



Secretariat provided by the
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Agenda item 18
Doc. StC 4.11
20 October 2006

FOURTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

20-21 November 2006, Bonn, Germany

SYNTHESIS OF INFORMATION PROVIDED BY AEWA PARTIES AND SIGNATORIES THROUGH NATIONAL REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT FOR THE TRIENNIUM 2003-2005

Prepared by the Secretariat

AEWA Contracting Parties (53¹ out of 117 Range States or 45%)

Africa (21; 40 %): Benin, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritius, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda

Eurasia (32; 60 %): Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (the FYR), Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan

AEWA Parties that have provided National Reports (as of 14 February 2006) (34; 69% of due reports)²

Africa (10; 53% of due reports): Congo, Djibouti, Guinea (not in the required report format), Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Niger, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania

Eurasia (24; 80% of due reports): Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Georgia, Hungary, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (the FYR), Moldova, Monaco, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Netherlands, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan

¹ Number of Contracting Parties as of 1 January 2006.

² Parties that joined the Agreement after 1st of October 2005 were not requested to provide a National Report.

AEWA Parties that have not provided National Reports (15; 41% of due reports; as of 14 February 2006)

Africa (9; 47% of due reports): Benin, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Mali, Nigeria, Sudan, Togo, Uganda

Eurasia (6; 20% of due reports): Finland, France, Israel, Portugal, Romania, Syria

AEWA Signatory States that have provided National Reports (as of 14 February 2006) (2)

Africa (1): Morocco

Eurasia (1): Belgium

AEWA Parties as of 01 October 2005 or later that were not required to provide National Reports (4)

Africa (2): Ghana, Tunisia

Eurasia (2): the European Union, Latvia

INTRODUCTION

Contracting Parties shall submit National Reports to each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties (not later than one hundred and twenty days before its opening) in the format agreed by MOP1 for national reporting. A preliminary synthesis based on the reports provided by Contracting Parties by 30 September 2005, i.e. 23, and by Signatories, i.e. 2, in total 25 National Reports, was presented by the Secretariat to MOP3 in the end of October 2005. In its Resolution 3.4 MOP called upon all Contracting Parties that had not done yet so to submit reports by 31 December 2005, and the Secretariat to perform analysis of all received reports and make results available to the Parties and the Technical Committee by the end of February 2006. The Secretariat gave the opportunity to the parties to provide their reports by 14 February 2006. As a result 11 more Parties submitted reports.

This synthesis reflects all sections of the national reporting format that are easily quantifiable and some of the descriptive ones where majority of reporting parties gave informative answers. In a number of cases parties and signatories provided irrelevant responses to questions, or not reported at all. This created obstacles for producing a representative analysis. The insufficient quality of reports should be addressed in the next round of reporting for MOP4.

Current final synthesis is based on 33 reports by Contracting Parties and two by Signatory States: in total 35 reports. The National Report of Guinea was excluded from this analysis for the reason that the information provided not in the required format was not sufficient and comparable.

This paper presents an interpretation by the Secretariat of information provided by Parties and Signatories in their National Reports. If any discrepancies are found, please inform the Secretariat.

SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS

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

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

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

Good progress has been made in research on species and their habitats in some regions of the Agreement area and monitoring schemes are relatively well established throughout the Agreement area.

Bi- and multilateral training and knowledge-sharing programmes are being developed by a number of countries. Public awareness activities are regularly taking place in all parties and signatories with the aim of securing support for waterbird and wetland conservation.

FUTURE PRIORITIES

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

In some cases where such policies and legislation are already on place, a lack of effective implementation and enforcement, for various reasons, has been recognized. Parties

should strive to make use of the policies and legislation approved by them and provide necessary resources where these are lacking.

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

Parties should endeavour to develop mechanisms for implementing emergency measures to at least the most likely threatening conditions that may emerge.

