



Second Meeting of the UNEP/CMS Preventing Poisoning Working Group (PPWG2)

Toledo, Spain, 19 – 21 February 2017

UNEP/CMS/PPWG2/Doc.2

REPORT:

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CMS GUIDELINES TO PREVENT THE RISK OF POISONING TO MIGRATORY BIRDS

Results of the Questionnaire on the Implementation of the CMS Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds (February 2017)

The present document reports on the questionnaire on the implementation of the CMS Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.2/Annex 2: Guidelines). The questionnaire was sent out to the members of the CMS Preventing Poisoning Working Group (PPWG) and experts of affiliated institutions, on 25 November 2016 in order to consult them on the implementation of the guidelines' recommendations in their countries. The aim was to obtain a basis for the evaluation of the progress of implementation during the 2nd Meeting of the PPWG, taking place in Toledo, Spain, 19 to 21 February 2017. Ten out of 50 questionnaires sent out were returned by experts from: Canada, Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain (two responses), Uganda and the United Kingdom.

Questions were asked on the implementation in the fields defined by the terms of reference of the PPWG. These terms of reference include the sources of poisoning of migratory birds: insecticides, rodenticides, poison-baits, veterinary pharmaceuticals and lead ammunition and fishing weights. Due to differences in legislation and development status of environmental policies in different countries, some recommendations of the guidelines have potentially already been fulfilled by national legislation, and consequently several questions may appear not to be applicable. The same might be the case regarding some sources of poisoning relevant for particular groups of migratory birds (e.g. vultures). However, considering the large variation in implementation status tackling the different sources of poisoning, this questionnaire was designed to cover the broad range of recommendations set out in the guidelines as a general framework. The survey included questions requiring YES/NO answers as well as some ones providing multiple choices for answering. Every question offered the possibility of including additional comments or stating examples.

Additional information was asked regarding the general existence of national strategies to tackle the different sources of poisoning of migratory birds and with regard to the general applicability and practicability of the Guidelines, and priority actions and needs. A template of the questionnaire is attached as an annex.

Some members of the working group made useful comments on the questionnaire with a view to make it more effective and user-friendly. These suggestions will be incorporated in future versions of the questionnaire.

Results of the questionnaire

Total number of reports returned: ten

Number of countries reported on: nine (two reports from Spain, one from a Ministry official, one from a University scientific expert; taken into account under “# Countries applicable”)

Table 1. YES/NO responses on the implementation of guideline recommendations. Asterisks with numbers refer to more specific questions and responses (see below).

	# Responses	Total # countries responding	# responses Spain (max. 2)	# Countries applicable	YES (# Countries)	NO (# Countries)
INSECTICIDES						
1. Local risk hotspots identified	9	8	2	8	3	6
2. High risk substances removed	8	8	1	8	0	1
3. Types of high risk substances removed *1)	8	7	2	7	-	-
4. Mandatory evaluation mechanisms for products implemented	9	8	2	8	7	1
5. Safe alternatives found	8	8	1	8	4	3
6. Integrated pest management incentivized (IPM)	9	8	2	8	4	4
6a. Type of incentives IPM *2)					-	-
7. Certification systems for IPM in place	9	8	2	8	2	6
8. Neonicotinoid insecticides monitored	8	7	2	7	3	4
9. All insecticide use documented (crop/region)	8	7	2	7	2	5
10. Organophosphates and carbamates documented (crop/region)	8	7	2	7	2	5
RODENTICIDES						
1. SGARs banned or restricted	9	8	2	8	6	2
2. Programme baiting encouraged	9	8	2	8	3	5
3. Best practice guidelines developed	8	7	2	7	4	3
4. Best practice guidelines applied	6	5	1	5	3	2

