



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

1. General Information

Name of reporting Contracting Party

> Hungary

Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

> 01.03.2003

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

> Department for Nature Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture

Name and title of the head of institution

> Dr. Rozalia Szekeres Érdiné, Head of Department

Mailing address - Street and number

> Kossuth ter 11.

P.O.Box

> 1860 Budapest

Postal code

> H-1055

City

> Budapest

Country

> Hungary

Telephone

> +36-1-7952-397

Fax

> +36-1-795-0069

E-mail

> rozalia.szekeres.erdine@fm.gov.hu

Website

> www.termeszetvedelem.hu

Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

> Mr. Zoltan Czirak, Councillor

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Unit, Department for Nature Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address - Street and number

> Kossuth ter 11.

P.O.Box

> 1860 Budapest

Postal code

> H-1055

City

> Budapest

Country

> Hungary

Telephone

> +36-1-7952-046

Fax

> +36-1-795-0069

E-mail

> zoltan.czirak@fm.gov.hu

Website

> www.termesztvedelem.hu

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

Name and title of the TC NFP

> Mr. Andras Schmidt, Deputy Head of Department

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Natura 2000 Unit, Department for Nature Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address - Street and number

> Kossuth ter 11.

P.O.Box

> 1860 Budapest

Postal code

> H-1055

City

> Budapest

Country

> Hungary

Telephone

> +36-1-7952-399

Fax

> +36-1-795-0080

E-mail

> andras.schmidt@fm.gov.hu

Website

> www.termesztvedelem.hu

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

Name and title of the CEPA NFP

> CEPA NFP not appointed yet

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

> Mrs. Orsolya Dobó-Kiss Ministry of Agriculture/Animal Health and Coordination Unit

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.

No

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)

Please provide further details, including the relevant legislation

> Act No. 55 of 1996 on conservation of game, game management and hunting

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)

- No

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

> The teal (*Anas crecca*) and goldeneye (*Bucephala clangula*) became fully protected species since 01.10.2012. At the same time, the greylag goose is huntable again. (Open season from 01.10. - 12. 31., daily bag limit 2 specimens)

Therefore currently only four native wildfowl (*Anser fabalis*, *Anser albifrons*, *Anser anser* and *Anas platyrhynchos*) and the coot (*Fulica atra*) are huntable.

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 Hungary

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.

> Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület (2003): Veszélyeztetett madarak fajvédelmi tervei.

Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület, Budapest. 160 p.

Monitoring; restrictions imposed on farmers in some cases annually in order to save breeding of Corncrake.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Gallinago media*

(Great Snipe)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> The great snipe is a rare transient migrant across to Hungary. All potential migration stopover sites for this species are protected, the species is strictly protected, no other conservation measures are needed.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Aythya nyroca*

(Ferruginous Duck)

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.

> Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület (2003): Veszélyeztetett madarak fajvédelmi tervei. Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület, Budapest. 160 p.

The Environment and Energy Operation Programme supported/support 44 projects that contained wetland restorations. Half of these projects (22) consisted/consist purely of wetland restoration. The 44 projects cover 76 602 ha Natura 2000 areas (not all wetlands), the 22 purely wetland projects cover 39453 ha. Regular waterbirds census.

Control of the time and extent of seaweed cutting in order to ensure successful breeding; leaving the reed stands, finishing harvest in February.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Oxyura leucocephala*

(White-headed Duck)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> The species went extinct as a breeding bird in the sixties. Nowadays, the species is only a vagrant. The species is strictly protected, but at this time no further activities are necessary.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Platalea leucorodia*

(Eurasian Spoonbill)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> We have several action plans for the management of protected areas, and where it is necessary they include actions how to protect spoonbills.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Anser erythropus*

(Lesser White-fronted Goose)

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.

