

2019 CMS National Report

Deadline for submission of the National Reports: 17 August 2019

Reporting period: from April 2017 to August 2019

Parties are encouraged to respond to all questions and are also requested to provide comprehensive answers, when required.

COP Resolution 9.4 called upon the Secretariats and Parties of CMS Agreements to collaborate in the implementation and harmonization of online reporting implementation. The CMS Family Online Reporting System (ORS) has been successfully implemented and used by CMS, AEWA, IOSEA and Sharks MOU in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC.

Decision 12.4 requested the Secretariat, taking account of advice from the informal advisory group, to develop a proposal to be submitted for the approval of the 48th meeting of the Standing Committee (StC48) for a revision of the format for the national reports to be submitted to the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and subsequently. The new format was adopted by StC48 in October 2018 and made available as an offline version downloadable from the CMS website in December 2018. The revised format aims inter alia at collecting data and information relevant to eight indicators adopted by COP12 for the purpose of assessing implementation of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023.

This online version of the format strictly follows the one adopted by StC48. In addition, as requested by StC48, it incorporates pre-filled information, notably in Sections II and III, based on data available at the Secretariat. This includes customized species lists by Party. Please note that the lists include taxa at the species level originating from the disaggregation of taxa listed on Appendix II at a level higher than species. Please review the information and update or amend it, when necessary.

The Secretariat was also requested to develop and produce a guidance document to accompany any revised National Report Format. Please note that guidance has been provided for a number of questions throughout the national report as both in-text guidance and as tool tips (displayed via the information 'i' icon).

For any question, please contact Ms. María José Ortiz, Programme Management Officer, at maria-jose.ortiz@cms.int

High-level summary of key messages

In your country, in the reporting period, what does this report reveal about:

Guidance: This section invites you to summarise briefly the most important positive aspects of CMS implementation in your country and the areas of greatest concern. Please limit this specifically to the current reporting period only. Your answers should be based on the information contained in the body of the report: the intention is for this section to distil the technical information in the report into some very brief and simple "high level" messages for decision-makers and for wider audiences. Although keeping it brief, please try also to be specific where you can, e.g. "New wildlife legislation enacted in 2018 doubled penalties for poisoning wild birds" is more informative than "stronger laws"; "50% shortfall in match-funding for GEF project on gazelles" is more informative than "lack of funding".

The most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention? (List up to five items):

- > -As depositary Germany has the special task to care for the accession of new parties to CMS. The Growth of the recent past -meanwhile nearly 130 parties - is a successful progress.
- A research project on the illegal killing and capture of birds of prey was accomplished (cf. chapter X) and the implementation of its suggestions to diminish the problem were started already in spring 2019.
- Projects in CMS with a Special German interest and funding like CAMI, the renewable Energy Task Force, MIKT or the African Wild Ass Action plan are well developing.
- In 2019 we managed to care for a new German JPO Support and the selection procedure already started in early summer 2019. - This will help to implement CMS tasks in Africa.

The greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention? (List up to five items):

- > Germany is a federal state and therefore implementation takes more time than in states with a central government.

The main priorities for future implementation of the Convention? (List up to five items):

- > As far as the depositary tasks are concerned Germany strives for more than 150 parties until the 50th anniversary of CMS.

The Implementation of the Research Project and its suggestions to diminish infringements against the protection of birds of prey" will be a high priority for the close future.
The working groups -cf. above - and the JPO Task will be a focal subject for the Close future too.

I. Administrative Information

Name of Contracting Party

> Germany

Date of entry into force of the Convention in your country (DDMMYY)

> 1.10.1984

Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention

> None

Report compiler

Name and title

> Hans Christian Stotzem

Full name of institution

> Bundesamt für Naturschutz (Federal Agency for Nature Conservation)

Telephone

> +49 (0) 228-8491 1432

Email

> hans-christian.stotzem@bfn.de

Designated CMS National Focal Point

Name and title of designated Focal Point

> Oliver Schall

Full name of institution

> Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und nukleare Sicherheit (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety) - in brief "BMU"

Mailing address

> Robert-Schuman-Platz 3

53175 Bonn

Germany

Telephone

> +49 (0) 228 99 305 2632

Email

> Oliver.Schall@bmu.bund.de

Representative on the Scientific Council

Name and title

> Dr. Timm Reinhardt

Full name of institution

> Bundesamt für Naturschutz (Federal Agency for Nature Conservation)

Mailing address

> Konstantinstraße 110

53179 Bonn

Germany

Telephone

> +49(0)228 8491-1433

Email

> timm.reinhardt@bfn.de

II. Accession/Ratification of CMS Agreements/MOUs

Please confirm the status of your country's participation in the following Agreements/MOUs, and indicate any updates or corrections required:

Please select only one option

- Yes, the lists are correct and up to date
 No, updates or corrections are required, as follows:

Updates or corrections:

>

Country participation in Agreements/MOUs:

Please select only one per line

	Party/Signatory	Range State, but not a Party/Signatory	Not applicable (= not a Range State)
Western African Aquatic Mammals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
West African Elephants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Wadden Sea Seals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Southern South American Grassland Birds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
South Andean Huemul	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Slender-billed Curlew	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Siberian Crane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sharks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Saiga Antelope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ruddy-headed Goose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pacific Islands Cetaceans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monk Seal in the Atlantic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Middle-European Great Bustard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IOSEA Marine Turtles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High Andean Flamingos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gorilla Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
EUROBATS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dugong	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bukhara Deer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Birds of Prey (Raptors)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Atlantic Turtles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ASCOBANS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic Warbler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
AEWA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ACCOBAMS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ACAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. Species on the Convention Appendices

Please confirm that the Excel file linked to below correctly identifies the Appendix I species for which the country is a Range State.

Please download the Appendix I species occurrence list for your country here.

Guidance: Article I(1)(h) of the Convention defines when a country is a Range State for a species, by reference also to the definition of “range” in Article I(1)(f). The latter refers to all the areas that a migratory species inhabits, stays in temporarily, crosses or overflies at any time on its normal migration route. In adopting the current format for national reports, the Standing Committee was aware that there are occasional cases where it may be difficult to determine what is a “normal” migration route, and for example to distinguish this from aberrant or vagrant occurrences. This issue has been identified for possible examination in the future by the Sessional Committee of the CMS Scientific Council. In the meantime, if in doubt, please make the interpretation that you think will best serve the wider aims of the Convention. A note on the application of the Convention to Overseas Territories/Autonomous Regions of Parties can be found at https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/instrument/territories_reservations%202015.pdf.

References throughout this report format to “species” should be taken to include subspecies where an Appendix to the Convention so provides, or where the context otherwise requires.

