool.

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

› The sites are protected according to the provisions in the EU Birds Directive and the Ramsar Convention. Furthermore, the sites as a whole or partly are protected according to national legislation e.g. as nature conservation and/or wildlife reserves. A management planning process is being implemented for all Danish NATURA 2000-Sites including basic investigations, conservation goals, monitoring and management plan. In Denmark the national wetland policy is covered by an integrated and a comprehensive set of nature protection and environmental laws and strategies which also complies with article 6 of the Convention of Biological Diversity. Article 6 states that countries shall prepare national strategies for protecting, and for the sustainable exploitation of, biodiversity. Denmark has prepared a national biodiversity strategy report after a consultation procedure which involved central and regional authorities and NGO's. It is recognized that biodiversity is an extremely broad concept. In the final analysis, it can be stressed that the aim of the entire nature and environmental conservation effort in Denmark is the preservation of biodiversity. The most relevant legal instruments regarding conservation and wise use of wetland are the following:

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

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

# Pressures and Responses

## 6. Management of Human Activities

### 6.1. Hunting

#### 28. Does your country have an established system for the collection of harvest data, which covers the species listed in Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.3)

Yes

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

All AEWA species occurring in your country

> Details given below.

The whole territory of your country

> Details given below.

All harvesting activities

> Details given below.

Field for additional information (optional)

> The total bag of the Danish hunters is annually recorded. Each hunter is obliged to inform the authorities of their annual bag. The results are published annually in a separate information brochur to the hunters. If the bag of a waterbird species has significantly declined it is considered to close or reduce the open season for the species. Results are published in short notes on an annual basis, latest in 2014 (link below). Every sixth year, a major assessment of populations trends, bag statistics and harvest sustainability is made. See Christensen et al. (2013)(link below): Christensen, T.K., Asferg, T., Madsen, A.B., Kahlert, J., Clausen, P., Laursen, K., Sunde P. and Haugaard, L. 2013. Jagttidsrevision 2014. Vurdering af jagtens bæredygtighed i forhold til gældende jagttider. Aarhus Universitet, DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 108 s. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 66

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

[Latest 2014 bag statistics](#)

[2013 major assessment of hunting](#)

#### 29. Has your country phased out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.4)

Fully

When was the lead shot use in wetlands banned? What legislation is in place? Who does enforce this legislation?

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

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

Yes

Please explain how this was assessed.

> In collaboration with the Danish Police the Danish Forest and Nature Agency is carrying out onsite control of the use of proper ammunition.

Please explain what was compliance with legislation found to be:

Good (almost full compliance)

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

> There is a high degree of self-justice within the member of the Hunters association, and the police is taking this issue seriously, and deals with it efficiently.

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

No

Please explain the reasons for not doing this

> None

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

**30. Are there measures in your country to reduce/eliminate illegal taking? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.6)**

Yes

How would you rate the effectiveness of the measures?

High

Please provide details

> There is a high degree of self-justice within the member of the Hunters association, and a developed system of game reserve control is working well. Moreover, police is taking this issue seriously, and deals with it efficiently. A study of mute swans have thus demonstrated, that the proportion of illegally shot individuals of this protected species has declined from 12% in the 1970s to 5% in the 1990s, reflecting this. Andersen-Harild, P., Clausen, B. & Nilson, B.R. (2002). Beskydning af Knopsvaner Cygnus olor i Danmark- en sammenligning af forholdene i 1979 og 1996. - Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift 96: 9-14.

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

**31. Are legally binding best practice codes and standards for hunting (e.g. bird identification) considered a priority or appropriate for your country? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 2, Target 2.4)**

Yes

Are there legally binding best practice codes or standards in place?

Yes

What do these cover?

Proficiency test for hunters (including bird identification)

Other (please specify)

> Shooting tests and ability to hit target is mandatory in the test necessary to achieve the right to get hunters license.

**32. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds?**

No

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

> A long-going programme is being used, from before the AEWA guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds: Every third year a scientific report is edited on the quarry species population and the hunting season is evaluated and possibly revised based on the results, to ensure sustainable harvest of migratory birds. Latest report was published in 2013 (also mentioned above in section 28, with link to the report).

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

> None.