	# Responses	Total # countries responding	# responses Spain (max. 2)	# Countries applicable	YES (# Countries)	NO (# Countries)
POISON-BAITS						
1. Drivers identified *3)	9	8	2	8	-	-
2. Reporting system in place	10	9	2	9	7	2
3. Alternative methods for livestock protection	7	6	2	6	5	1
4. Multi-stakeholder forums on human-wildlife conflict	8	7	2	7	7	0
5. # Training courses; # participants *4)	5	5	2	5	-	-
6. National strategies implemented to deter poison-baits	9	8	2	8	5	3
7. Regional plans implemented	7	6	2	6	3	3
8. Infringement penalties existing	8	7	2	7	7	0
9. How many incidents in last 5 years *5)	5	4	2	2	-	-
10. Hunting licences withdrawn in poison-bait areas	8	7	2	7	2	5
11. Subsidies suspended when infringements occur	8	7	2	7	1	6
12. Sentencing guidelines existing	7	7	1	7	4	3
13. Increase in resources for enforcement against wildlife poisoning	8	7	2	7	3	4
14. Department needs for enforcement *6)	8	7	2	8	-	-
15. Vicarious liability	8	7	2	7	0	7
16. Grace periods removed	5	5	1	5	3	2
17. Access to toxic substances restricted	8	7	2	7	4	3
18. Coordinated product removal with neighbouring countries	8	7	2	7	0	7
VETERINARY PHARMACEUTICALS						
1. Surveillance for ungulate carcasses enhanced	7	6	2	6	1	5
2. Vulture safe zones developed	5	4	2	4	0	5
3. Community education in high risk areas implemented	6	5	2	5	3	2
4. NSAIDs voluntarily withdrawn	7	6	2	6	1	5
5. Awareness-raising by product stewardship	7	6	2	6	3	3
6. Use of veterinary diclofenac prohibited	8	7	2	7	1	6
7. Multi-species safety testing introduced	7	6	2	6	2	4

	# Responses	Total # countries responding	# responses Spain (max. 2)	# Countries applicable	YES (# Countries)	NO (# Countries)
8. Methods against illegal use of human diclofenac (vial size)	5	5	1	5	2	3
9. Diclofenac bottles labeled " <i>not for veterinary use</i> "	6	5	2	5	3	2
10. Pharmacies required to report sale	5	4	2	4	1	3
11. Pharmacies required to record sale and purchase	4	3	2	4	1	3
12. Alternatives (meloxicam) available	6	5	2	5	5	0
13. Subsidies provided for use of safe alternatives	7	6	2	6	1	5
LEAD AMMUNITION AND FISHING WEIGHTS						
1. Steps being taken regarding lead ammunition *7)	10	9	2	10	-	-
2. Non-toxic alternatives promoted	9	8	2	9	5	4
3. Legislative processes implemented regarding lead ammunition *8)	10	9	2	9	-	-
4. Lead ammunition in process of phase out *9)	9	8	2	8	-	-
5. Remediation of contaminated environments	9	9	1	9	2	7
6. Deadline for lead ammunition ban 2017 being met	9	8	2	8	0	8
7. Steps being taken regarding lead fishing weights *10)	7	6	2	6	-	-
8. Anglers being made aware	7	6	2	6	0	6
9. Weights phased out in high risk areas for birds	9	8	2	8	1	7
10. Legislative processes implemented regarding lead fishing weights *11)	10	9	2	9	-	-
11. Deadline for lead fishing weights ban 2017 being met	9	8	2	8	1	7
12. Action regarding other lead sources *12)	7	6	2	7	-	-

Specific information provided on questions with multiple response options (indicated by asterisks and numbers in Table 1):

Insecticides

Table S*1). Types of high-risk substances used as insecticides, which have been suspended from the market, as reported by the experts.

Country	Types of high risk substances suspended	Comments
Canada	Carbofuran, Fenthion, Terbufos	Current evaluation procedures inadequate to detect risk – or decisions made to maintain high risk products despite evaluations; e.g. chlorpyrifos
Iran	Diazinon, Pirimiphosmethyl, Teflobenzuron, Fuzalon, Thiaclopride, Thiomton, Fenthoat, Fention, Dicofol Lindane, Monochrotophos, Phosphamidon, Endosulfan, Azinphosmethyl, Azinphosethyl, Carbaryl, Amitraz, Aldicarb, Emthoat, Propetamphos, Triazophos, Decrotophos, Chlorphenvinphos, Metidathion, Emtidathion, Foxim, Propoxur	Many of them still on the market and also used (sometimes widely) illegally; lack of enforcement of regulations. Some of these compounds are only removed from usage in agriculture but still in use in health/veterinary sector; laws and regulations of the "Organization of plant protection" of Iran largely outdated; some herbicides and fungicides suspended from Iranian market
Israel	Monocrotophos, Azinphos methyl, Acephate, Parathion methyl, Diazinon, Dichlorvos, Fenthion, Methidathion, Prothiophos, Oxydemeton methyl, Terbutryn, Prometryn, Ametryn, Cadusafos and others	
Italy	Methomyl, Metidation, Phosalone, Rotenone, Tiodicarb, Trichlorfon, Triflumuron (date of revocation 30/07/2004), Methamidophos (20/01/2005), Malathion (15/09/2005), Endosulfan, Fenitrothion (29/05/2006), Buprofezin, Carbaril, Carbofuran, Copper Oxychloride (Rame Ossicloruro) Petroleum Oils/(Cas 92062-35-6), Cyromazine, Diazinon, Dichlorvos (15/06/2006), Methylbromide (24/07/2006), Bifenthrin (03/04/2007)	Subject to EU regulations
New Zealand	DDT and others	
South Africa	Monocrotophos, Aldicarb	Consult registrar for further information
Spain	e.g. aldicarb, carbofuran, several organophosphates	According to EFSA (European Food and Safety Agency) standards
Uganda	N/A	
United Kingdom	N/A	

Table S*2). Types of incentives for integrated pest management (IPM).