Please select only one option

Yes the file is correct and up to date (please upload the file as your confirmation of this, and include any comments you may wish in respect of individual species)

No, amendments are needed and these are specified in the amended version of the Excel file provided (please upload the amended file using the attachment button below).

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Section III Appendix I Germany corrected.xlsx](#)

Please confirm that the Excel file linked to below correctly identifies the Appendix II species for which the country is a Range State.

Please download the Appendix II species occurrence list for your country here.

Guidance: See the guidance note in question III.1 concerning the interpretation of “Range State”.

Please select only one option

Yes the file is correct and up to date (please upload the file as your confirmation of this, and include any comments you may wish in respect of individual species)

No, amendments are needed and these are specified in the amended version of the Excel file provided (please upload the amended file using the attachment button below).

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Section III Appendix II Germany corrected.xlsx](#)

IV. Legal Prohibition of the Taking of Appendix I Species

Is the taking of Appendix I species prohibited by national or territorial legislation in accordance with CMS Article III(5)?

Please select only one option

- Yes for all Appendix I species
 Yes for some species
 Yes for part of the country, or a particular territory or territories
 No

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

- > Protection by Federal Nature protection legislation or by Hunting legislation :
- Bundesnaturschutzgesetz (Federal Nature Conservation Act)
- Bundesartenschutzverordnung (Regulation on Species conservation)
- Bundesjagdgesetz (Federal Hunting Act)
- EU Habitats Directive
- EU Birds Directive
- EU Council Regulation No 338/97

Exceptions: Where the taking of Appendix I species is prohibited by national legislation, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

If yes, please indicate in the Excel file linked to below which species, which reasons among those in CMS Article III(5) (a)-(d) justify the exception, any temporal or spatial limitations applying to the exception, and the nature of the “extraordinary circumstances” that make the exception necessary.

Please download the list of species here, select all that apply and upload the amended file using the attachment button below.

Guidance: According to Article III(5) of the Convention, exceptions to a legal prohibition against taking of Appendix I species can only be made for one (or more) of the reasons specified in sub-paragraphs (a)-(d) of that Article. For any species you list in this table, therefore, you must identify (in the second column of the table in the Excel file) at least one of the reasons that justify the exception relating to that species. In any case where you identify reason (d) as applying, please explain (in the third column) the nature of the “extraordinary circumstances” involved. According to Article III(5), exceptions granted for any of the four reasons must also be “precise as to content and limited in space and time”. Please therefore state what the specific mandatory space and time limitations are, in each case, using the third column; and indicate the date on which each exception was notified to the Secretariat in accordance with Article III(7).

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Section IV exceptions.xlsx](#)

Please indicate in the Excel file linked to below the species for which taking is prohibited.

Please download the list of species here, select all that apply and upload the amended file using the attachment button below.

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

>

Exceptions: Where the taking of Appendix I species is prohibited by national legislation, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

If yes, please indicate in the Excel file linked to below which species, which reasons among those in CMS Article III(5) (a)-(d) justify the exception, any temporal or spatial limitations applying to the exception, and the nature of the “extraordinary circumstances” that make the exception necessary.

Please download the list of species here, select all that apply and upload the amended file using the attachment button below.

Guidance: According to Article III(5) of the Convention, exceptions to a legal prohibition against taking of Appendix I

species can only be made for one (or more) of the reasons specified in sub-paragraphs (a)-(d) of that Article. For any species you list in this table, therefore, you must identify (in the second column of the table in the Excel file) at least one of the reasons that justify the exception relating to that species. In any case where you identify reason (d) as applying, please explain (in the third column) the nature of the “extraordinary circumstances” involved. According to Article III(5), exceptions granted for any of the four reasons must also be “precise as to content and limited in space and time”. Please therefore state what the specific mandatory space and time limitations are, in each case, using the third column; and indicate the date on which each exception was notified to the Secretariat in accordance with Article III(7).

Where the taking of all Appendix I species is not prohibited and the reasons for exceptions in Article III(5) do not apply, are steps being taken to develop new legislation to prohibit the taking of all relevant species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please indicate which of the following stages of development applies

Please select only one option

- Legislation being considered
- Legislation in draft
- Legislation fully drafted and being considered for adoption in (specify year)

>

- Other

>

Please indicate in the Excel file linked to below the species for which taking is prohibited.

Please download the list of species here, select all that apply and upload the amended file using the attachment button below.

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

>

Where the taking of all Appendix I species is not prohibited and the reasons for exceptions in Article III(5) do not apply, are steps being taken to develop new legislation to prohibit the taking of all relevant species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please indicate which of the following stages of development applies:

Please select only one option

- Legislation being considered
- Legislation in draft
- Legislation fully drafted and being considered for adoption in (specify year)

>

- Other

>

Where the taking of all Appendix I species is not prohibited and the reasons for exceptions in Article III(5) do not apply, are steps being taken to develop new legislation to prohibit the taking of all relevant species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please indicate which of the following stages of development applies:

Please select only one option

- Legislation being considered
- Legislation in draft
- Legislation fully drafted and being considered for adoption in (specify year)

>

- Other

>

Are any vessels flagged to your country engaged outside national jurisdictional limits in intentionally taking Appendix I species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please provide more information on the circumstances of the take, including any future plans in respect of such take.

>

V. Awareness

(SPMS Target 1: People are aware of the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats and migration systems, and the steps they can take to conserve them and ensure the sustainability of any use.)

During the reporting period, please indicate the actions that have been taken by your country to increase people's awareness of the values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems (note that answers given in section XVIII on SPMS Target 15 may also be relevant).

(Select all that apply).

- Campaigns on specific topics
- Teaching programmes in schools or colleges
- Press and media publicity, including social media
- Community-based celebrations, exhibitions and other events
- Engagement of specific stakeholder groups
- Special publications
- Interpretation at nature reserves and other sites
- Other (please specify)

> The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

NorthRhine-Westphalia: Internet-based information services on species such as bats and migratory birds by the North Rhine-Westphalian State Agency for Nature, Environment and Consumer Protection

Schleswig-Holstein: Special training for bird-watching guides and guided birdwatching tours (particular in schools) in the Bundesland of Schleswig Holstein, education campaigns in schools of Schleswig Holstein, where they offer varied education units and learning materials about migratory birds and emphasize the importance of the Wadden Sea as an avian hot spot

Thuringia: Thuringia conducts specialist conferences on migratory bird and bat species

No actions taken

Impact of actions

Please indicate any specific elements of CMS COP Resolutions 11.8 (Rev. COP12) (Communication, Information and Outreach Plan) and 11.9 (World Migratory Bird Day) which have been particularly taken forward by these actions.