> Bogyó, D., Ecsedi, Z., Tár, J. & Zalai, T. 2014. [Hungarian National Action Plan for Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*).] Calandrella XVII. 1-93. (In Hungarian with English summary)

National working group was established in order to work and finalize a NSAP in the framework of an EU LIFE+ Project in 2013. Now, the working group is not active daily, but in acute cases, the working group can discuss new questions using the mailing list provided by the Hortobágy National Park Directorate.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Branta ruficollis*

(Red-breasted Goose)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> Formerly the species was a rare visitor in Hungary. In autumn of 2014, more than 2000 individuals visited Hungary. If this increasing importance of Hungarian sites will be continuing, the NSSAP will be necessary. The species is strictly protected and also benefits from the implementation of NSSAP of Lesser Whitefront.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Limosa limosa*

(Black-tailed Godwit)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> All of the important Black-tailed Godwit's habitats are protected. Wetland restorations have taken place, partly for this species, and management efforts are also taken at numerous sites (grazing instead of mowing, elimination of invasive species). Agri-environmental schemes is also promoted to encourage a management of agricultural areas supporting breeding Black-tailed Godwit and other wetland species (such as Common Redshank) too.

The species is strictly protected. No additional conservation measures are needed at this time.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Glareola nordmanni*

(Black-winged Pratincole)

No NSSAP

Please explain the reasons

> The bird breeds occasionally in Hungary. The species is strictly protected. There are a lot of conservation efforts to save collared pratincoles. The black-winged pratincole has also benefits from these measures,.

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 *Ciconia nigra* / Black Stork

For *Ciconia nigra* / Black Stork

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> Kalocsa B. & Tamás E. (2003): Fekete gólya (*Ciconia nigra*). In: [Haraszthy L. (szerk.)]: Veszélyeztetett madarak fajvédelmi tervei. Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület, Budapest: 19-26.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Ciconia ciconia* / White Stork

For *Ciconia ciconia* / White Stork

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> http://www.termeszettvedelem.hu/_user/browser/File/FajmegorzesiTervek/fehergolya_fmt_2013.pdf
The NSSAP was adopted in 2013.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Glareola pratincola* / Collared Pratincole

For *Glareola pratincola* / Collared Pratincole

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> Csíder I. & Monoki Á. (2013): Székicsér *Glareola pratincola* (Linnaeus, 1766). In: Sallai R. B. (szerk.): Veszélyeztetett Natura 2000-es fajok egyesületi fajvédelmi tervei. Nimfea Természetvédelmi Egyesület, [Túrkeve]: 133-152.

National Single Species Action Plan for *Charadrius alexandrinus* / Kentish Plover

For *Charadrius alexandrinus* / Kentish Plover

NSSAP in place and being implemented

Please provide details

> 1. Pigniczki, Cs. (2006): Fajmegőrzési tervek. Széki lile. Környezetvédelmi és Vízügyi Minisztérium, Természetvédelmi Hivatal, 2006.
2. Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület (2003): Veszélyeztetett madarak fajvédelmi tervei. Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület, Budapest. 160 p.

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?
> The Kentish Plover Action Plan and the action plans produced by BirdLife/MME follow more or less the format of BirdLife International (2001): European Union action plans for eight priority bird species.

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

> Because no emergency situation has occurred in Hungary.

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)

Yes

Please provide details on the register

> No re-establishment has taken place since Hungary's accession to AEWA.

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

> Article 14 (2) of the Act on nature conservation No. 53 of 1996: "... the re-establishment of any wild species requires permission from the nature conservation authority."

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

> see answer for 12.

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

> Control of invasive alien species is incorporated into Act No. 53 of 1996 on nature conservation, into the National Nature Conservation Master Plan (chapter 5.4.1.2.5) and also into the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and into legislation and programmes of certain sectoral activities such as common health, plant protection, animal husbandry. Article 9 (4) of the Act No. 53 of 1996 on nature conservation: "The introduction of any living organism that is new to the flora or fauna of the country can only be permitted if their establishment does not change natural processes harmfully to native species." No introduction of non-native waterbird species has been planned or is being planned in the triennium. The permitting procedure in the case of introduction of non-native species is the nature conservation authority (except in the case of huntable species, where it is the hunting authority).