Country	Type of incentives	Comments
Canada	No incentives	The concept of IPM is often not applicable due to the prophylactic and systemic nature of pesticide use
Iran	Non-monetary	Some incentives in the form of providing some biological control agents such as tiny trichogramma wasps, advice by governmental agricultural engineers/technicians, sporadic farm/field schools
Israel	Monetary	
Italy	Monetary	Regional Rural Development Programmes (2014-2020) provide for specific measures addressed to fund farmers adopting IPM
New Zealand	No incentives	
South Africa	No incentives	CropLife SA and AVCASA promote IPM

Country	Type of incentives	Comments
Spain	Monetary	According to Directive 2009/128/CE establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides, the implementation of IPM is compulsory for EU Member States; transcribed by the Royal Decree 1311/2012
Uganda	No incentives	
United Kingdom	N/A	

Poison-baits

Table S*3) Drivers of poison-bait use identified (1=YES; 0=NO).

Country	Predator control	Poaching	Traditional medicine	Others	Comments
Canada	1	0	0	0	
Iran	1	1	0	0	
Israel	1	0	0	0	
Italy	1	0	0	0	Mainly used to control wolves, foxes and feral dogs. Sometimes also documented in feuds between hunters, livestock-breeders or truffle-searchers
New Zealand	1	0	0	1	Control of invasive herbivores
South Africa	1	1	1	0	www.wildlifepoisoningprevention.co.za
Spain	1	0	0	0	Different origins: to prevent damage by predators (mostly fox and wolf) to livestock, to crops (e.g. rabbits) and to game species
Uganda	1	1	0	0	
United Kingdom	N/A				
Sum	8	3	1	1	

Table S*4). Training provided by the expert’s affiliations (national institutions, NGOs).

Country	# Courses	# Participants	Targeted professionals	Comments
Canada	N/A	N/A		
Iran	N/A	N/A	Environmental guards, related university students, related government officials	Some courses mostly provided by the DoE of Iran on issues related to wildlife, not particular on laws/consequences of poison baits; in some of these courses may recommendations on animal poisoning be made.
Israel	N/A	N/A	Livestock breeders, field crops farmers	constant meetings, seminars, round table discussions etc.

Country	# Courses	# Participants	Targeted professionals	Comments
Italy	N/A	N/A	Rangers, forest guards, provincial police officers	<p>Many courses to create anti-poisoning dog units. In the last few years, initiatives have been adopted in the framework of EU LIFE Projects to tackle poison-baits. Police officers have been trained, special anti-poisoning dog units (DU) have been created:</p> <p>LIFE antidoto: 2 DUs, with 2 dog trainers and 5 dogs, operating in central Italy. The LIFE project ended in 2014 but DUs are still working with the financial support of the Italian Ministry for the Environment. (http://www.lifeantidoto.eu)</p> <p>LIFE Pluto: 6 DUs, each of them with 1 dog trainer and 2 dogs, operating in southern, central and northern Apennines. (http://www.lifepluto.it/en/)</p> <p>LIFE M.I.R.Co.Lupo: 1 DU, with 1 dog trainer and 2 dogs, operating in northern Apennines. (http://www.lifemircolupo.it)</p> <p>LIFE Medwolf: 1 DU, with 1 dog trainer and 2 dogs, operating in central Apennines. (http://www.medwolf.eu/index.php/home-25.html)</p> <p>LIFE WolfAlps: 3 DUs, operating in the Alps. (http://www.lifewolfalps.eu/en/)</p> <p>LIFE UnderGriffonWings: 1 DU with 1 dog trainer and 1 dog, operating in Sardinia. (http://www.lifeundergriffonwings.eu/it/index.html)</p>
New Zealand	N/A	N/A	Fur hunters, conservation workers, farm workers	There are courses run to use a number of licensed pesticides (1080, cyanide and other newly developed toxins); mitigation methods to minimize the effects on non-targets is included in the training.
South Africa	6	230	Rangers, police, judiciary, farmers and others	Wildlife Poisoning Prevention & Conflict Resolution trained 197 rangers/police/prosecutors across southern Africa during 2016. Continuation during 2017 provided funding availability.
Spain	N/A	N/A	Guards of Regional governments and National Parks, farmers, hunters, school students, general population of rural areas, others	<p>Different projects to fight against the illegal use of poison-baits; LIFE project VeneNO, conducted by SEO/BirdLife, actions executed, amongst others, education, training and awareness raising. Project website: http://www.venenono.org/; traveling exhibitions to promote biological control of vole pest in crops through the installation of artificial nests for kestrels and little owls, carried out by the ONG GREFA (http://www.grefa.org/95-proyectos/servivios-ambientales/control-biologico-del-topillo-campesino/noticias-control-biologico-del-topillo-campesino/2435-nuestro-trabajo-divulgativo-sobre-el-control-biologico-del-topillo-tiene-resultados)</p>
Uganda	N/A	N/A	N/A	General awareness raising about the need to protect biodiversity, but no specific programme on poisoning
United Kingdom	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table S*5). Number of incidents have been investigated regarding wildlife poisoning in the last 5 years.