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

Parties should endeavor to standardize, and where possible unify, regionally or internationally, monitoring of hunting levels. The role of hunting clubs and organization for the management of the hunting practice could be strengthened and streamlined.

Eco-tourism should receive more attention and specific actions should be undertaken to encourage its development in all parties, especially those, where it could bring substantive revenues to local or national economies.

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

Specific actions are necessary to streamline research activities in order to meet the need for knowledge on species and their habitats. Existing gaps in monitoring programmes should be addressed in order to suffice information need on the state and trends of species and their habitats.

The lack of trained contributors is probably amongst the most significant bottlenecks for the implementation of the Agreement. This is a high international priority issue and the training needs should be precisely identified in order to be effectively addressed, including through strengthened bi- and multilateral programmes.

AEWA need to receive more attention in public awareness raising events and AEWA-specific awareness rising activities should be carried on, strengthened and developed.

SPECIES CONSERVATION

Legal measures

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

Summary: Only three parties (9%; two African and one Eurasian) reported that they have developed special policy/strategy or legislation, while in the majority of reporting parties and signatories (83%), protection of waterbirds and their supporting sites is covered by general nature conservation policy/legislation. One party (3%) is currently developing its waterbird conservation policy/legislation, but two Eurasian countries (6%) reported that in general they do not have such a legal instrument in place (Monaco and Macedonia, the FYR).

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

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

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

Summary: Only 11 reporting parties and signatories (31%; five African and six Eurasian) have fully developed legal measures to prohibit or regulate the taking of and trade in birds listed in columns A and B of the Action Plan. Nearly half of parties and signatories (16), however, have partially introduced such legal measures (46%; two African and 14 Eurasian) and one Eurasian country (3%) is in a process of developing legal measures. Only two African countries (6%) reported no legal measures in place, while one African and four Eurasian countries (14%) did not respond to this question.

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

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

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

Summary: Regarding legal measures or practices to prohibit or regulate methods of taking, the situation is very similar to that described in the previous section. The slight differences are that now more countries have legal measures in place (13; 37%; four African and nine Eurasian), but one more country (3, 9%, two African and one Eurasian) reported lacking legal measures. Eleven countries (31%; two African and nine Eurasian) have developed partially their legal measures and one Eurasian country (3%) is currently developing such. For one African country (3%) this issue is not applicable due to the lack of hunting in wetlands. Six countries (17%; one African and five Eurasian) did not reply to this question).

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

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

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

Summary: Only nine parties and signatories (28%; four African and five Eurasian countries) reported that they have fully developed legal measures or practices to regulate the setting of taking limits and monitoring these limits. Another eight countries (23%; one African and seven Eurasian) reported partial measures or practices in place, and one Eurasian country (3%) is developing such. The same number of countries (8; 23%; two African and six Eurasian) have not developed any. Again same number and composition of parties and signatories (8; 23%; two African and six Eurasian) have not provided any information on this question. For one African country (3%) this issue is not applicable due to the lack of hunting in wetlands.

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

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

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

Summary: A relatively high number of reporting parties and signatories have fully (14; 40%; four African and ten Eurasian countries) or partially (7; 20%; one African and six Eurasian countries) developed legislation to regulate the sustainable hunting of column A asterisk-marked species. For four Eurasian and one African countries (14%) this question was not applicable, because all species from column A are protected by national legislation and no hunting is allowed. Only two African countries (6%) have no such legal measures in place, and one Eurasian country (3%) is developing such. Six countries (17%; two African and four Eurasian), however, did not respond to this question in their National Reports.

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

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

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

Summary: The majority of reporting parties and signatories (13; 37%; three African and ten Eurasian countries) have only partially developed and introduced legislation to regulate the exemptions in the above-mentioned paragraphs of the Action Plan. Another ten countries (29%; three African and seven Eurasian) have no legislation in place on this subject. The smallest group of three Eurasian countries (9%) have fully developed and introduced such regulation measures. One Eurasian country (3%) is developing its pertinent legislation, and for one African country (3%) this question is not applicable. A relatively high number of countries (7; 18%; three African and four Eurasian) have not provided information in their National Reports.

