

Replies received from Signatories concerning the development of National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies

1. **Angola** – “Angola is currently revising its NBSAP in general. At the same time, we will introduce the conservation of raptors in the biodiversity strategy, according the Raptors MoU. We are integrating in the same strategy because it would be easier for the government to finance NBSAP actions, and consequently, raptors conservation actions will be carried out. In our NBSAP, we forecast specific and concrete actions for the protection of birds of prey. With regard to our needs, we can ask for financial assistance in order to help us cover the country to work with other stakeholders in the particular cases of raptors conservation. We are preparing a National Report on Raptors that will be delivered to CMS Abu Dhabi on the occasion of MoS1.” [translated from French] (17 October 2012).

Congo – Congo requires technical assistance and expresses that it is “important for us to obtain the French version of the Guidelines.” [translated from French] (2 October 2012).

2. **European Union** – “A strategy for the EU and its Member States has been planned. A consultation process between the European Commission and the Member States has recently started within the EU and this is currently at an early stage. The ‘*Guidelines for Preparing National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies*’ provide all the information needed at this moment. The EU contact point for the Raptors MoU may contact the Interim Coordinating Unit if any additional assistance is needed. The EU strategy will not be ready in advance of MoS1. It is envisaged to finalize it before the end of 2013” (8 October 2012).

3. **France** – Confirmation received by email that France is preparing to write a National Strategy in the context of the Raptors MoU. No specific support or assistance is needed at this stage (28 June 2012).

4. **Germany** – “Germany has a long lasting tradition in Raptors conservation issues. As a federal State, the issues of nature protection on the spot falls under the competency of our 16 German Länder ("states") and reports or actions concerning a Germany wide Raptor Conservation would need a coordination with the 16 "Länder". Since the EC Birds Directive of 1979 Germany is under European obligations to protect raptors and to designate Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for the relevant species as specified in the said Directive. The issue whether to create specific projects or programmes for certain taxa groups was already discussed long time before the Raptors MoU. Germany decided as an overall approach a ‘National strategy for the Protection of Biological Diversity’, which will be the most important contribution for species and habitat protection not only for raptors for the forthcoming years. This approach appears more useful and ecologically sound than creating for each taxa group a separate instrument. Furthermore a programme for species, where Germany has a special national responsibility was created, giving the possibility to grant subsidies by the federal government. This programme includes the Red Kite (*Milvus milvus*) as a species of particular concern and a particular German responsibility. Furthermore a project for Hen Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) is currently in preparation” (12 October 2012).

Guinea – “We have started to elaborate the outlines of the national strategy based on the first version of the guide for the species listed in categories I and II of the annex for our country. In relation to the assistance, we require from your side, a technical and financial assistance for the elaboration of the simplified national strategy in order to reach an Action Plan by species of the two categories I and II for the next two years. We absolutely expect to present and submit to the ICU at the 1st meeting of signatories at MoS1 in next December in Abu Dhabi. I remain at your disposal for further information if needed. I thank you.” [translated from French] (6 August 2012).

5. **Hungary** – “Our opinion is that no new Strategies are required under Article 12 of the MoU where such strategies already exist. We can, however, now complement the information contained therein, as for the Action Plans that also cover Hungary. The Category 1 migratory raptors that are relevant for

Hungary are *Falco vespertinus*, *Falco cherrug* and *Aquila heliaca*. *Milvus milvus* only breeds in very small numbers (a handful of pairs) and occurs extremely sporadically on passage, as Hungary lies on the margin of the species' present range. *Circus macrourus* migrates through in very small numbers again (a few observations per year). Therefore, the Category 1 species for which a Strategy or Species Action Plan can be meaningful in a Hungarian context are *Falco vespertinus*, *Falco cherrug* and *Aquila heliaca*. The European Commission has approved action plans for, among others, *Aquila heliaca*, *Milvus milvus* and *Falco vespertinus*. These are, of course, fully relevant in Hungary (moreover, the plan for *F. vespertinus* has been compiled partly by Hungarian experts), but in the case of *Aquila heliaca*, additionally, a more recent Management Plan exists specifically for Hungary, which is also cited in the Raptors MoU guidelines. For *Falco cherrug*, an international SSAP exists under the Bern Convention, which was also compiled by Hungarian experts, with contributions from numerous other experts. For Category 2 species, strategies or plans are to be submitted „where appropriate” under the MoU. An EU action plan exists for *Aquila pomarina*, which is also applied by Hungary and recently, an Action Plan has been approved for the conservation of *Haliaeetus albicilla* along the Danube. It is not planned to prepare action plans or strategies for the remaining Category 2 species which are relevant for Hungary. We are not planning to prepare a raptor conservation and management strategy and/or further species action plans for raptors, as in our opinion the above plans fully satisfy the requirements under the MoU and, apart from the MoU obligations, there seems no urgent conservation necessity to prepare further plans for Hungary” (18 July 2012).