Country	# incidents	Comments
Canada	N/A	
Iran	N/A	Many
Israel	c. 450	Most are not related to birds. It includes predators, fish, and wild boars.
Italy	N/A	Lack of national database
New Zealand	N/A	
South Africa	N/A	
Spain	25 with penalty sentence from Court; >500 incidents analyzed in laboratories	Samples often not sufficient for trial
Uganda	N/A	
United Kingdom	N/A	

Table S*6). Department needs for enforcement of policy around wildlife poisoning (1=Need; 0= No need).

Country	Personnel	Material Resources	Community support	Funding	Other	Comments
Canada	1	0	0	1	0	
Iran	1	0	1	1	0	
Israel	1	1	1	1	0	
Italy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
New Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	None. It is not a major problem in NZ.
South Africa	1	0	1	1	1	Major problem is lack of funding.
Spain	1 (2x)	0	1 (1x)	1 (2x)	0	
Uganda	1	1	1	1	0	
United Kingdom	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Sum	7	2	5	7	1	

For Spain, two experts from two different institutions provided responses.

Lead ammunition and fishing weights

Table S*7). Awareness raising of poisoning by lead ammunition, particularly at key sites for migratory waterbirds (1=existing; 0=not existing).

Country	Collaborative websites (hunters/multi-MEAs/natural-resource managers/conservation organizations)	Leadership by ammunition users (hunters / wildlife managers) to non-toxic alternatives	Others	Comments
Canada	0	0	1	Canada has required that non-toxic (non-lead) shot be used: in national wildlife areas since 1995, in wetlands since 1997, for hunting most migratory game birds across the nation since 1999, and for upland game birds since 2012 although this is a partial ban only.
Iran	0	0	0	This year DoE announced that there will be no new hunting license issued but finally they issued at least 5,000 only in one instance; according to several sources, there are more than a million guns in the hands of people with 350 million lead bullets. Except few articles online about danger of lead in hunting/ fishing nothing yet legally but lots of scientific papers about lead poisoning.
Israel	0	0	0	None
Italy	0	0	1	ISPRA (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, a public institution under the control of the Italian Ministry for the Environment) published a technical report on lead poisoning in 2012 (http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/en/publications/reports/lead-in-ammunition-problems-and-possible-solutions?set_language=en). The content of the report has been presented in many meetings and conferences. Initiatives to raise awareness on the risks related to the use of lead ammunition have been undertaken in some local context, e.g. in the breeding range of the Bearded Vulture.
New Zealand	1	1	0	
South Africa	1	1	1	SA Wingshooters have engaged with BirdLife and are aware of IUCN Motion of 2016 in this regard.
Spain	1 (1x)	0	1 (2x)	The main action implemented is the legal prohibition of lead ammunition in certain wetlands, as well as raise awareness of lead poisoning in the frame of specific projects. Courses and talks from local to national scale.
Uganda	0	0	0	Not a big issue in the region.
United Kingdom	0	0	1	Conservation NGOs are highlighting risks.
Sum	3	2	6	

For Spain, two experts from two different institutions provided responses.

Table S*8). Legislative processes implemented to reduce environmental contamination by lead ammunition (1=existing; 0=not existing).

Country	Restrict sale	Restrict possession	Partial ban of use (wetlands/ specific species)	Complete ban of use	Others	None	Comments
Canada	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Iran	0	1	1	0	0	0	Lack of enforcement.
Israel	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Italy	0	0	1	0	0	0	Lack of enforcement; since 2007, ban on the use of lead gunshot in wetlands inside the EU Natura 2000 Network sites (about 50% of Italian wetlands). No restriction was introduced on the possession of lead ammunition, even in hunting areas where the use of lead shot is banned.
New Zealand	0	0	1	0	0	0	http://www.fishandgame.org.nz/non-toxic-shot-regulations-0
South Africa	0	0	0	0	1	0	Proactive promotion of collaboration when alternative ammunition becomes available at affordable prices
Spain	0	0	1	0	0	0	Lead ammunition use is banned in wetlands included in the Ramsar List, in protected natural areas and in Natura 2000 sites.
Uganda	0	0	0	0	0	1	
United Kingd.	0	0	1	0	0	0	The UK has had legislative bans on wetland use for many years although compliance with regulations is known to be poor
Sum	0	1	6	0	1	2	

Table *9). Status of phase-out process for lead ammunition (1=existing; 0=not existing).