**6.2. Other human activities**

**33. Have restrictions on use of lead fishing weights been introduced in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12)**

Yes

Please describe what restrictions are in place, when they were introduced and whether they are considered to have worked (i.e. reduced the impact of lead poisoning). Please attach any published or unpublished references.

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

**34. 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)**

Yes and being implemented

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

Yes

Please provide details

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

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

> The EIA process includes a public hearing.

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

**35. 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)**

Yes, all proposed projects

Please provide information on the outstanding cases

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

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

Yes

**36. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on how to avoid, minimize or mitigate impact of infrastructural developments and related disturbance affecting waterbirds?**

No

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

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

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

37.1. 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?

No

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

> Collisions with power lines are not considered a significant threat to waterbirds in Denmark - Bird species' status and trends reporting format for the period 2008-2012 under the EU Birds Directive:  
[http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run\\_conversion?file=dk/eu/art12/envuzv5nq/DK\\_birds\\_reports-14331-142817.xml&conv=343&source=remote](http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run_conversion?file=dk/eu/art12/envuzv5nq/DK_birds_reports-14331-142817.xml&conv=343&source=remote)

37.2. Have 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; and, if such studies identify any risks, has every effort been made to ensure these are avoided?

No

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

> Proposals for new power lines are subject to EIA which includes the assessment of impact on waterbirdspecies in the area.

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

No

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

> As above. In some areas existing power liners are now being laid under ground including in some wetland areas.

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

Yes

37.5. 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 and modified as a matter of priority?

No

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

> see 37.1

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

> see 37.1

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

No

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

> See 37.1

**38. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on how to avoid or mitigate impact of electricity power grids on migratory birds in the African-Eurasian region?**

No

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

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

No

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

> Not on a national scale. New constructions for renewable energy are subject to EIA including assessment of impact on waterbirdspecies in the area

39.2. Please describe what international environmental guidelines, recommendations and criteria are being followed in your country for renewable energy developments impact assessment and the utilization of renewable energy sources.

> EIA proces are done in accordance with the EU nature directives

39.3. 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?

> No. When wind-turbines first have been established, mitigations have not been implemented. Mostly only minor adverse effects are recorded

Please share information and lessons learnt from the post-construction monitoring and mitigation measures.

> There is a large volume of scientific papers and reports dealing with post-construction impacts of wind turbine installations both on land and from Danish waters. While most of these have demonstrated minor (if any) effects on offshore species, there are also a few examples of flight-avoidance behaviour or displacements of birds affected by wind-turbines. Reports published during the 2012-2014 reporting period: Skov H., Leonhard, S.B., Heinänen, S., Zydalis, R., Jensen, N.E., Durinck, J., Johansen, T.W., Jensen, B.P., Hansen, B.L., Piper, W. and Grøn, P.N. (2012). Horns Rev 2 Monitoring 2010-2012. Migrating Birds. Orbicon, DHI, Marine Observers and Biola. Report commissioned by DONG Energy  
Petersen, I.K, Mackenzie, M.L., Rexstad, E., Kidney, D. and Nielsen, R.D., 2013. Assessing cumulative impacts on long-tailed duck for the Nysted and Rødsand II offshore wind farms. Report commissioned by E.ON Vind Sverige AB. Aarhus University, DCE – Danish Centre for Environment and Energy. 28 pp.  
Petersen, I.K., Nielsen, R.D. and Mackenzie, M.L. (2014). Post-construction evaluation of bird abundances and distributions in the Horns Rev 2 offshore wind farm area, 2011 and 2012. Report commissioned by DONG Energy. Aarhus University, DCE – Danish Centre for Environment and Energy. 51 pp.

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

[Skov et al.2012 report](#)

[Petersen et al. 2013 report](#)

[Petersen et al. 2014 report](#)

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

No

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

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

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

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

39.6. Have any specific measures been put in place to assess, identify and reduce potential negative impacts of biofuel production on migratory waterbirds and their habitats?