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

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

Single Species Action Plans

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

Summary: SSAPs for a small number of species (1-2) are being implemented in seven reporting parties and signatories (20%; one African and six Eurasian countries). SSAPs for more species (3-5 or 6-10) are being implemented respectively in three countries (9%; one African and two Eurasian) and in two Eurasian countries (6%). Only one Eurasian country (3%) invests efforts in implementing more than 10 SSAPs. The largest group of parties and signatories (12; 34%; four African and eight Eurasian countries) do not implement any SSAP. The second largest group of countries (10; 28%; four African and six Eurasian ones) has not given information in their National Reports.

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

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

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

Summary: The situation regarding the SSAPs in preparation is slightly better. SSAPs for a small number of species (1-2) are in preparation in eight reporting parties and signatories (22%; three African and five Eurasian countries). SSAPs for more species (3-5 or 6-10) are in preparation respectively in four Eurasian countries (11%) and in three Eurasian countries (9%). Ten parties and signatories (29%; three African and seven Eurasian countries) are not preparing any new SSAP. The same number of countries (29%; four African and six Eurasian) has not given information on the preparation of SSAPs in their National Reports.

Conclusions: Although slightly more countries are preparing more SSAPs than are implementing them, the attention being paid to this activity is lower than it should be.

The most work is being done in the Eurasian region, while in Africa preparation of SSAPs is a poorly implemented activity.

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

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

Summary: The situation regarding the proposed SSAPs is similar to that of SSAPs in preparation and being implemented. Five reporting parties and signatories (14%; two African and three Eurasian countries) have proposed SSAPs for a small number of species (1-2). SSAPs for more species (3-5 or 11-20) were proposed in three (9%; one African and two Eurasian) and two (6%; one African and two Eurasian) countries, respectively. In the largest group of countries (14; 39%; four African and ten Eurasian) no new SSAPs were proposed. The second largest group of countries (32; 28%; two African and nine Eurasian) has not given information in their National Reports on the number of proposed SSAPs.

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

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

Emergency measures

Bilateral or multilateral co-operative action undertaken to develop and implement emergency measures to conserve species in response to unfavourable or endangering conditions occurring in the Agreement area (question 2.4):

Summary: Only six countries (17%), of which two African, have reported some kind of action to develop and implement emergency measures. In all cases the actions deal with monitoring and cleaning up of oil spills in marine environment. Additional measures reported by countries are suspension of hunting in prolonged periods of cold (UK) and

fire prevention (South Africa). It is worth mentioning the trilateral monitoring scheme of oil spills in Wadden Sea by Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands. Under this section Spain and Slovenia have reported schemes for removal of Ruddy Ducks – an alien invasive species, which hybridizes with the globally threatened White-headed Duck.

Conclusions: Unfavourable and endangering conditions are not sufficiently addressed throughout the Agreement area – only a limited number of countries have some mechanisms for responsive measures in place, mainly dealing with oil spills in marine environment and rarely with other endangering conditions.

Priorities: All countries should endeavour to develop measures for emergency response to at least the most likely threatening conditions that may emerge, such as oil and other toxic/polluting spills, prolonged weather, fires, etc.

Re-establishments

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

Summary: A fairly large number of reporting parties and signatories (12; 34%; four African and eight Eurasian countries) have developed national policy on re-establishment of waterbirds, and one Eurasian country (3%) is currently developing its policy. However, the majority of countries (16; 45%; four African and twelve Eurasian) reported no policy in place. Two countries (6%; one African and one Eurasian) considered this question not applicable to them, because policy on re-establishments of waterbirds was not necessary. Another four countries (12%; one African and three Eurasian) have not reported on this issue in their National Reports.