Country	Phased out in all habitats	phased out only in wetlands	In process of being phased out	No action has been taken	Comments
Canada	0	0	1		
Iran	0	0	0	1	
Israel	0	0	0	1	
Italy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A national working group was created in 2013 to discuss initiatives on problems deriving from lead ammunition. This group met only once, few weeks after CMS COP 11. An extension of the ban of lead ammunition to all aquatic habitats and to big game (ungulates) hunting was proposed some years ago. Currently this proposal is not on the political agenda.
New Zealand	0	1	0	0	
South Africa	0	0	0	1	
Spain	0	1	0	0	Lead ammunition use is banned in wetlands included in the Ramsar List, in protected natural areas and in Natura 2000 sites.
Uganda	0	0	0	1	
United Kingdom	0	1	0	0	
Sum	0	3	1	4	

Table S*10). Awareness raising of poisoning by lead ammunition, particularly at key sites for migratory waterbirds (1=existing; 0= not existing).

Country	Collaborative websites (hunters/multi-MEAs/natural-resource managers/conservation organizations)	Leadership by ammunition users (hunters/wildlife managers) to non-toxic alternatives	Promotion of Anglers Code of Practice	Others	Comments
Canada	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	In Canada it is now illegal to use or possess lead fishing sinkers and jigs in national parks and wildlife areas. They are still used everywhere else.
Iran	0	0	0	0	Some online discussions on lead poisoning in water; nothing yet prohibited; lead fishing weights are used widely, lots of online notes (in Persian) on their production.
Israel	0	0	0	0	
Italy	0	0	0	0	
New Zealand	0	0	0	0	No evidence that this issue has been promoted in New Zealand by any group; https://www.mpi.govt.nz/travel-and-recreation/fishing/fishing-methods/

Country	Collaborative websites (hunters/multi-MEAs/natural-resource managers/conservation organizations)	Leadership by ammunition users (hunters/wildlife managers) to non-toxic alternatives	Promotion of Anglers Code of Practice	Others	Comments
South Africa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Spain	0	0	0	0	One expert raises the point that there have been some activities on the issue in Catalonia.
Uganda	0	0	0	0	
United Kingdom	0	0	0	1	Lead fishing weights of most sizes were phased out in the mid-1980s.
Sum	0	0	0	1	

Table S*11). Legislative processes implemented to reduce environmental contamination by lead fishing weights (1=existing; 0=not existing).

Country	Restrict sale	Restrict possession	Partial ban of use (wetlands/specific species)	Complete ban of use	Others	None	Comments
Canada	0	0	0	0	1	0	In Canada it is now illegal to use or possess lead fishing sinkers and jigs in national parks and wildlife areas. They are still used everywhere else.
Iran	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Israel	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	1	
New Zealand	0	0	1	0	0	0	Lead weights prohibited in freshwater fisheries (e.g. fly-fishing or spinners only in game fisheries, other floating lures are permitted in coarse fisheries); see online resource below a)
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Uganda	0	0	0	0	0	1	
United Kingdom	0	0	0	1	0	0	Lead fishing weights of most sizes were phased out in the mid-1980s
Sum	0	0	1	1	1	6	

a) http://fishing.fishandgame.org.nz/sites/default/files/About_Fish_Game/NZ_Council/Fishing%20Regs%20NI%202016-17%20Proof%20D.pdf

Table S*12). Activities regarding other sources of lead poisoning (1=existing; 0=not existing).

Country	Industrial pollution from lead mining and smelting processes	Leaded paint	Other sources of discarded lead	Comments
Canada	0	0	1	
Iran	1	1	1	As a toxicologist, member of the Iranian society of toxicology, I did lots of awareness about lead toxicity for human, birds etc. Our colleagues have published lots of scientific papers. Myself did lots of toxicological awareness raising in Iran, nearby countries and globally in recent years.
Israel	0	1	0	
Italy	N/A	N/A	N/A	
New Zealand	0	0	1	Lead was banned from vehicle fuels in 1996 in New Zealand. It is recognized as a hazard in paints http://www.worksafe.govt.nz/worksafe/information-guidance/all-guidance-items/lead-based-paints-management-guidelines/lead-based-paint-guidelines-2008.pdf
South Africa	0	1	0	Paint manufacturers are aware and compliant. Car battery manufacturers charge a levy for remanufacture.
Spain	1 (1x)	0 (2x)	0 (2x)	Work in the Aznalcollar spill in Doñana and in the old mines of Sierra Madrona-Valle de Alcudia (Sierra Morena). Around 20-30 papers published.
Uganda	0	0	0	
United Kingdom	0	0	0	
Sum	2	3	3	

For Spain, two experts from two different institutions provided responses.