Not applicable

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

No

**40. Is by-catch of waterbirds in fishing gear taking place in your country? (Resolution 3.8)**

Yes

Please provide details

> An ongoing project by NaturErhvervstyrelsen is currently evaluating the amount of by-catch of birds from spare time fisheries set nets in Natura 2000 sites. First results have just recently been published. Petersen, I.K.

and Nielsen, R.D. (2015). Omfanget af bifangster af fugle i nedgarn i fritidsfiskeriet i to NATURA2000-områder. - Notat fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi. 8 pp. 9 April 2015.

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

[First report on bycatch](#)

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

**41. 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)**

Not applicable

Please explain

> There are regulations on fishing practice concerning net gear, but no regulation concerning by-catch of waterbirds.

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 6.2. Other Human Activities**

> None.

# Pressures and Responses

## 7. Research and Monitoring

### 43. Does your country have waterbird monitoring schemes for the AEWA species in place? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 3, Target 3.2)

Yes

#### Covering the breeding period

Partially

Please provide details

> The main research institution involved with waterbird monitoring in Denmark is the DCE – Danish Centre for Environment and Energy and its affiliated Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University (former National Environmental Research Institute (NERI)). This department coordinates the national waterbird national monitoring scheme under the NOVANA programme on behalf of the Ministry of Environment and the Danish Nature Agency.

Breeding waterbirds are monitored in a joint venture between by the local units of the Nature Agency and Denmark volunteers, who report their data to the NOVANA programme. This is a programme initiated in 2004 and represents a more comprehensive monitoring programme for waterbirds, and since then has provided data on a more regular basis than hitherto, especially for breeding waterbirds with poor conservation status. The governmental NOVANA programme is thus focused on breeding EU-Birds Directive annex I species, and is being reported almost annually (latest report with 2012-2013 data, Pihl et al. 2015).

BirdLife Denmark runs a dedicated monitoring programme (partly financed by the Ministry of Environment) for breeding birds using the point-count survey method (latest report Heldbjerg et al. 2014).

BirdLife Denmark in 2014 initiated the third Danish national breeding bird atlas, running 2014-2017.

For rare breeding birds, the annual national bird observations report "Fugleåret", based on citizen science data typed into the BirdLife Denmark's web-based DOFbasen portal, likewise gives valuable information about their breeding occurrence in the country (latest report with 2013 data, Lange 2014).

Latest NOVANA report: Pihl, S., Holm, T.E., Nielsen, R.D., Clausen, P., Petersen, I.K., Laursen, K., Bregnballe, T. and Søgaard, B. 2015. Fugle 2013-2013. NOVANA. Aarhus Universitet. DCE – Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 170 pp. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 125. (link below)

Latest point-count report: Heldbjerg, H., Brandtberg, N. and Jørgensen, M.F. (2014): Overvågning af de almindelige fuglearter i Danmark 1975-2013. Årsrapport for Punktællingsprogrammet. Dansk Ornitologisk Forening. (link below)

Latest "Fugleåret" report: Lange, P. (ed.)(2014): Fugleåret 2013. Volume 8. 256 pp. (not electronically accessible)

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

[Latest NOVANA monitoring report](#)

[Latest BirdLife Denmark point-count report](#)

#### Covering the passage/migration period

Partially

Please provide details

> The governmental NOVANA programme for passage birds is focused on staging waterbirds for which Special Protection Areas have been designated under EU-Birds Directive legislation, but involves several annual or almost annual (partly or complete) national counts of several waterbirds, for which numbers in Denmark are of international significance in spring and/or autumn (latest report with 2012-2013 data, Pihl et al. 2015).

For rarer visiting staging and migrating waterbirds the annual national bird observations report "Fugleåret", based on citizen science data typed into the BirdLife Denmark's web-based DOFbasen portal, likewise gives valuable information about their staging numbers and migration over Denmark (latest report with 2013 data).

References – see above under breeding birds.

#### Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

Partially

Please provide details

> Wintering waterbirds are monitored by Department of Bioscience in a joint venture between professional staff and volunteer contributors from BirdLife Denmark and the Danish Hunters Association, and this has been so on a regular basis since 1965.

The governmental NOVANA programme part focused on wintering waterbirds contributes to all relevant International Waterbird Census (IWC) schemes.