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

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

Introductions

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

Summary: The largest group of reporting countries and signatories (12; 34%; three African and nine Eurasian countries) has reported legal measures developed and fully implemented. Another group of ten Eurasian countries (29%) has only partially implemented their legal measures to prohibit introduction of non-native waterbird

species, while one Eurasian country (3%) has developed, but not yet implemented, its legislation on this issue. Development of legal measures is in progress in four countries (11%; one African and three Eurasian). No drafting of legislation has taken place yet in seven countries of the Agreement area (20%; five African and two Eurasian). One African country (3%) has not reported on this issue.

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

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

HABITAT CONSERVATION

Habitat inventories

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

Summary: Majority of parties and signatories have developed and published either specific AEWA species inventories (17; 49%; five African and twelve Eurasian countries) or other similar inventories (9; 25%; one African and eight Eurasian countries). Inventories are currently being developed in two African and two Eurasian countries (11%). Only two African and one Eurasian country (9%) have reported neither an existing nor a developing inventory, while two Eurasian countries (6%) have not responded to this question.

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

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

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

Summary: An exceptionally high number of reporting parties and signatories (24; 68%; eight African and sixteen Eurasian countries) have undertaken such reviews, while another four Eurasian countries (11%) have undertaken similar reviews. Three Eurasian countries (9%) have reported that they are currently developing strategic reviews of sites to establish a network. Only two Eurasian countries (6%) have no such strategic review in place or under development, while two African countries (6%) have not provided information on this issue in their National Reports.

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

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

Conservation of areas

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

Summary: In the majority of reporting parties and signatories a management planning process for protected sites is either in place (19; 54%; six African and thirteen Eurasian countries) or is being developed (seven Eurasian countries; 20%). Only one African and two Eurasian countries (9%) have neither developed nor are developing such a planning process yet, while another six countries (17%; three African and three Eurasian) have not provided information on this issue in their National Reports.

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

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

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

Summary: One Eurasian country (3%) is implementing management plans for 1-2 protected areas. In two countries (6%; one African and one Eurasian) management plans are being implemented for 3-5 sites. The same composition of countries implements management plans for 6-10 sites. Only one African country (3%) reported that it implements management plans in 11-20 sites, while three Eurasian countries (9%) are implementing plans for more than 20 sites. Ten parties and signatories (28%; three African and seven Eurasian countries) have reported no implementation of any management plan, and eleven countries (31%; three African and eight Eurasian) have not provided any information in their National Reports. Another five countries (14%; one African and four Eurasian countries) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

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

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

for parties to introduce management plans for as many sites as possible over the next triennium should already be outlined as a priority.

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

Summary: One African and four Eurasian countries (14%) are preparing management plans for 1-2 sites. In three countries (9%; one African and two Eurasian) management plans are in preparation for 3-5 sites. The same composition of countries are preparing management plans for 6-10 sites. Only one Eurasian country (3%) reported that it is preparing management plans for 11-20 sites, and another four Eurasian country (11%) are preparing plans for more than 20 sites. Three African countries (9%) have reported no preparation of a management plan, and ten countries (28%; three African and seven Eurasian) have not provided any information in their National Reports. Another six countries (17%; one African and five Eurasian countries) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

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

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

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

Summary: In three countries (9%; one African and two Eurasian) management plans were proposed for 1 or 2 sites. In other two countries (6%; one African and one Eurasian) management plans were proposed for 3 to 5 sites. One Eurasian country (3%) per each of the following two numerical categories reported that management plans were proposed for 6 to 10 and for 11 to 20 sites, while in two Eurasian countries (6%) management plans for more than 20 sites are under consideration. Eight countries (23%; four African and four Eurasian ones) have reported no any proposed new management plan, and nine countries (25%; three African and six Eurasian) have not provided any information in their National Reports. Another nine countries (25%; one African and eight Eurasian countries) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

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

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

Rehabilitation and restoration

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

Summary: A fairly large number of reporting parties and signatories (20; 56%; six African and fourteen Eurasian countries) already have such policy in place, although some of them (e.g. Morocco) reported that they were not implemented yet due to shortage of resources. One African and two Eurasian countries (9%) reported that they are currently developing their policies for identification, rehabilitation and restoration of wetlands. While eight countries (23%; two African and six Eurasian) have not yet drafted such policies, the UK reported that they have already implemented such restoration activities. Three countries only (9%; one African and two Eurasian) have not answered this question in their National Reports, and one Eurasian country (3%) have given partial and unclear answers, which cannot be quantified.