> On federal level, funding of the WMBD. The last time three years ago.

The following activities were carried out by the Bundesländer:

Baden-Württemberg: Excursions informing on migratory birds, their way of life and their migration at important resting and wintering grounds in the Ramsar-area "Oberrhein-Rhin Supérieur" (part of the CMS resolution 11.8 Underlining); the current education plan of Baden-Württemberg includes the teaching of the subject bird migration (especially the bird migration as a strategy for wintering) and the migrating species (part of the CMS resolution 11.8 Underlining) in school. A special seminar for teachers offers material to implement the subject bird migration (part of the CMS resolution 11.8 Underlining). The bird of the year 2019 is the Skylark. An exhibition informs about the way of life and threats of the Skylark (Part of the CMS resolution 11.8 Underlining)

Brandenburg: Specific awareness campaigns have been launched only in the framework of two CMS Memoranda of Understanding - for the Great Bustard and for the Aquatic Warbler

Hesse: In Cooperation with the International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine (IKSR) the Hessian government implemented measures for protection purposes and future management of the eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) (vgl. <https://rp-darmstadt.hessen.de/umwelt/landwirtschaftfischereiweinbau/fischerei/fischartenschutz/aal>) and connected with this several activities to raise the public awareness.

The Federal State of Hesse works in cooperation with the NGO NABU Hessen and the species-specialist-group Arbeitsgemeinschaft Fledermausschutz in Hessen (AGFH) to improve the knowledge about migrating bats in public (f.e. <https://fledermaus-hessen.jimdo.com/fledermäuse-schützen/>).

Lower Saxony: Different actions to increase people's awareness of the values of bats: e.g. BatNight, educational programs for volunteers and professionals; public relations work like information kiosks, exhibitions (e.g. "FledermausReich" Nationalparkhaus Harz St. Andreasberg), print of promotion and information materials, social media and further activities of associations/ NGOs (e.g. NABU, BUND, NUVD) as well as forestry and nature conservation authorities etc. Further activities of Lower Saxony can be found in the current EUROBATS national report.

Saxony: Performing local and regional events, especially in the context of events from the NGO "NABU" regarding "Birdwatch" and the European Bat Night.

Overall, how successful have these awareness actions been in achieving their objectives?

Tick one box

Please select only one option

1. Very little impact

- 2. Small impact
- 3. Good impact
- 4. Large positive impact
- Not known

Please identify the main form(s) of evidence that has/have been used to make this assessment.

> Due to more important issues no attention was given to evaluate ex post awareness actions.

VI. Mainstreaming Migratory Species in Other Sectors and Processes

(SPMS Target 2: Multiple values of migratory species and their habitats have been integrated into international, national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes, including on livelihoods, and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.)

Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any national or local strategies and/or planning processes in your country relating to development, poverty reduction and/or livelihoods?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

> The National Strategy on Biological Diversity serves all kind of habitat and species conservation purposes: including migratory species.

Do the 'values of migratory species and their habitats' referred to in SPMS Target 2 currently feature in any other national reporting processes in your country?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

Describe the main involvements (if any) of non-governmental organizations and/or civil society in the conservation of migratory species in your country.

> The Federal Nature Protection act contains a general duty of NGO involvement - however, this obligation applies to all kind of conservation issues and not only to migratory species.

Many NGOs carry out data collection on a voluntary basis or manage protected areas. Involvement also includes technical advice and, in individual cases, implementation of projects through work and services contracts.

Restoration of sturgeon populations in the North and Baltic Sea tributaries is carried out by a research institute with support by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation. The measures have been developed on an experimental basis and are currently transferred to a functional level. The projects are currently expanded on a regional level (HELCOM, OSPAR).

Describe the main involvements (if any) of the private sector in the conservation of migratory species in your country.

> In Germany the intra-national conservation of migratory species is in principle a task of the 16 German Federal States ("Bundesländer"). Their policy involving the private sector is different. In general the following assessment might be given as a brief summary:

Voluntary workers are compiling data on occurrences or distribution of species and protect bat roosts and bird nests, the private sector is actively involved in monitoring and species conservation projects and public relations (e.g. honouring private initiatives with awards or other financial contributions).

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Baden-Württemberg: Since 2004, the „Heinz-Sielmann-Foundation“ has been creating a network of new habitats for animals and plants in „Sielmans biotop network Lake Constance“. This project is currently still being expanded. Since 2014, regional authorities and landscape conservation associations in the region “Lake Constance” have been able to apply for co-financing for habitat measures. Those biotopes also serve numerous migratory birds as stepping stones, resting and breeding sites.

Hesse: Private homeowners and church parishes cooperate with the NABU/AGFH action plan “Fledermausfreundliches Haus “ (batfriendly home) and make their estates available as nursery roosts for bats.

Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: The tourism industry likes to advertise “intact nature” and uses also species like *Clanga pomarina* in the project “ChanceNatur”.

Lower Saxony: Participation in volunteering programs (governmental or in associations/NGOs for nature conservation), citizen science projects, school education.

North Rhine-Westphalia: Some financial support from the private sector in activities of NGOs and Biological Stations for migratory species, e.g. through the HIT Stiftung.

Saxony: Create bat roosts, especially regarding building restorations.

Saxony-Anhalt: Respecting the needs of species conservation in planning and intervention measures; Contractual Agreements on the protection of bat roosts in the Natura 2000 conservation areas.

Schleswig-Holstein: Nature NGO's and entrepreneurs/organisations, which are National Park Partners, offer a

large variety of guided tours, exhibitions, presentations and printed material to inform about ecology, occurrence, distribution as well as threats to and conservation of migratory bird species.
Thuringia: Private citizens report their observations via e-mail, phone or internet portals to coordinators and technical authorities.

VII. Governance, Policy and Legislative Coherence

(SPMS Target 3: National, regional and international governance arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migration systems have improved significantly, making relevant policy, legislative and implementation processes more coherent, accountable, transparent, participatory, equitable and inclusive.)

Have any governance arrangements affecting migratory species and their migration systems in your country, or in which your country participates, improved during the reporting period?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No, but there is scope to do so
 No, because existing arrangements already satisfy all the points in Target 3

Please provide a short summary:

> Concerning marine sites -including sites of importance for harbour porpoises - draft governance arrangements concerning fishery issues were reached. However given, that for marine issues the EU has the fishery competence these Arrangements are now in EU negotiations.

To what extent have these improvements helped to achieve Target 3 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (see text above)? Tick one box.

Please select only one option

1. Minimal contribution
 2. Partial contribution
 3. Good contribution
 4. Major contribution
 Not known

Please describe briefly how this assessment was made

> The process is still not settled. Therefore it is too early to give an assessment.