Additional Information

Table Add. Question 1). National strategies on the sources of poisoning to migratory birds (1=existing; 0=not existing).

Country	Insecticides	Rodenticides	Poison-baits	Veterinary pharmaceuticals	Lead ammunition and fishing weights	Comments
Canada	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Iran	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Israel	0	0	0	0	0	
Italy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
New Zealand	N/A	1	1	N/A	0	

Country	Insecticides	Rodenticides	Poison-baits	Veterinary pharmaceuticals	Lead ammunition and fishing weights	Comments
South Africa	1	1	0	1	0	Legislation and enforcement insufficient.
Spain	1	N/A	1	N/A	0	a) National Action Plan for the sustainable use of pesticides (approved in 2012), acc. to article 4 of Directive 2009/128/CE; c) National Strategy against the illegal use of poison-baits in the wild (approved in 2004, currently under revision)
Uganda	0	0	0	0	0	
United Kingdom	0	0	0	0	0	
Sum	2	2	2	1	0	

To the question *Do you find the Guidelines on Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds useful for implementation?* (additional question 2) three participants assessed the Guidelines as a useful tool, three as being somewhat useful, one as being unrealistic and one participant as being not useful. Among those participants who found the guidelines somewhat or not useful or unrealistic, it was stated that:

- only some of the guidelines are relevant to the country concerned
- the guidelines are partially already implemented
- several parts are difficult to implement (e.g. banning lead in fishing tackle) due to a lack of political will to change the current practice without evidence that the change will reduce harm to wildlife
- the guidelines need to be better promoted in the national governments (add. question 3).

To the question *What would make these guidelines more useful?* (add. q. 4), the responses were:

- commitments of governments to implement them
- encourage the EU institutions to complete regulation gaps such as: lead in fishing gear, prohibition of diclofenac, and very importantly: give more weight to environmental consequences as opposed to economic benefits for manufacturers under the European criteria for authorization of substances (in case of EU member states)
- implementation tools are needed, e.g. resources and accessible promotional materials on websites etc. with active promotion by the right voices, e.g. a Lead Task Force to take forward lead guidelines.

To the additional question 5, *In what ways can CMS support you in implementing these guidelines?* responses were:

- fact sheets summarizing scientific evidence for effects of poisons or use of products on different groups of species are helpful to engage governments in legislation changes where there is evidence of direct harm to wildlife from various types of poisons and applications

- resource mobilization; small grants; supporting project and budget development for SMART goals (considering the funding needs of organizations)
- CMS could introduce itself as a force that acts at the international level to different user communities (farmers, hunters, fishermen, pharmaceutical industries...) as a complementary approach to raise awareness of these issues
- law enforcement in countries
- further leadership from the PPWG – including the formation of the Lead Task Force to bring stakeholders together.

To the additional question 6 *What are the greatest challenge(s) regarding implementing the guidelines to prevent poisoning of migratory birds?* responses were:

- proposed changes to current practice need to gain political acceptance for legislative changes to occur, based on good science and pressure from interested groups
- committed collaboration by all parties in the country; lack of leadership or financial support to cover costs
- government and stakeholder inertia – great efforts needed in persuading key stakeholders to take ownership of the problems and work together to implement solutions, e.g. finding appropriate product alternatives
- resource mobilization

The final question (add. q. 7) *What are the most important implementation(s) regarding the guidelines to prevent poisoning of migratory birds?* received the following answers:

- control of acute toxins so that they are used only by trained operators who are aware of how to manage risks to wildlife
- to urge landowners and pesticide users to use products responsibly and according to label prescription.
- ensure migratory routes, resting points and flyways are safe to birds
- implementation related to insecticides
- actions against intentional poisoning, not only regarding migratory species
- lead poisoning as a priority issue

Annex:

Prevention of Poisoning of Migratory Birds Reporting Form

Dear Member of the Working Group, please answer to the questions in this Reporting Form by clicking on the appropriate checkbox(es). For questions which specifically ask for examples or a listing of items, please provide those in the *Comments* box below the question. Apart from that, in any case, please feel invited to provide comments in the *Comments* box below any question where you think that it might be informative/helpful. Thank you very much.

i.) Insecticides

1.) Have local risk hotspots of bird poisoning by insecticides (e.g. within breeding, wintering and stop-over sites) been identified?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

2.) Have substances of high risk to birds been removed from the market?