This involve annual counts of 48 sites (reduced network sites) aimed at providing national trends for waterbirds, and contributing to the IWC midwinter census network. Complete national surveys of whooper and



bewick's swans and all goose species are also undertaken annually in mid-January, and a complete national survey of all waterbirds is undertaken every 3-4 years (latest report with 2012-2013 data, Pihl et al. 2015). For rarer visiting waterbirds the annual national bird observations report "Fugleåret", based on citizen science data typed into the BirdLife Denmark's web-based DOFbasen portal, likewise gives valuable information about their wintering occurrence in the country (latest report with 2013 data, Lange 2014).  
References - see above under breeding birds.

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

> Not during the present reporting period.

Denmark in the past worked jointly with Guinea-Bissau to develop monitoring of waterbirds in the Bijagos Archipelago.

Denmark regularly contribute with fundings to monitoring of waterbirds in Greenland (not AEWA member)

**45. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol?**

No

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

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

**46. Have any research programmes been established in your country in the last 5 years to address waterbird conservation priorities in accordance with the AEWA strategies and plans? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 3, Target 3.3)**

No

Please explain the reasons.

> The Avian Research Group of DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy at Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, is the largest waterbird research group in Denmark. Staff members of the Group in coordination with The Nature Agency regularly update research priorities related to waterbird management issues, initiate and maintain research on several waterbird species of major international or national conservation or management concern (e.g. alien species or species causing damage), including species covered by existing AEWA SSAPs (e.g. Black-tailed Godwit, Greenland White-fronted Goose), ISMP's (Pink-footed Goose), expected SSAP's/ISMP's (Taiga Bean Goose, Long-tailed Duck). Other research priorities are threatened species (e.g. Light-bellied Brent Goose, terns, meadow birds, Common Eiders)

**47. List (or provide links to lists) of research related to waterbirds and their conservation that has been undertaken or results published in the past triennium (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 3, Target 3.5)**

> The majority of breeding and staging waterbird monitoring data collected under the NOVANA programme have been made publicly available through the Danish Environment Data Portal during 2013-2014, and more will be published during 2015. Members of the Avian Research Group (mentioned above) publishes > 100 papers, reports, technical notes, and popular articles dealing with waterbird monitoring, ecology and management annually.

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

[Danish Environment Data portal](#)

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

**48. Has your government provided over the past triennium funds and/or logistical support for the International Waterbird Census at international or national level? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 3, Target 3.1)**

Yes

**Nationally**

Yes

Please provide details

> See above under section 43 - dealing with the non-breeding/wintering period.

### **Internationally**

Yes

Please provide details

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

Field for additional information (optional)

> None.

### **49. Has the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbirds been investigated in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12)**

No

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

No

Please provide reason(s)

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

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

> Two units within DCE - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy at Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, are engaged in research related to migratory waterbirds within the AEWA region, i.e. the "Arctic group" based in Roskilde and the "Avian Research Group" based in Kalø. Staff from both groups, however, carry out research on various issues both in Denmark and the Arctic - and occasionally elsewhere in Western Europe and North Africa, and generally together with a broad network of collaborators in other countries. Projects have thus within the past 15 years been carried out in Arctic Canada, Greenland, Svalbard, Arctic Russia, Iceland, Ireland, United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Egypt, and China. Project priorities are set once a year in close cooperation with the Game Management Council and the Danish Nature Agency. All projects have applied aspects, and are related to current management issues. Staff from the "Avian Research Group" in 2003 developed national criteria for assessment of favourable conservation status of species covered by the EU Birds Directive. A following evaluation of the conservation status for birds likewise published in 2003 found that most waterbird species have favourable conservation status, many fewer uncertain and/or unfavourable conservation status, a situation that is still the case, following more recent updates (e.g. Pihl et al. 2012, Nyegaard et al. 2014).

Pihl, S., Clausen, P., Petersen, I.K., Nielsen, R.D., Laursen, K., Bregnballe, T., Holm, T.E. and Søgaard, B. 2013. Fugle 2004-2011. NOVANA. Aarhus Universitet. DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi, 188 pp. - Videnskabelig rapport fra DCE - Nationalt Center for Miljø og Energi nr. 49. <http://www.dmu.dk/Pub/SR49.pdf>  
Nyegaard, T., Meltofte, H., Tofft, J. and Grell, M.B. (2014): Truede og sjældne ynglefugle i Danmark 1998-2012. - Dansk Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift 108: 1-144.