Has any committee or other arrangement for liaison between different sectors or groups been established at national or other territorial level in your country that addresses CMS implementation issues?

Guidance: There is no fixed model for what these arrangements may involve, and it is for each Contracting Party to decide what best suits its own circumstances. Examples could include a steering group that includes representatives of territorial administration authorities, a coordination committee that involves the lead government department (e.g. environment) working with other departments (e.g. agriculture, industry); a forum that brings together government and NGOs; a liaison group that links with business and private sector interests; a stakeholder forum involving representatives of indigenous and local communities; a coordination team that brings together the National Focal Points for each of the biodiversity-related MEAs to which the country is a Party (see also question VII.3); or any other appropriate mechanism. These mechanisms may be specifically focused on migratory species issues, or they may address CMS implementation in conjunction with related processes such as NBSAP coordination, a National Ramsar Committee, etc. The Manual for National Focal Points for CMS and its Instruments (https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/basic_page_documents/Internet_english_09012014.pdf) may be helpful in giving further context for this.

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

Does collaboration between the focal points of CMS and other relevant Conventions take place in your country to develop the coordinated and synergistic approaches described in paragraphs 23-25 of CMS COP Resolution 11.10 (Rev. COP12) (Synergies and partnerships)?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

> In cases where coordinations with other MEA are needed this coordination takes place, so e.g. concerning Berne Convention, CITES, CBD etc. - Once a month in the ministry a Meeting on "internationale nature protections issues" takes place.

Within the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), the responsible units for the different biodiversity-related conventions are in close contact in their day-to-day work. In addition, twice per year these units conduct an exchange on different topics related to the convention ("so-called "jour fixe")

Has your country or any jurisdictional subdivision within your country adopted legislation, policies or action plans that promote community involvement in conservation of CMS-listed species?

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please identify the legislation, policies or action plans concerned:

> On federal Level: National Action Plan on the protection and recovery of the European sturgeon *A. sturio*. In general, nature conservation is a task of the Bundesländer.

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Lower Saxony: Newly adopted policy of the Ministry of Environment of the state of Lower Saxony: "Promotion of cooperation between nature conservation authorities and non-government organisations"

North Rhine-Westphalia: The Biodiversity Strategy of North Rhine-Westphalia (2015) identifies as actions a) the involvement of local landowners and landusers in the development of protected areas, and b) the development of concepts for providing advice to farmers for biodiversity-friendly land use. Both actions will support the conservation of migratory species such as waders and bats, among others.

Schleswig-Holstein: Indirectly: Action Plan for the implementation of the Strategy for Sustainable Tourism in the Wadden Sea World Heritage Destination. The Hallig Programme (HP), an agri-environmental and climate measure aimed at Hallig agriculture and Hallig ecology especially feeding areas for Arctic goose species.

The National Park Law §6 2.1. dictates that rules for the use of the tidal flats on the mainland coast and around the islands and the Halligen (Oland, Langeneß, Gröde, Hooge and Nordstrandischmoor) as well as routes for tidal flat walks beyond this area, are laid down by the authority responsible for the national park in agreement with the local municipalities. At common trilateral Wadden Sea cooperation level action plans for Common Seal (1985), Grey Seal (1985) and Common Porpoise (1988)

VIII. Incentives

(SPMS Target 4: Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to migratory species, and/or their habitats are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats are developed and applied, consistent with engagements under the CMS and other relevant international and regional obligations and commitments.)

Has there been any elimination, phasing out or reforming of harmful incentives in your country resulting in benefits for migratory species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No, but there is scope to do so
- No, because no such incentives have existed

Please indicate what measures were implemented and the time-periods concerned.

>

Please indicate what measures were implemented and the time-periods concerned.

>

Has there been development and/or application of positive incentives in your country resulting in benefits for migratory species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No, but there is scope to do so
- No, because there is no scope to do so

Please indicate what measures were implemented and the time-periods concerned.

>

Please indicate what measures were implemented and the time-periods concerned.

>

IX. Sustainable Production and Consumption

(SPMS Target 5: Governments, key sectors and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption, keeping the impacts of use of natural resources, including habitats, on migratory species well within safe ecological limits to promote the favourable conservation status of migratory species and maintain the quality, integrity, resilience, and ecological connectivity of their habitats and migration routes.)

During the reporting period, has your country implemented plans or taken other steps concerning sustainable production and consumption which are contributing to the achievement of the results defined in SPMS Target 5?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 In development / planned
 No

Please describe the measures that have been planned, developed or implemented

>

Please describe what evidence exists to show that the intended results of these measures are being achieved.

>

Please describe the measures that have been planned, developed or implemented

> A lot of activities are still in progress

However, these measures (like issues linked to e.g. to climate Change or marine litter etc.) concern other areas of Environment policies and are not directly in charge of CMS. In order to save time a doubling, tripling, etc. of reporting duties to a for these issues not specialised organisation like CMS should be avoided.

Please describe what evidence exists to show that the intended results of these measures are being achieved.

> cf, comment above

What is preventing progress?

>

X. Threats and Pressures Affecting Migratory Species; Including Obstacles to Migration

(SPMS Targets 6+7: Fisheries and hunting have no significant direct or indirect adverse impacts on migratory species, their habitats or their migration routes, and impacts of fisheries and hunting are within safe ecological limits; Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been reduced to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.)

Which of the following pressures on migratory species or their habitats are having an adverse impact in your country on migratory species included in the CMS Appendices?

Guidance: This question asks you to identify the important pressures that are reliably known to be having an actual adverse impact on CMS-listed migratory species at present. Please avoid including speculative information about pressures that may be of some potential concern but whose impacts have not yet been demonstrated.

Please note that, consistent with the terms of the Convention, “in your country” may in certain circumstances include areas outside national jurisdictional limits where the activities of any vessels flagged to your country are involved.