- No high risk substances have been removed
- Some high risk substances have been removed
- All high risk substances have been removed

Comments:

|

3.) Please list the high risk substances that have been removed from the market:

[Comments:]

4.) Have mandatory evaluation mechanisms for new and existing products been implemented?

- No mandatory evaluations have been implemented
- Mandatory evaluations for new products have been implemented
- Mandatory evaluations for new and existing products have been implemented
- Evaluations have been implemented, but they are not mandatory

[Comments:]

5.) Have safe alternatives been found to traditional pesticides?

- Yes
- No

Which ones (please list under *Comments*)?

[Comments:]

6.) Has integrated pest management been incentivized?

- Yes
- No

[Comments:]

6a.) If so, what incentives are being offered to farmers using integrated pest management (You may select more than one)?

- Monetary
- Non-monetary

Comments:

|

7.) Have certification systems for integrative pest management been put in place in response to farm-bird friendly crop production?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

8.) Are neonicotinoid insecticides being monitored to confirm safe use?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

8a.) If so, by whom?

Comments:

|

9.) Are all insecticide usages being documented by crop and region?

Yes

No

Comments:
|

10.) Are organophosphates and carbamates (including banned substances) being documented by crop and region?

Yes

No

Comments:
|

ii.) Rodenticides

1.) Have second generation anticoagulant rodenticides used in open agricultural fields been banned or restricted?

- Banned
- Restricted
- No action

If there has not been a complete ban, please provide a short explanation:

Comments:

|

2.) Is programme baiting being encouraged, (in which rodenticides are applied only when infestations are present, followed by bait removal)?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

2a.) Through which platform is programme baiting being encouraged?

Comments:

|

3.) Have best practice guidelines (including treatment and timing of rodent management, mitigation techniques, monitoring and evaluation, information sharing) been developed?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

4.) Are best practice guidelines applied?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

iii.) Poison-baits

1.) What drivers have been identified in regards to using poison-baits?

- Predator control
- Poaching
- Traditional Medicine
- Other (please list under *Comments*)

Comments:

|

2.) Is there a reporting system in place to account for poisoning incidents?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Comments:

|

2a.) If yes, please give a short insight into the system (under *Comments*):

Comments:

|

3.) Are there alternative, practical, non-toxic methods for livestock protection which are being offered to farmers, hunters, etc.? If Yes, please list examples under *Comments*.

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Comments:

|

4.) Have any multi-stakeholder forums taken place to formulate management decisions regarding human-wildlife conflicts?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Comments:

|

5.) Please indicate the number of training courses and individuals educated about the law and consequences of poison-baits:

Training courses: _____

Individuals: _____

Comments: |

5a.) Which professional groups have been targeted by education and training (please list under *Comments*)?

Comments:
|

6.) Have any national strategies been implemented to deter poison-baits?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Comments:
|

7.) Have any regional action plans been implemented to deter poison-baits?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Comments: |

8.) Are there any infringement penalties existing around poison-baits?

- Yes
- No

Comments:
|

8a.) If yes, which infringement penalties exist around poison-baits?

Comments:
|

9.) How many incidents have been investigated regarding poisoning in the last 5 years?

Comments:
|

10.) Are hunting licenses being withdrawn for persons and areas where illegal poison-bait activity occurs?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Comments:
|

11.) Have government subsidies for landowners been suspended in the case of infringements?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

12.) Do sentencing guidelines exist for wildlife poisoning?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

13.) Has there been an increase in resources for enforcement around wildlife poisoning?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

|

14.) What specifically is your department lacking to effectively enforce policy around wildlife poisoning? (You may select more than one)

- Personnel
- Material Resources
- Community support
- Funding
- Other

Comments: |

15.) In the absence of an identified offender, is it possible to hold a superior body or organization responsible for the crime? (Vicarious liability¹)

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

16.) Have grace periods for banned products been removed?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

¹ Vicarious liability is a type of secondary liability, which allows an organization, region, or superior body to be held accountable for an offence in the absence of an identified party.