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

> 3/2001 joint Decree No. 3 of February, 2001 of KöM-FVM-NKÖM-BM on the detailed rules of establishment, operation and maintenance of Zoos and establishment for care of animals.
The rules are enforced by nature conservation authorities.

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)?

Being developed

Please provide starting date and expected finalisation date of the process

> The structure and main contents have been elaborated, but because the EU adopted a new regulation on invasive species, the national action plan will be finalised in the near future in the light of implementation of the EU legislation. At present, Hungary tries to contribute to the EU list of invasive species.

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)

Not applicable

Please explain

> At the moment, non-native waterbird species occur in Hungary only as vagrants. There are some accepted records of Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), Egyptian goose (*Alopochen aegyptiaca*) and ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*).

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

> EU funding has been and will be secured for local eradication of invasive species, and there have been such projects in the reporting period, but they did not concentrate on aquatic weeds, rather on riverside, semi-aquatic habitats etc. and they were not focussed on waterbird habitat conservation.

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

Yes

Please provide details

> Article 9 (4) of the Act No. 53 of 1996 on nature conservation: "The introduction of any living organism that is new to the flora or fauna of the country can only be permitted if their establishment does not change natural processes harmfully to native species." No introduction of non-native waterbird species has been planned or is being planned in the triennium. The permitting procedure in the case of introduction of non-native species is the nature conservation authority (except in the case of huntable species, where it is the hunting authority).

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

> In 1998 the MME published a book titled Important Bird Areas in Hungary, which analyses the situation of wild birds in Hungary and focuses on the major conservation issues affecting birds and their habitats. New research carried out by BirdLife Hungary and its Partners suggest 43 Important Bird Areas (IBAs) for conserving a wide range of biodiversity.

- The Proposed Special Protection Areas of Birds and their Habitats in Hungary, published by MME in 2002, identifies the proposed national network of Special protection Areas (SPAs) for the Birds Directive Annex I species and the migratory birds, where birds and their habitats have to be maintained in a good conservation status.

SPAs were designated by the Government in October 2004. In 2007, the European Commission launched an infringement procedure against Hungary for insufficient designation of the SPA network. The Commission's arguments practically did not concern waterbirds, the focus was on raptors and other terrestrial species. Hungary replied to the Commission's arguments and in 2010, designated further sites (SPAs), after which the European Commission closed the infringement procedure, which means the network can be considered complete (including for waterbirds).

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?

Not applicable

Please explain

> The SPA network was identified in line with guidance from the European Commission and the provisions of the Birds Directive. Nationally protected areas were also designated much before the guidelines were approved.

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

No

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

> 26

Total area (ha)

> 481648.9

Out of the above total: number of protected sites

> 26

Out of the above total: protected area (ha)

> 481648.9

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

> 14

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

> 180465.2

All sites of national importance

Total number

> 20

Total area (ha)

> 378175.3

Out of the above total: number protected sites

> 18

Out of the above total: protected area (ha)

> 377742.5

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

> 10

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

> 232874

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

No

Please explain the reasons

> Designation of nationally and internationally important sites includes the buffer zones of wetland habitats.

Examples of best practice (optional)

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

> There is no outstanding example of management planning or implementation.

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)

No

Please explain the reasons

> All internationally and nationally important sites are designated.

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, AEW Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 1, Target 1.2)

No

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of capacity

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

Yes

Please provide details

> The main elements of the guidelines have been incorporated into the management practice of the national park directorates responsible for the management of these sites.

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

No

Please explain the reasons

> The network of SPAs was elaborated based on the advice of MME/BirdLife Hungary and the data of the Hungarian national park directorates, as well as guidance from the European Commission and the criteria of the Birds Directive.