Direct killing and taking

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Illegal hunting	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), including illegal taking off specimens from the nests	
Legal hunting	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA)	
Other harvesting and take		
Illegal trade		
Deliberate poisoning	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA)	

Bycatch

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Bycatch	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Bycatch in gill net and bottom trawl fisheries in the estuary and the marine waters; Phocoena phocoena (App 2) Bycatch in gill nets	Both 1

Collisions and electrocution

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Electrocution	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Electro narcosis on improper repelling devices at power stations and water abstraction facilities	
Wind turbines	cf. above	

Other collisions	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Water abstraction leading to the collection of fish on the intake screens, turbine mortality of downstream migrating juveniles, impingement of fish of turbine screens in cases where migration assisting structures are built but not functional downstream migration facilitation. Ship strikes in the lower section of river (Hamburg - North Sea) due to increasing ship size and limited water depth. Removal of fish during dredging operations ; Phocoena phocoena (App 2) ship strikes mainly in rivers of Elbe and Weser	Phocoena phocoena 2
------------------	--	---------------------

Other mortality

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Predation	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive)	
Disease	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive), Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive), Phocoena phocoena (App 2) (infections)	Phocoena phocoena 2
Accidental/indirect poisoning	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive)	
Unexplained stranding events		

Alien and/or invasive species

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Alien and/or invasive species	Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Concurrence and infection risk by non native sturgeon species, predation by invading gobies (Neogobius melanostomus)	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus 2

Disturbance and disruption

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Disturbance	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive)	
Light pollution	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive)	
Underwater noise	Phocoena phocoena (App. 2)	1

Habitat destruction/degradation

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Habitat loss/destruction (including deforestation)	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Continuous development of shipping channels in coastal and river waters reduces habitat availability, habitat diversity and quality. The uniform river channel and high flow velocities resulting from the modifications increase sediment transport and reduce the population size of invertebrates. In addition, fish migration is rendered more energy consuming due to the higher flow velocities, Phocoena phocoena (App 2)	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus 1, Phocoena phocoena 2

Habitat degradation	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), bats (cf. reporting under the habitats directive), Acipenser sturio (App 1+2) Loss of lateral connectivity and erosion, loss of structural elements (pools, banks, dead wood) minimize the habitat availability; Phocoena phocoena (App 2)	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus 1, Phocoena phocoena 2
Mineral exploration/extraction	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Dredging of navigation routes; Melanitta nigra (App. 2) through sand extraction in Schleswig-Holstein	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus 1, Melanitta nigra 3
Unsustainable land/resource use	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA)	
Urbanization	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA)	
Marine debris (including plastics)	Phocoena phocoena (App 2)	2
Other pollution	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Phocoena phocoena (App 2) PCB and other POPs	Phocoena phocoena 1-2
Too much/too little water		
Fire		
Physical barriers	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Dams etc. obstruct migration routes. Fish migration facilities are not planned and built in adequate dimensions to allow sturgeon migration. If they do, additional use for hydropower increases the risk of mortality in outward migrating individuals.	1

Climate change

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Climate change	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Increasing water temperature increases the risk of a mismatch between migration cues and physiological migration cues.	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus 3

Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Lack of knowledge		
Inadequate legislation	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Protection of habitat suffers from opposing targets and laws for energy production, agricultural practice etc. Harmonization of targets and resulting legal prerequisites is urgently required; Phocoena phocoena (App 2)	Both 1
Inadequate enforcement of legislation	Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Bycatch is not sufficiently controlled, in cases of poaching the enforcement and penalties are not in balance with the individual catch value of the fish. Overall enforcement efforts are too low. Enforcement in the EEZ and beyond is virtually ineffective; Phocoena phocoena (App 2) as above	Both 1
Inadequate transboundary management	Birds (cf. reporting under the birds directive & AEWA), Acipenser sturio/oxyrinchus (App 1+2) Bycatch is not sufficiently controlled, in cases of poaching the enforcement and penalties are not in balance with the individual catch value of the fish. Overall enforcement efforts are too low. Enforcement in the EEZ and beyond is virtually ineffective; Phocoena phocoena (App 2) as above	Both 1

Other (please specify)

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low

	Birds cf. reporting under birds directive & AEWA	
	Bats cf. reporting under the habitats directive	

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in countering any of the pressures identified above? (Identify the pressures concerned).

> Especially concerning IAS the European Union and its member states made progress in the last years to identify the problem species concerned and to prepare eradication.

In Germany from 2015 till the end of 2018 a research project on the illegal killing and capture of birds of prey was carried out to identify the scale of the illegal activities and to describe solutions.

For the final report data lasting back till 2005 have been evaluated.

The report clearly shows that the illegal killing and capture of birds of prey may cause a significant problem not only for more common species like buzzards or goshawks but also for more rare species like white-tailed eagle or peregrine falcons. But it is also obvious that a huge number of unreported cases and consequently a huge number of unreported offenders have not been identified.

Major problems are:

- the lack of specific knowledge of enforcement officers and based on that the lack of purposeful and consequent investigations,

- the low level of sanctions set up by courts and

- the availability of tools to catch birds and toxic substances to kill birds.

To tackle such problems capacity building and awareness-raising must be improved but also further legal steps f.e. to reduce the availability of some products are required.

Bundesländer:

There are conservation measures in all of the federal states. One example is a project in Schleswig-Holstein, supported by the National Park Authority, to protect the population of the Gull-billed Tern in the salt-marsh in the Elbe estuary from predation and disturbance in order to increase breeding success.

In general, nature conservation is a task of the Bundesländer.

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning the pressures identified above? (Identify the pressures concerned).

> Presumably no major changes in comparison to the last reporting period.

Have you adopted new legislation or other domestic measures in the reporting period in response to CMS Article III(4) (b) ("Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor ... to prevent, remove, compensate for or minimize, as appropriate, the adverse effects of activities or obstacles that seriously impede or prevent the migration of the species")?

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please give the title or other reference (and date) for the measure concerned:

> On federal level, there is no new legislation. Measures are in the responsibility of the Bundesländer.

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Baden-Württemberg: Since 2014, the measures from the management plans for the FFH area 8220-341

"Bodanrück and West Lake Constance" and the bird sanctuaries 8220-402 "Bodanrück" and

8220-403 "Mindelsee", as well as parts of the bird sanctuaries 8220-401 "Untersee" and 8220-404 "Überlinger See" with the bog duck (*Aythya nyroca*) are consistently implemented.

Lower Saxony: Ongoing reintroduction project and habitat restoration for the ferruginous duck

<https://wildtierstation.de/artenschutz/moorente.html>

Saxony-Anhalt: Further support of the Great Bustard in the EU bird sanctuary "Fiener Bruch", preparation of a feasibility study on the reintroduction of the Great Bustard in the EU bird sanctuary "Zerbster Land" (under the Great Bustard MoU), consideration of flight corridors between the different strands of the species with regard to the guidelines on species protection at wind turbines.

Thuringia: Optimization of the storage regime at the flood retention basin "Straußfurt" with regard to the migration of shorebirds and resting of cranes

Please add any further comments on the implementation of specific provisions in relevant CMS COP Resolutions, including for example:

Resolution 12.22 on by-catch.

Resolution 12.14 on underwater noise.

Resolution 12.20 on marine debris.