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

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

Hunting

Monitoring of hunting levels in place (question 4.2)

Summary: The majority of reporting parties and signatories (22; 63%; five African and seventeen Eurasian countries) have developed monitoring systems for hunting levels. Another four countries (11%; two African and two Eurasian) are implementing partial monitoring, and one Eurasian country (3%) is currently developing its monitoring system. Two countries (6%; one African and one Eurasian) are lacking hunting monitoring activities, and for one African country (3%) this is not applicable due to no hunting in wetlands. Five countries (14%; one African and four Eurasian) have not reported on this issue in their National Reports.

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

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

Actions undertaken by hunting clubs and organisations to manage hunting activity (question 4.3):

Summary: Fifteen countries (43%), ten of which Eurasian, have reported some kind of action undertaken by their national hunting clubs and organizations. In the majority of cases clubs and organisations issue licenses, provide training, test proficiency of their members, stocks management and warding. In one case (Tanzania) has been reported that hunting organizations participate in game quota setting. In Ireland hunting organisations fundraise for wetland restoration. In three countries (9%) (Jordan, Congo, Djibouti) hunting organizations do not exist, and in Mauritius (3%) waterbird hunting is not practiced. The rest of the countries have not provided information in this section of the report or the information is inconsistent with the question.

Conclusions: Generally hunting clubs and organization in a number of parties are having an active role in the management of hunting practice.

Priorities: In some cases the management role of hunting organization could be probably strengthened and streamlined. This issue deserves a better analysis based on more consistent and comprehensive information from more parties.

Eco-tourism

Status of eco-tourism programmes and initiatives (question 4.4)

Summary: Only a very small number of countries, mainly (west) European, have reported well-established eco-tourism. In the rest of Eurasia this sector is not receiving attention at all, or programmes and initiatives are at their start with isolated cases of infrastructural development and limited tourism activity. Some of the African parties are renowned for depending extensively on eco-tourism for sustaining their national economies, e.g. East Africa and to some extent South Africa. In other reporting countries it is less developed, but yet existing and established. However, some of the African parties have reported no any eco-tourism being in place.

Conclusions: Eco-tourism throughout the Agreement area is far from the desired level of development, which could be also of significance at least for local economies if not for national ones.

Priorities: This subject should receive more attention and specific actions should be undertaken to encourage the development of eco-tourism in all parties, especially those, where it could bring substantive revenues to local or national economies. For better understanding of the current status a more comprehensive analysis should be undertaken, which will inform further planning.

Other human activities

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

Summary: Nearly all parties and signatories (28; 80%; seven African and twenty one Eurasian countries) have reported that EIA are carried out in cases when waterbird sites are potentially affected, and in one Eurasian country (3%) a similar assessment is being applied. However, in some cases poor standards of EIA procedure and formal assessment were reported (in practice it is known that these are not just single cases). In one African and one Eurasian country (6%) EIA procedures are being developed and in other two African country (6%) EIAs are not necessarily carried out. Two Eurasian countries (6%) have not provided information on this issue in their National Reports.

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

Priorities: All parties should strive to implement EIA in all cases when waterbird sites could be potentially affected by some activities. Where no EIA procedures are in place, these should be developed. In addition, all parties should endeavor to ensure that EIA is not only conducted for formal reasons, but plays role in a rigorous assessment that is

capable of revealing potentially harmful activities and preventing deterioration of conditions in or destruction of sites important for waterbirds.