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

> Internationally important sites (Special Protection Areas that overlap with Ramsar sites which are of international importance for waterbirds):

Balaton, Balatoni-berkek, Kis-Balaton, Bodrogzug - Kopasz-hegy - Taktaköz, Borsodi-sík, Béda-Karapanca, Gemenc, Pacsmagi-tavak, Sárvíz völgye, Tatai Öreg-tó, Velencei-tó és Dinnyési-fertő, Fertő, Hortobágy, Kis-Sárrét, Alsó-Tisza-völgy, Csongrád-bokrosi Sóstó, Felső-kiskunsági szikes puszták és turjánvidék, Gátéri Fehér-tó, Izsáki Kolon-tó, Kiskunsági szikes tavak és az őrjegi turjánvidék, Ócsa (not an SPA, but an SAC and is nationally protected), Ipoly völgye, Hanság, Felső-Tisza, Cserebökényi-puszták, Tisza Alpár-Bokrosi ártéri öblözete

Nationally important sites (Special Protection Areas designated for waterbirds but not Ramsar sites plus 5 nationally important areas outside the SPA network)

SPAs:

Mórichelyi-halastavak, Hevesi-sík, Kesznyéten, Belső-Somogy, Nyugat-Dráva, Jászkarajenői puszták, Zámolyi medence, Szigetköz, Bihar, Jászság, Közép-Tisza, Szatmár-Bereg, Dévaványai-sík, Kígyósi-puszták, Vásárhelyi és Csanádi-puszták

Plus 5 nationally important areas:

Pellérdi-halastavak, Sumonyi-halastavak, Baláta-tó TT, Sárosfői-halastavak TT, Tiszavasvári Fehér-szik TT

Sites with management plans in place:

Balatoni berkek, Kis-Balaton, Pacsmagi-tavak, Velencei-tó és Dinnyési-fertő, Fertő, Kis-Sárrét, Felső-kiskunsági szikes puszták és turjánvidék, Gátéri Fehér-tó, Izsáki Kolon-tó, Kiskunsági szikes tavak és az őrjegi turjánvidék, Cserebökényi-puszták, Tisza Alpár-bokrosi ártéri öblözete, Borsodi-sík, Hanság;Szigetköz, Kesznyéten, Bihar, Tiszavasvári fehér-szik

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

> Act No. 55 of 1996 on game protection, game management and hunting contained the obligation to establish the national game management database. This has been fulfilled and the Szent István University is responsible for maintaining the database. All hunters have the obligation to yearly report the number of individuals /game species hunted on their hunting territory.

The whole territory of your country

> The Act applies in the whole territory of the country.

All harvesting activities

> The Act applies to all legal harvesting activities. Act No. 55 of 1996 on game protection, game management and hunting contained the obligation to establish the national game management database. This has been fulfilled and the Szent István University is responsible for maintaining the database. All hunters have the obligation to yearly report the number of individuals /game species hunted on their hunting territory.

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?

> June, 2005 Ministerial Decree No. 56/2005 (VI.25.) FVM, amending the implementation decree of the Act on game protection, game management and hunting, has been adopted. In compliance with the regulation the use of leadshot is forbidden by force of law on wetlands from 15th August, 2005.

The rules are enforced by hunting authorities.

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

No

Please explain the reasons for not doing this

> Lack of capacity.

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

> Lack of capacity.

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

> On the basis of Act No. 55 of 1996 on game protection, game management and hunting, in the case of small game hunting (including wildfowl) by foreign hunters, the hunting organisations are obliged to inform the regional nature conservation authority in advance about the time and location of the hunting in order to secure the nature conservation inspectors to check the legality of the hunting.

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)

Club Affiliation

Game Management Plans

Other (please specify)

> The above best practice is incorporated in the Hungarian legislation on hunting. Bird identification tests have been recently supplied with good photo material.

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

Yes

Please provide details

> The system of no or reduced waterfowl hunting zones (core areas) is incorporated in the Hungarian legislation on hunting. The harvest data system is fully in line with AEWA guidelines.

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)

No

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

> Overall regulation of environmental protection is ensured by the Act No. 53 of 1995. 314/2005 Governmental Decree lays down the detailed rules on Environmental Impact Assessment in Hungary. Certain activities (which may negatively affect migratory waterbird species as well) are subject to obligatory detailed EIA, like the construction of motorways, highways, railways, public roads longer than 10 km, 220 kV power lines longer than 15 km. Other activities, like redistribution of land property (in case of protected areas, ecological corridors or lands larger than 300 hectares), alteration of intensive agricultural land-use, meliorization, establishment of animal husbandry facilities in certain cases, construction of 120 kV power lines and 2 MW wind turbine.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

> The public is involved in line with the EIA Directive of the EU.