Resolution 7.3 (Rev. COP12) on oil pollution
Resolution 11.22 (Rev. COP12) on live captures of cetaceans (and Decision 12.48).
Resolutions 7.5 (Rev. COP12) and 11.27 (Rev. COP12) on renewable energy.
Resolutions 7.4 and 10.11 on power lines and migratory birds.
Resolution 11.15 (Rev. COP12) on poisoning of migratory birds.
Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP12) on illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds (and Decision 12.26).
Resolution 11.31 on wildlife crime.
Resolution 12.21 on climate change (and Decision 12.72).
Resolution 11.28 on invasive alien species.
Resolution 12.6 on wildlife disease.
Resolution 12.25 on conservation of intertidal and coastal habitats.
Resolution 10.2 on conservation emergencies
Resolution 7.2 (Rev. COP12) on impact assessment.
> • Resolution 12.22 on by-catch.

Harbour Porpoise:

In the whale sanctuary within the National Park Schleswig-Holstein Wadden Sea all kinds of gillnet fishery are prohibited within the 3 nautical mile zone (according to the „Landesverordnung zur Änderung der Landesverordnung über die Ausübung der Fischerei in den Küstengewässern vom 4. Dezember 2013“). Beyond the 3 nautical mile zone gillnet fishery in the whale sanctuary with nets exceeding a special height and mesh size (nets with a stretched span between bottomline and floatline higher than 1.30 m and a mesh size above 150 mm) is prohibited for German fishermen.

Based on the „Freiwillige Vereinbarung zum Schutz von Schweinswalen und tauchenden Meeresenten zwischen Landesfischereiverband, Fischereischutzverband, Ostsee Info-Center (OIC)“ (http://www.ostseeinfocenter.de/Freiwillige_Vereinbarung_Fortschreibung_2015.pdf) the fishermen voluntarily avoid the areas, where seabirds actually occur in great numbers between November and March. The OIC announces the areas.

The fishers voluntarily reduce the gillnets in July and August to reduce cetacean bycatch.

Within the framework of a research project (STELLA), conducted by the Thuenen Institute for Baltic Sea Fisheries and funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), the development of alternative management approaches and fishing gear and techniques is investigated in order to minimize conflicts in gill net fisheries and conservation objectives and subjects of protection in the EEZ of the Baltic Sea.

<https://www.thuenen.de/en/of/projects/fisheries-environment-baltic-sea/gill-net-fisheries-development-of-alternative-management-approaches-stella/>

<https://www.bfn.de/themen/meeresnaturschutz/belastungen-im-meer/fischerei/stella-forschungsprojekt.html>

• Resolution 12.14 on underwater noise.

Harbour Porpoise:

Within the framework of a research project (UWE) funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), effects of the Underwater Sound of Offshore Windfarms on Marine Mammals are investigated.

A “Noise Protection Concept” for harbour porpoises by the German Ministry of the Environment is in place in the North Sea since 2013 including a standard of dual noise immission criteria for the installation of wind turbines.

• Resolution 12.20 on marine debris.

Harbour Porpoise:

Several projects and initiatives in place in order to monitor and collect marine litter, also within the framework of OSPAR.

• Resolution 11.16 on illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds

- see question on most significant advances (above)

- Initiative against the illegal net trapping of birds in Egypt and Libya

- In the federal state North-Rhine Westphalia, the ministry for the Environment dissolved its executive department for Environment criminality

• Resolution 7.5 on renewable energy

- see report on renewable energy, published by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation:

https://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/BfN/erneuerbareenergien/Dokumente/BfNERneuerbareEnergienReport2019_barrierefrei.pdf (german)

• Resolution 7.4 on power lines and migratory birds

- see working manual, published by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation:

<https://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/BfN/service/Dokumente/skripten/Skript512.pdf> (german)

• Resolution 11.31 on wildlife crime

- see question on most significant advances (above)

Furthermore:

For marine issues cf. the annual ASCOBANS reports.

For illegal killing of Birds cf. the description given above.

XI. Conservation Status of Migratory Species

(SPMS Target 8: The conservation status of all migratory species, especially threatened species, has considerably improved throughout their range.)

What (if any) major changes in the conservation status of migratory species included in the CMS Appendices (for example national Red List category changes) have been recorded in your country in the current reporting period?

If more rows are required, please upload an Excel file (using the attachment button below) detailing a longer list of species.

Guidance: “Conservation status” of migratory species is defined in Article I(1)(b) of the Convention as “the sum of the influences acting on the migratory species that may affect its long-term distribution and abundance”; and four conditions for conservation status to be taken as “favourable” are set out in Article I(1)(c).

The emphasis of this question is on “major changes” in the current reporting period. Information is therefore expected here only where particularly notable shifts in status have occurred, such as those that might be represented by a re-categorisation of national Red List threat status for a given species (or subspecies, where relevant).

Please note also that you are only being asked about the situation in your country. Information about global trends, and global Red List reclassifications etc, will be communicated to the CMS via other channels outside the national reporting process.

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats)

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

Aquatic mammals

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

Bats

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

Birds

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

--	--	--	--	--

Reptiles

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

Fish

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

Insects

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)

XII. Cooperating to Conserve Migration Systems

(SPMS Target 9: International and regional action and cooperation between States for the conservation and effective management of migratory species fully reflects a migration systems approach, in which all States sharing responsibility for the species concerned engage in such actions in a concerted way.)

In the current reporting period, has your country initiated or participated in the development of any proposals for new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II species (following the advice in COP Resolution 12.8)?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

In the current reporting period, have actions been taken by your country to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please specify which countries have been approached:

- Azerbaijan
 Bahamas
 Bahrain
 Barbados
 Belize
 Bhutan
 Botswana
 Brunei Darussalam
 Cambodia
 Canada
 Central African Republic
 China
 Colombia
 Comoros
 Democratic People's Republic of Korea
 Dominica
 El Salvador
 Grenada
 Guatemala
 Guyana
 Haiti
 Iceland
 Indonesia
 Jamaica
 Japan
 Kiribati
 Kuwait
 Lao People's Democratic Republic
 Andorra
 Lebanon
 Lesotho
 Malawi
 Malaysia
 Maldives
 Marshall Islands
 Mexico
 Micronesia
 Myanmar
 Namibia
 Nauru
 Nepal
 Nicaragua
 Niue
 Oman

- Papua New Guinea
- Qatar
- Republic of Korea
- Russian Federation
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- San Marino
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Solomon Islands
- South Sudan
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Thailand
- Timor-Leste
- Tonga
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- United States of America
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City State
- Venezuela
- Viet Nam
- Zambia

In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the implementation of concerted actions under CMS (as detailed in COP Resolution 12.28) to address the needs of relevant migratory species? (See the species list in Annex 3 to Resolution 12.28 www.cms.int/en/document/concerted-actions-1)

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please describe the results of these actions achieved so far:

>

Have any other steps been taken which have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in Target 9 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (all relevant States engaging in cooperation on the conservation of migratory species in ways that fully reflect a migration systems approach), including for example (but not limited to) measures to implement Resolution 12.11 (and Decision 12.34) on flyways and Resolution 12.17 (and Decision 12.54) on South Atlantic whales?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please provide details:

>

XIII. Area-Based Conservation Measures

(SPMS Target 10: All critical habitats and sites for migratory species are identified and included in area-based conservation measures so as to maintain their quality, integrity, resilience and functioning in accordance with the implementation of Aichi Target 11, supported where necessary by environmentally sensitive land-use planning and landscape management on a wider scale.)