RESEARCH AND MONITORING

Status of research and monitoring programmes for species

Mechanism of identification of research priorities and status of research (question 5.1):

Summary: A good number of parties and signatories (African and Eurasian) reported a record of ongoing or implemented research projects. Research priorities are being identified in accordance with agreed national research (or similar) plans, or through coordinated efforts of the responsible state institutions, academic institutions and NGOs. Small number of countries, however, reported decentralized priority identification, done by each research organizations. In several countries (Eurasian) research is done by NGOs only and they follow their own priorities. Yet a relatively significant number of countries from Africa and Eurasia have reported very limited and basic research activities or no any at all.

Conclusions: Although well established and somewhere having major progress, within some parts of the Agreement area research yet is lacking a targeted and priority-based approach.

Priorities: Specific actions would be necessary to streamline research activities in order to meet the need for knowledge on species and their habitats. At first instance, a more comprehensive analysis is necessary.

Undertaken monitoring activities (question 5.2):

Summary: In nearly all reporting parties and signatories monitoring activities are taking place, but are ranging from very limited and basic actions to various and comprehensive schemes. Yet several countries in Eurasia and Africa (Macedonia, the FYR, Moldova, Djibouti) have no any ongoing monitoring projects.

Conclusions: Monitoring activities are well represented throughout the Agreement area. However, many gaps exist and the existing monitoring programmes are not sufficient to provide necessary information on the state and trends of species and their habitats.

Priorities: A more rigorous analysis is necessary to match the ongoing monitoring activities with the knowledge need in order to identify priorities for further targeted development.

EDUCATION AND INFORMATION

Training and development programme

Status of training and development programmes which support waterbird conservation and implement the AEWA Action Plan (question 6.1):

Summary: In the majority of reporting parties and signatories training is ranging from very limited to little (with only a few exceptions) and it has covered only certain aspects of the conservation practice. In several African and Eurasian countries no training has taken place at all.

Conclusions: The lack of trained contributors is probably amongst the most significant bottlenecks for the implementation of the Agreement.

Priorities: This issue should be considered high priority at international level and the training needs should be precisely identified in order to be effectively addressed.

Bilateral or multilateral co-operative actions undertaken to develop training programmes and share examples of good practice (question 6.2):

Summary: It is only several West European countries that have undertaken bilateral or multilateral programmes to provide training and share experience. Amongst them are Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden. Main recipients of training are representatives of countries from Africa and Eastern Europe, or other Baltic states in the case of Sweden. It should be noted that UK has implemented successfully extensive programmes for training and knowledge transfer not only within the Agreement area, but also worldwide. Jordan has provided such services to other Middle East countries, while the only African country training other countries from the continent is Kenya (through the Kenya Wildlife Service).

Conclusions: Good progress, but yet not fully matching the needs.

Priorities: Bilateral and multilateral training and knowledge transfer programmes should be encouraged and strengthened in order to tackle a serious obstacle for the implementation of the Agreement – the shortage of qualified personnel.

Raising public awareness

Activities to raise public awareness on the objectives of the AEWA Action Plan and to secure support for waterbird and wetland conservation (question 6.3)

Summary: Generally parties and signatories have not reported specific campaigns, information notes or other initiatives aiming at raising public awareness on the objectives

of the AEWA Action Plan. In the majority of cases this has been done as part of other events, not linked specifically to the Agreement. As an exception should be mentioned the celebration of the Migratory Waterbird Day in April 2005, declared on the occasion of the Agreement's 10th anniversary. Then a number of countries (parties and non-parties) in Eurasia and Africa printed common poster and organized public events.

Conclusion: Public-oriented events are regularly organized in all parties and signatories and generally there is good promotion of waterbird and wetland conservation.

Priorities: AEWA should receive more attention in such events and AEWA-specific awareness rising activities should be carried on, strengthened and developed.