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

> SEA/EIA are obligatory for certain projects in line with EU regulations, but there has been no project proposal in the reporting period that would have seriously affected waterbirds or their habitats.

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?

No

Please explain why not

> SEA/EIA are obligatory for certain projects in line with EU regulations, but there has been no project proposal in the reporting period that would have seriously affected waterbirds or their habitats.

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

Yes

Please provide details

> The relevant EU legislation includes the main elements of the AEWA guidelines, and as an EU member state, Hungary applies EU legislation.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

> The relevant stakeholders are consulted annually in the frame of the Accessible Sky programme (national scheme for the bird-friendly conversion of the power line system in Hungary), running since 2008.

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?

> Waterbird populations, among a number of other conservation aspects, are considered by the authorities when granting consent to a power line, but not in such detail (e.g. over a period of 5+ years) often due to lack of data. However, every effort is made to ensure the elimination of harmful effects.

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.

Yes

Please provide details

> Protected areas, SPAs etc are considered by the authorities under legislation when deciding about consenting to a new power line.

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

Please provide details

> In the frame of the Accessible Sky programme, bird-safe designs are jointly planned by conservationists and electric engineers.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

> In the frame of the Accessible Sky programme, a number of priority power lines have been retrofitted from EU co-financing.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

> Monitoring is organised annually by BirdLife Hungary. The effectiveness of retrofitting projects is monitored under the EU funded projects. The effectiveness of mitigation measures is only irregularly monitored.

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?

> It is not included in the National Biodiversity Strategy, however, it is included in the National Nature Conservation Master Plan.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

> The guidelines have been incorporated in the implementation of the Accessible Sky programme.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

> A national sensitivity and zoning map of protected areas, Natura 2000 network etc. was produced in 2007 for wind farms.

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.

> EU legislation (Habitats Directive, Birds Directive, EIA/SEA directives) and the Espoo Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment.

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?

No

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

Not applicable

Please explain

> The regulation provides for avoidance and mitigation of damage, but no such case occurred in the reporting period.

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:

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

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?

No

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

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

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?
> It is not included in the National Biodiversity Strategy, however, it is included in the National Nature Conservation Master Plan.

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

Not applicable

Please explain

> Hungary is a landlocked country, without marine fishing.

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

> Hungary is a landlocked country, without marine fishing.

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

> - National waterfowl monitoring carried out 8 months a year (August through April) aiming to detect the dynamics of breeding birds and migratory birds and carrying out synchronic censuses on Ramsar and important migratory sites.

- Rare and Colonial Nesting Bird Monitoring: The primary aim is to estimate the rare and colonial nesting bird populations and its change in long-term period for example: cormorants and herons.

Covering the passage/migration period

Partially

Please provide details

> - National waterfowl monitoring carried out 8 months a year (August through April) aiming to detect the dynamics of breeding birds and migratory birds and carrying out synchronic censuses on Ramsar and important migratory sites.

No regular national monitoring scheme exists for waders, gulls and terns.

Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

Fully

Please provide details

> - National waterfowl monitoring carried out 8 months a year (August through April) aiming to detect the dynamics of breeding birds and migratory birds and carrying out synchronic censuses on Ramsar and important migratory sites.

No regular national monitoring scheme exists for waders, gulls and terns.

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

> Lack of capacity.

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

Yes

Please provide details

> The monitoring system is fully in line with the AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol.

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.

> Lack of funding

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 Magyar Vízivad Közlemények (Hungarian Wildfowl Bulletin) publishes wildfowl monitoring data from numerous Hungarian wetlands, including many Ramsar sites.