Have critical habitats and sites for migratory species been identified (for example by an inventory) in your country?

Guidance: The CMS does not have a formal definition of what constitutes a “critical” site or habitat for migratory species, and in this context it is left to report compilers to work to any interpretations which may be in existing use at national level, or to use informed expert judgement. The Scientific Council Sessional Committee is likely to give this issue further consideration at a future date. In the meantime some helpful reflections on the issue can be found in the “Strategic Review of Aspects of Ecological Networks relating to Migratory Species” presented to COP11 (<https://www.cms.int/en/document/strategic-review-aspects-ecological-networks-relating-migratory-species>) and the “Critical Site Network Tool” developed under the auspices of AEW and the Ramsar Convention (<http://www.wetlands.org/informationflyway/criticalsiteworktool/tabid/1349/language/en-US/Default.aspx>).

Please select only one option

- Yes, fully
- Partially - to a large extent
- Partially - to a small or moderate extent
- No

What are the main gaps and priorities to address, if any, in order to achieve full identification of relevant critical habitats and sites as required to achieve SPMS target 10?

> At least for Migrating Birds the important bird Areas were more or less fully identified by respective publications like GRIMMET AND JONES, HEATH et al. concerning "Important Bird Areas".

For migratory species falling under obligations of the Habitats Directive -likee.g. bat species - the appropriate sites were identified too.

Has any assessment been made of the contribution made by the country’s protected areas network specifically to migratory species conservation?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / for some areas
- In development
- No

Please provide a short summary:

>

Please provide a short summary:

> Due to the requirements to implement the Birds and the Habitats Directive assessments on the sufficiency and appropriateness of sites for migratory and for non-migratory species took place.

The bird protection report 2013, published in 2017 under "Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt 157", contains a compilation of the population trends of all waterfowl species regularly wintering in Germany's EU Bird protected areas over a period of 12 and 25 years.

i

The German Wadden Sea National Parks have a good database on migratory birds.

Has your country adopted any new legislation or other domestic measures in the reporting period in response to CMS Article III(4) (a) (“Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor ... to conserve and, where feasible and appropriate, restore those habitats of the species which are of importance in removing the species from danger of extinction”)?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please give the title or other reference (and date) for the measure concerned:

> cf. answer of the question on domestic measures in response to CMS article III (4) (b) in chapter X

In respect of protected areas in your country that are important for migratory species, have any assessments of management effectiveness been undertaken in the reporting period?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / for some areas

- In development
- No

Please provide a reference and/or summarise what is covered:

> ONLY PARTLY/FOR SOME AREAS:

German National Parks: Since 2009, German National Parks are evaluated every 10 years. In the reporting period a so called in-between-evaluation has been undertaken. However, the development of populations of migratory species is only one aspect among many others.

German Biosphere Reserves: In the reporting period some biosphere reserves have been evaluated due to the period review of the MAB-program (inter alia Flusslandschaft Elbe, which is important for migratory birds).

However, the development of populations of migratory species is only one aspect among many others.

EU Bird Protected Areas: The national report for the German implementation of the EU Birds Directive -including issues of SPAs "Special Protected Areas" is due in mid 2019.

Ramsar Sites: The Quality of the German Ramsar sites can be derived from the "Ramsar Information Sheets" (RIS), which are prepared for each designated area, as from the national reports on Ramsar sites.

Beyond Protected Areas, are other effective area-based conservation measures implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please describe:

> As part of the promotion of chance.natur projects, which are financed mainly by the German government, various nature conservation measures have been implemented to promote migratory bird species. Among the ongoing projects, this applies in particular to the project "Untere Havelniederung". Other projects with similar effects, financed by EU-LIFE etc., are managed by the federal states.

Nature conservation is a task of the Bundesländer. Thus, the Bundesländer are responsible for the conservation measures.

Please add any particular information about key steps taken to implement specific provisions in relevant CMS COP Resolutions, including for example:

Resolution 12.7 on ecological networks.

Resolution 12.13 on Important Marine Mammal Areas.

Resolution 12.24 on Marine Protected Area networks in the ASEAN region.

Resolution 12.25 on intertidal and other coastal habitats.

> Cf. informations already given above

Resolution 12.7 Ecological Networks:

With respect to clause 16 of resolution 12.7 on ecological networks the Federal Government of Germany, represented by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, has initiated a research and development (R&D) project in October 2016. This R&D-project, inter alia, aims to identify gaps in the existing protected area coverage in Germany on a national scale. The R&D-project is the base for a national action plan on protected areas, which is planned for 2020 (inter alia in the context of Aichi-Target 11).

XIV. Ecosystem Services

(SPMS Target 11: Migratory species and their habitats which provide important ecosystem services are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities and the poor and vulnerable.)

Has any assessment of ecosystem services associated with migratory species (contributing to the achievement of SPMS Target 11) been undertaken in your country since the adoption of the SPMS in 2014?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / in progress
- No

Please provide a short summary (including source references where applicable):

>

Please provide a short summary (including source references where applicable):

>

XV. Safeguarding Genetic Diversity

(SPMS Target 12: The genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species is safeguarded, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion.)

Are strategies of relevance to migratory species being developed or implemented to minimize genetic erosion of biodiversity in your country?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please select the relevant strategies (select all that apply):

- Captive breeding
- Captive breeding and release
- Gene typing research
- Reproductive material archives/repositories
- Other

>

XVI. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans

(SPMS Target 13: Priorities for effective conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems have been included in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, with reference where relevant to CMS agreements and action plans and their implementation bodies.)

Are priorities for the conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems explicitly addressed by your country's national biodiversity strategy or action plan?