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

[Pihl et al. 2014](#)

[Nyegaard et al. 2014](#)

# Pressures and Responses

## 8. Education and Information

### 8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

**50. 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)**

No

Please explain the reasons

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

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

**51. Has a National AEWA Focal Point for Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) been nominated by your country? (Resolution 5.5)**

No

Please explain the reasons

> None appointed

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

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

No

Please explain the reasons

> see answer to point 50. In addition to that all Danish Hunters each year receive an electronic publication on subjects mainly relating to hunting but which may also include information on general conservation and protection issues.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

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

**54. 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? Please consider both national and international funding and different types of support provided. (Strategic Plan 2009- 2017, Objective 4, Target 4.1 and Resolution 3.10, Resolution 5.5)**

No

Please explain the reasons

> This has not been prioritised - resource constraints

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

**55. In Resolution 3.10 the Meeting of the Parties encouraged Contracting Parties to host AEWA**

**Exchange Centres for their respective regions. Has your country considered/shown interest in hosting a Regional AEWA Exchange Centre? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 3, Target 2 and Resolution 3.10)**

Not considered yet

Please provide details on the answer given above

> None

Field for additional information (optional)

> None

**56. Training for CEPA (Communication, Education and Public Awareness) at national level is supposed to be conducted by staff who have been trained in the framework of an AEWA Training of Trainers programme. Have staff who were trained as part of a Training of Trainers workshop conducted national CEPA training in your country in the past triennium? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 4, Target 4.2)**

Applicable only for countries in regions where Training of Trainers programme has taken place (for Eastern and Southern African countries in Naivasha, Kenya, May 2013, and for Lusophone African countries in Luanda, Angola, January 2014)

No

Please explain the reasons

> N/A

Field for additional information (optional)

> N/A

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 8.1. AEWA Communication Strategy**

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

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

## Pressures and Responses

### 9. Implementation

#### **57. Has your country approached non-contracting parties to encourage them to ratify the Agreement? (Resolution 3.10)**

Report only on activities over the past triennium

Yes

Please list all non-contracting parties, which were approached, and describe each case, including achieved progress

> Greenland has informally been contacted since last MoP.

#### **58. Has your country supported/developed international co-operation projects for the implementation of the Agreement, according to the priorities outlined in the AEWA International Implementation Tasks (IIT) for the current triennium? (Resolution 5.3)**

No

Please explain the reasons

> Denmark annually contributes approximately 29,500 EURO to Wetlands International mainly for their role in the International waterbird Census

#### **59. Has your country donated funds to the AEWA Small Grants Fund over the past triennium? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 5, Target 5.4)**

No

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of resources.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of resources.

#### **61. 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 2009-2017, Objective 5, Target 5.7)**

No

Please explain the reasons

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

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

No

Please explain the reasons

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

#### **63. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated and engaged with national processes to implement and to assess delivery of the CBD Strategic Plan 2011 - 2020 including the Aichi targets?**

No

# Pressures and Responses

## 10. Climate Change

### 65. Please outline relevant climate change research, assessments and/or adaptation measures that are relevant to migratory waterbirds and which have been undertaken or planned in your country. (Resolution 5.13)

a. Research and studies of climate change impacts on waterbirds

Undertaken

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

> Department of Bioscience at Aarhus University has participated in the NOWAC (Nordic Waterbirds And Climate) network <http://www.ducksg.org/activities/nowac/>, a research collaboration aimed at exploring already observed and/or expected impacts of climate change of waterbirds in the northern parts of Europe. The network has published several papers on the issue, including species-specific studies of tufted duck, common merganser, goldeneye, smew, and dabbling ducks:

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

Dalby, L., Söderquist, P., Christensen, T.K., Clausen, P., Einarsson, Á., Elmberg, J., Fox, A.D., Holmqvist, N., Langendoen, T., Lehikoinen, A., Lindström, Å., Lorentsen, S.-H., Nilsson, L., Pöysä, H., Rintala, J., Sigfússon, A. and Svenning, J.-C. (2013) The status of the Nordic populations of the Mallard in a changing world. - *Ornis Fennica* 90: 2-15.