Bóhm András: VÁLTOZÁSOK MAGYARORSZÁG NEMZETKÖZI JELENTŐSÉGŰ VIZES ÉLŐHELYEINEK ÖKOLÓGIAI HELYZETÉBEN. 33-78. [pdf]

Changes in ecological state of wetlands of international importance in Hungary (in Hungarian with English summary)

Barabás Lilla: A HAZAI RÉCEFAJOK FÉSZKELŐ-ÁLLOMÁNYAINAK ELTERJEDÉSE. 79-120. [pdf]

Breeding distribution of Hungarian duck species (in Hungarian with English summary)

Kovács Gyula: A 2009 NOVEMBERI VÍZIMADÁR-FELMÉRÉS EREDMÉNYEI A BALATONON ÉS A KÖRNYEZŐ VIZESÉLŐHELYEKEN. 153-160. [pdf]

Results of waterbird census (November 2009) at LakeBalaton and its surrounding wetlands (in Hungarian with English summary)

Kovács Gyula: A 2010 NOVEMBERI VÍZIMADÁR-FELMÉRÉS EREDMÉNYEI A BALATONON ÉS A KÖRNYEZŐ VIZESÉLŐHELYEKEN. 161-168. [pdf]

Results of waterbird census (November 2010) at LakeBalaton and its surrounding wetlands (in Hungarian with English summary)

Kovács Gyula: A 2011 NOVEMBERI VÍZIMADÁR-FELMÉRÉS EREDMÉNYEI A BALATONON ÉS A KÖRNYEZŐ VIZESÉLŐHELYEKEN. 169-176. [pdf]

Results of waterbird census (November 2011) at LakeBalaton and its surrounding wetlands (in Hungarian with English summary)

Bátty Gellért & Csonka Péter: A FERENCMAJORI-HALASTAVAK VONULÓ VÍZIMADARAINAK MONITORINGJA A 2002-2011 KÖZÖTTI IDŐSZAKBAN. 177-196. [pdf]

Monitoring of migratory waterbirds of Fishponds at Ferencmajor in the period 2002-2011 (in Hungarian with English summary)

Gál János, Gosztonyi Livia & Faragó Sándor: A KÁRÓKATONA (Phalacrocorax carbo) BIOMETRIAI PARAMÉTEREI, IVARI ÉS KORVISZONYAI, VALAMINT ÁLLAT-EGÉSZSÉGÜGYI HELYZETE MAGYARORSZÁGON. 197-210. [pdf]

Biometrical parameters, sexual and age relations and health situation of Great Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) in Hungary (in Hungarian with English summary)

Keresztessy Katalin, Gosztonyi Livia & Faragó Sándor: A KÁRÓKATONA (Phalacrocorax carbo) HALFOGYASZTÁSA MAGYARORSZÁGON. 211-238. [pdf]

Fish consumption of Great Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) in Hungary (in Hungarian with English summary)

Faragó Sándor & Gosztonyi Livia: A KÁRÓKATONA (Phalacrocorax carbo) VONULÓ ÉS TELELŐÁLLOMÁNYA MAGYARORSZÁGON (1996-2012). 239-274. [pdf]

Population number of Great Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) migrating and wintering in Hungary (1996-2012) (in Hungarian with English summary)

Faragó Sándor & Gosztonyi Livia: A SZÜRKE GÉM (Ardea cinerea) VONULÓ ÉS TELELŐÁLLOMÁNYA MAGYARORSZÁGON (1996-2012). 275-310. [pdf]

Population number of Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) migrating and wintering in Hungary (1996-2012) (in Hungarian with English summary)

Faragó Sándor: A TAVASZI ERDEI SZALONKA VADÁSZAT KIALAKULÁSÁNAK TÖRTÉNETE ÉS FENNTARTÁSÁNAK INDOKAI MAGYARORSZÁGON. 311-332. [pdf]

History of development of spring Woodcock shooting and arguments its maintenance in Hungary (in Hungarian with English summary)

Tamás Ádám & Agócs Péter: A DUNA DUNAFÖLDVÁR ÉS BAJA KÖZÖTTI SZAKASZA (1560-1479 FKM) VÍZIMADÁR-ÁLLOMÁNYÁNAK VIZSGÁLATA. 349-426. [pdf]

Study of waterbird populations on the Danube between Dunaföldvár and Baja (1560-1479 rkm) (in Hungarian with English summary)

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

> National waterfowl monitoring carried out 8 months a year (August through April) was financed by the Ministry of Agriculture.