6. **Madagascar** – “The document on National Strategy for Raptors Conservation is prepared” (7 October 2012).

7. **Mongolia** – “I have discussed with my colleagues about the importance of national strategy for birds of prey in Mongolia. All supported the idea and suggested WSCC (Wildlife Science and Conservation Center) of Mongolia lead the effort. Recently, we approached the director of the international cooperation of the Ministry of Nature, Environment, and Tourism of Mongolia and asked if MNET would be interested in developing a national strategy for birds of prey. The discussion went very well, our proposal was well received, and there was an informal agreement that WSCC will lead this effort for MNET and develop the National Strategy for Conservation for the Birds of Prey before CMS's December meeting. In order to gather information and share and listen ideas (as part of the strategy development process) from other Mongolian ornithologists and conservationists, we need to have a half day meeting. I wonder if UNEP/CMS Raptors MoU office can provide us little [financial] assistant on this. [...] Labor costs can be spared by WSCC of Mongolia” (9 July 2012).

8. **Netherlands** – “The EU is writing a regional strategy for the European Union which we will discuss October 5 at the Ornis Committee” (27 September 2012).

9. **Norway** – “It was our plan to involve a research bureau here to assist and to produce an overview of the situation. Due to lack of human resources I realize that we shall be belated. Probably not able to put on the table by the meeting” (2 October 2012).

10. **Pakistan** – “In Pakistan so far there is no exclusive National Conservation Strategy for raptors. However as raptors are integral and important component of biodiversity, we have National Conservation Strategy (1992), provincial and Biodiversity Action Plan of Pakistan (2000). These documents provide guidelines to assess the status of biodiversity, threats they are facing and outline measures for their conservation and management. All raptors are protected under the Provincial Wildlife Laws. Recently a new national law “The Pakistan Trade Control of Wild Fauna and Flora Act 2012” has been enacted. It is an exclusive law for effective enforcement of CITES provisions with the aim to bridge existing legal gaps in implementation of the Convention. This Act will also help us to address issues related to illegal trade in raptors (especially *Falco spp.*). The ICU of the Raptors MoU has been requested to share National Raptor Conservation Strategies of other signatory states (if there is any) as this may help in developing National Strategy in future. So far, we are not in the position to submit National Strategy in advance of MoS1” (5 October 2012).

Senegal – “We require financial and technical support. As for the technical support, the document on the guidelines will suffice if it is in French as we are francophone. On the other hand, for the financial support we need a minimum to hold meetings, for compilation and drafting; and we do not have this budget here in our Directorate. Can you financially support us or put us in contact with a structure.” [translated from French] (27 September 2012).

11. **Slovakia** – “As Slovak Republic is a member of MoU Raptors only since this year, the Strategy is not yet prepared, but we are planning to start to work on it. We are just starting the preparation of Strategy now, so we will see if such support is required. As soon, as we will identify this need, we will notify you. We could send only report on actual situation, how it is proceeding and what are the future plans (for MoS1)” (28 June 2012).

12. **United Arab Emirates** – The Ministry of Environment and Water confirmed at a face-to-face meeting that a National Strategy will be produced in cooperation with the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (28 June 2012).

13. **United Kingdom** – “We need to feed into an overall EU Regional Strategy so we need to take our lead from them with regard to format and content before commencing”. Development of the Strategy “will be dependent on the outcome of approaches we make to the Presidency of the EU” (24 July 2012).