Dalby, L., Fox, A.D., Petersen, I.K., Svenning, J.-C. and Delany, S. (2013) Temperature does not dictate the wintering distributions of European dabbling duck species. - *Ibis* 155: 80-88.

Pavon-Jordan, D., Fox, A.D., Clausen, P., Dagys, M., Deceuninck, B., Devos, K., Hearn, R.D., Holt, C.A., Hornman, M., Keller, V., Langendoen, T., Ławicki, L., Lorentsen, S.H., Luingujo, L., Meissner, W., Musil, P., Nilsson, L., Paquet, J.Y., Stipnicie, A., Stroud, D.A., Wahl, J., Zanatello, M. and Lehikoinen, A. (2015) Climate-driven changes in winter waterbird abundance in relation to EU protected areas. - *Diversity and Distributions* 21: 571-582.

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 22 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

> Department of Bioscience at Aarhus University has undertaken a study that explores to which extent light-bellied brent geese from the endangered East Atlantic Flyway-population (currently 6,900 birds, listed in Category A1c in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan) and other waterbirds may be affected under future sea level rise scenarios. The studies document major habitat losses that may have negative impacts on the waterbirds, and pin-points some mitigation measures.

Clausen, K.K., Stjernholm, M. and Clausen, P. (2013). Grazing management can counteract the impacts of climate change-induced sea level rise on salt marsh-dependent waterbirds. - *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 528-537.

Clausen, K.K. and Clausen, P. (2014). Forecasting future drowning of coastal waterbird habitats reveals a major conservation concern. - *Biological Conservation* 171: 177-185.

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

> The NOWAC network - mentioned above, has compiled two reviews on this issue:

Guillemain, M., Poysa, H., Fox, A.D., Arzel, C., Dessborn, L., Ekroos, J., Gunnarsson, G., Holm, T.E., Christensen, T.K., Lehikoinen, A., Mitchell, C., Rintala, J. and Møller, A.P. (2013): Effects of climate change on European ducks: what do we know and what do we need to know? - *Wildlife Biology* 19: 404-419.

Fox, A.D., Jónsson, J.E., Aarvak, T., Bregnballe, T., Christensen, T.K., Clausen, K., Clausen, P., Dalby, L., Holm, T.E., Jordan, D.P., Laursen, K., Lehikoinen, A., Lorentsen, S.-H., Møller, A.P., Nordström, M., Öst, M. Söderquist, P.

and Therkildsen, O.R. (in review): Current and potential threats to Nordic duck populations – a horizon scanning exercise.

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

No relevant activities

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 23 in Section 5, sub-section 5.2 investigates national measures for increasing resilience of the ecological network for waterbirds to climate change).

No relevant activities

f. Other undertaken or planned relevant activities.

No

**66. Has your country used the AEWA Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds to adapt to climate change?**

No

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 9. Implementation**

> None.

## Pressures and Responses

### 11. Avian Influenza

**67. 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?**

67.1 List challenges

> None.

The last major evidence for Avian Influenza in Denmark is from 2010, where 230 (10.4%) out of 2194 sampled birds were tested AI positive. None of these, however, with HPAI, but only low pathogenic variants of AI.

67.2 List required further guidance or information

> None.

67.3 Field for additional information (optional)

> Occurrence of Avian Influenza has been monitored in dead or live-caught birds in Denmark since 2006. Avian Influenza are stored and publicly available at the National Portal . Data on sampled birds and occurrence of Avian Influenza (see link below).

Numbers of birds analyzed have, however, been very low in recent years, with 18 sampled birds in 2012 (including 2 Oystercatchers *Haematopus ostralegus* with low-pathogenic AI), 10 sampled in 2013 (none with AI), and 10 sampled in 2014 (none with AI).

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

[National Portal of Avian Influenza](#)

**Optionally you can provide additional information on section 10. Avian Influenza**

> None.



## **12. Confirmation**

### **Confirmation of information verification and approval for submission**

#### **Please confirm:**

In addition a scanned copy of an official letter from the relevant state institution, approving the report for submission, can be attached.

I declare that the information provided in the Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2012-2014 has been verified and the report has been approved for submission by the appropriate state institution in the country.

#### **Date of submission**

> 03-06-2015