Internationally

No

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of financial resources.

49. Has the impact of lead fishing weights on watebirds 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)

> Lack of financial resources.

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)

Yes, being implemented

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

> Awareness-raising is a long-practised activity in the country:

its elements are partly in the acts on the media, on public education, on environmental protection and nature conservation, in concepts on public health, family policy and youth policy and are applied in connection with our accession to international conventions (Aarhus Convention) on the access to information.

CEPA was incorporated into some sectoral policies (e.g. National Environmental Programme, Vásárhelyi plan, National River Basin Management Plan under the Water Framework Directive) aiming at raising awareness of natural values and services and integrating their protection.

“Forest school network”: educational institutions that provide nature conservation training and education.

Visitor centres operate in the territory of each national park directorate.

No special support for biodiversity awareness raising but the theme is included into environmental education programmes and activities supported by the government and local governments and main organisers are visitor centres of national parks, NGOs, schools.

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

No

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

> CEPA NFP not appointed yet, but will be appointed in the near future.

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

> Lack of capacity.

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

> Lack of capacity

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)

Yes

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

Please provide details in the corresponding box below

National Level Funding and Support

> EU co-financing sources have been allocated for the support of, for example, the establishment of visitor

centres (including at wetlands), nature trails etc.

54.2 Has your country provided any funding or support towards the implementation of priority communication activities listed in the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009 - 2017 (Resolution 5.5)?

No

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of capacity

54.3 Has your country provided any funding or support to the revision process of Communication Strategy?

No

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of capacity

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

> Lack of funding does not make it feasible.

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

> In 2014, Russia contacted with Hungary - inter alia - on the conservation of wildfowl populations and on the possible ratification of the Agreement. Hungary gave some detailed information on this issue to Russia.

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)

Yes

Please list the IIT projects (see the full roster here) to which grants have been provided or for which initiatives have been undertaken and briefly provide any relevant information

> Hungary participated in an international LIFE project to save the European population of *Anser erythropus*; Hungary also participated in the Danube Parks project. Hungary has finalised its network of Special Protection Areas (EU scheme). Hungary participates in IWC. Hungary participated in a project to fit individuals of *Anser fabalis* and *Anser albifrons* with radio telemetry.

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 funding opportunities.

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 funding opportunities.

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)

Yes, it is operational on a regular basis

Please provide details

> National coordination takes place for numerous things covered by AEWA (for example drafting of legislation on waterbird hunting) even though this coordination is not taking place specifically for AEWA.

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)

Yes

Please provide details on each twinning arrangement

> Hungary has four transboundary Ramsar sites: Lake Fertő/Neusiedl with Austria, Ipoly/Ipel, Baradla Cave system and Upper Tisza Ramsar sites with Slovakia (see site descriptions at: <http://www.ramsar.org/sites-countries/the-ramsar-sites>) The transboundary Mura-Dráva-Duna Biosphere Reserve was established with Croatia in 2013.

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?

Yes

Please provide details

> Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Unit is responsible for both AEWA and CBD.

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

> Increased harmonisation of reporting obligations would help our work.

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of capacity

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

> Boros, Ecsedi, Oláh (ed) (2013): Ecology and management of soda pans in the Carpathian Basin. Hortobágy Environmental Association, Balmaúzjváros.

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

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of capacity

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

Undertaken

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

> <http://www.vahavahalozat.hu/files/vahava-2010-12-korigalt-2.pdf>

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

Please explain the reasons

> Lack of capacity

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

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

> Lack of capacity

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

> From the animal health point of view, the online reporting system of the EU and the OIE represent a sufficient and detailed database.

67.2 List required further guidance or information

> No further guidance or information is required.

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

> 12.05.2015.