17.) Is access to highly toxic substances restricted to certified professionals?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

18.) Are there coordinated product removal policies with neighboring countries to prevent poisoning?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

iv.) Veterinary Pharmaceuticals

1.) Has surveillance of ungulate carcasses in high risk areas for diclofenac use been enhanced?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

2.) Have vulture safe zones been developed to prevent diclofenac poisoning?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

3.) Has community education in high risk areas been implemented?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

4.) Have manufacturers voluntarily withdrawn non-steroidal anti-inflammatories (NSAIDs)?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

5.) Has awareness been raised by work with manufacturers through product stewardship?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

6.) Has the use of veterinary diclofenac been prohibited?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

7.) Has mandatory safety testing of NSAIDs (incl. multi-species testing using in-vitro and read across methods) been introduced?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

8.) Have methods (e.g. vial size reduction) been developed to reduce illegal use of human pharmaceuticals?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

8a.) If so, what methods?

[Comments:]

9.) Are bottles of diclofenac meant for human use being labeled “not for veterinary use”?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

10.) Are pharmacies required to report to a regulatory body regarding the sale of diclofenac?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

10a.) If so, what regulatory body must the pharmacies report to?

[Comments:]

11.) Are pharmacies required to record diclofenac sales and purchase details?

Yes

No

If Yes, since when? _____

[Comments:]

12.) Are alternative veterinary products (such as meloxicam) readily available?

Yes

No

[Comments:]

13.) Are subsidies provided to those unable to afford safe alternative products?

Yes

No

<p><i>Comments:</i> </p>

v.) Lead ammunition and fishing weights

1.) What steps are being taken to raise awareness of lead poisoning, particularly at key sites for migratory waterbirds (you may select more than one)?

- Collaborative websites (of hunters/multi-MEAs/natural-resource managers/conservation organizations)
- Leadership by ammunition users (hunters/wildlife managers) to raise awareness and promote non-toxic alternatives
- Others (please list under *Comments*)

Comments: |

2.) Are non-toxic alternatives to lead ammunition being promoted?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

3.) Which of the following legislative processes have been implemented to reduce environmental contamination by lead ammunition (you may select more than one; if selecting c.)=partial or e.)=others, please specify under *Comments*)

- Restrict sale
- Restrict possession
- Partial ban of use (in wetlands or on specific species)
- Complete ban of use
- Others
- None

Comments: |

4.) Is lead ammunition in the process of being phased out in your country?

- Lead ammunition has been phased out in all habitats
- Lead ammunition has been phased out only in wetlands
- Lead ammunition is in the process of being phased out
- No action has been taken

Comments: |

5.) Is there remediation of lead-ammunition contaminated environments in your country?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

6.) Is your country going to meet the deadline of banning lead ammunition by 2017?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

7.) What steps are being taken to raise awareness on the issue of lead poisoning from fishing weights (you may select more than one)?

- Collaborative websites (angler organizations/multi-MEAs/natural-resource managers/conservation organizations)
- Leadership by angling organizations and manufacturers to raise awareness and promote non-toxic fishing weights
- Promotion of Anglers Code of Practice
- Others (please list under Comments)

Comments: |

8.) Are anglers actively being made aware of non-toxic alternatives to lead fishing weights?

- Yes
- No

Comments: |

9.) Have lead fishing weights been phased-out in areas where migratory birds have been shown to be at risk?

- Yes
- No
- In progress

Comments: |

10.) Which of the following legislative processes have been implemented to reduce environmental contamination by lead fishing weights (you may select more than one; if selecting c.)=partial or e.)=others, please specify under *Comments*)

- Restrict sale
- Restrict possession
- Partial ban of use (in freshwater habitats)
- Complete ban of use
- Others
- None

[*Comments:*]

11.) Is your country going to meet the deadline of banning lead fishing weights by 2017?

- Yes
- No

[*Comments:*]

12.) Regarding which other sources of lead poisoning have you taken action in?

- Industrial pollution from lead mining and smelting processes
- Leaded paint
- Other sources of discarded lead (please specify under *Comments*)

[*Comments:*]

vi.) Additional Questions

1.) Is there a national strategy for each of the following categories?

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a.) Insecticides | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| b.) Rodenticides | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| c.) Poison-bait | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| d.) Veterinary pharmaceuticals | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| e.) Lead ammunition and fishing weights | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Comments: |

2.) Do you find the Guidelines on Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds useful for implementation?

- Not useful
- Somewhat useful
- Useful
- Very useful

Comments: |

3.) If you have selected not helpful, or somewhat helpful, please indicate why below:

- Guidelines are unclear
- Guidelines are unrealistic
- Difficult to implement
- Another reason

Comments: |

4.) What would make these guidelines more useful?

[Comments:]

5.) What ways can CMS support you in implementing these guidelines?

[Comments:]

6.) What are the greatest challenge(s) regarding implementing the guidelines to prevent poisoning of migratory birds?

[Comments:]

7.) What are the most important implementation(s) regarding the guidelines to prevent poisoning of migratory birds?

[Comments:]