Please select only one option

Yes

No

a. Please provide a link to or attachment of the strategy/action plan

> <https://www.bmu.de/en/publication/nationale-strategie-zur-biologischen-vielfalt/https://biologischevielfalt.bfn.de/nationale-strategie/naturschutz-offensive-2020.html>

b. Please identify the elements in the plan/strategy that are particularly relevant to migratory species, and highlight any specific references to the CMS/CMS instruments

> 1) Conservation, sustainable use and/or restoration of migratory species and their habitats (including protected areas)

- please see the answers in chapters B and C of the national biodiversity strategy

2) Actions to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger migratory species (e.g. alien invasive species or bycatch)

- please see chapter C of the national biodiversity strategy

3) Minimizing or eliminating barriers or obstacles to migration

- please see chapters B and C of the national biodiversity strategy, cf. chapters II, VI and VIII of the Nature Conservation Action Programme 2020 ("Naturschutzoffensive 2020")

4) Research and Monitoring of migratory species

- please see chapters C15 and H1 of the National biodiversity strategy

c. Please add comments on the implementation of the strategy or action plan concerned.

> -----

XVII. Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices of Indigenous and Local Communities

(SPMS Target 14: The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, thereby contributing to the favourable conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.)

Have actions been taken in your country to foster consideration for the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that are relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No
- Not applicable

Have actions been taken in your country to foster effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No
- Not applicable

If 'yes' or 'partly/in some areas' to either of the preceding two questions, please select which actions have been taken:

(select all that apply)

- Research & documentation
- Engagement initiatives
- Formal recognition of rights
- Inclusion in governance mechanisms
- Management strategies & programmes that integrate traditional and indigenous interests
- Other

>

Please add comments on the implementation of the actions concerned.

>

How would you rank progress since the previous report in your country to achieving Target 14 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (see text above)?

Please select one option:

Please select only one option

- 1. Little or no progress
- 2. Some progress but more work is needed
- 3. Positive advances have been made
- 4. Target substantially achieved (traditional knowledge is fully respected and there is effective participation from communities)

Please add comments on the progress made (where applicable).

>

XVIII. Knowledge, Data and Capacity-Building

(SPMS Target 15: The science base, information, training, awareness, understanding and technologies relating to migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, their value, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of their loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and effectively applied.)

In the current reporting period, which steps taken in your country have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in Target 15 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species? (see text above, and the answers given in Section V concerning SPMS Target 1 on awareness)

(select all that apply)

- Education campaigns in schools
- Public awareness campaigns
- Capacity building
- Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives
- Capacity assessments/gap analyses
- Agreements at policy level on research priorities
- Other (please specify):

> The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Schleswig-Holstein: Special training for bird watching guides

Thuringia: Provision of budgetary funds for monitoring programs, conclusion of working contracts.

No steps have been taken

Please describe the contribution these steps have made towards achieving the results defined in Target 15:

Education campaigns in schools

> Over 600 Schools have been reached to increase awareness on migratory fish mainly in the North of Germany

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Baden-Württemberg: The education plan includes the subject bird migration in the subject complex "Using energy efficiently" regarding the wintering strategies. Pupils gain knowledge of migrating bird species, their way of life and living sites, migration routes and threats.

North Rhine-Westphalia: Education is done by NGOs and Biological Stations, e.g. by NABU-"Naturschutzstation Niederrhein" which build the capacity of local school children at the Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area "Unterer Niederrhein" to be aware of the needs of migratory waders and geese.

Thuringia: Offers on environmental education at the "Vogelschutzwarte Seebach"

Public awareness campaigns

> On federal level diverse public awareness campaigns from the Federal Ministry for the Environment as well as from the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation.

BfN Vilm: More than 20 TV Features, more than 800 newspaper articles to increase awareness on migratory fish

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Bavaria: Ceremonial act for the 50th anniversary of the waterfowl census in 2016

<https://www.lfu.bayern.de/natur/vogelschutzwarte/wasservogelzaehlung/index.htm>

Hesse: The public perception of bats turned evidently in the past years. People are aware, that this group of species has special needs (f.e. nursery roosts in buildings) and the action plan "Fledermausfreundliches Haus" (batfriendly home) had a great echo in media and public and there have been 1150 houses that have been awarded with the sign "bat friendly home" (Fledermausfreundliches Haus -

<https://hessen.nabu.de/tiereundpflanzen/aktionenundprojekte/fledermausfreundlicheshaus/17833.html>).

Lower Saxony: BatNight (<https://www.nabu.de/tiere-und-pflanzen/aktionen-und-projekte/batnight/termine.html>),

"Fledermausregionalbetreuer" of Lower Saxony (<http://www.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/naturschutz/fledermaus-regionalbetreuer-in-niedersachsen-44215.html>),

Training course „Fledermausbotschafter“ (NABU) (<https://niedersachsen.nabu.de/tiere-und-pflanzen/aktionen-und-projekte/fledermause-in-niedersachsen/24047.html>),

activities of other associations/NGOs (e.g. www.bund-niedersachsen.de/themen/tiere-pflanzen/fledermaeuse/)

For more detailed information on the activities of Lower Saxony see the EUROBATS report of Lower Saxony between 2014 and 2018.

North Rhine-Westphalia: Public outings, presentations and other events for local people by NGOs and Biological Stations, building their capacity to understand and get involved in the conservation needs of migratory birds and bats. State wide, the North Rhine- Westphalian Academy for Conservation and Environmental Protection (NUA) works in this field through a multitude of seminars and workshops for a wide variety of stakeholders.

Schleswig-Holstein: Annual event "Brent goose day" on the Halligen

Capacity building

> More staff in General for nature conservation issues

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Saxony-Anhalt: More staff at the Federal Environment Agency of Saxony-Anhalt with main focus on bat conservation

Schleswig-Holstein: Special seminars for employees and volunteers of NGOs

Thuringia: More staff at the nature conservation authorities (especially for bird monitoring)

Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives

> Knowledge and data-sharing activities on the federal level by the Federal Ministry for the Environment as well as the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation.

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Bavaria: Reports about the Monitoring of waterfowl and their census in Bavaria

https://www.lfu.bayern.de/natur/monitoring_vogelbestand/rastende_wasservoegel/index.htm

Hesse: To improve the knowledge about bats in the Federal State of Hesse the Hessian Agency for Nature Conservation, Environment and Geology (HLNUG) cooperates with the hessian NGO Naturschutzbund Hessen (NABU e.V.) and the species-specialist group Arbeitsgemeinschaft Fledermausschutz in Hesse (AGFH). The data collected by volunteers get a quality-check and flow into the central hessian biodiversity-database.

Lower Saxony: Information on meadow birds is widely shared via publications, workshops and conferences. Development of a webGIS based information system about the occurrence and distribution of all bat species in Lower Saxony and Bremen. Citizen Science Project: www.batmap.de/web/start/start (Data acquisition, collection, quality management, spatial analysis, data sharing)

North Rhine-Westphalia: The North Rhine Westphalian State Agency for Nature, Environment and Consumer Protection runs and updates an internet-based information system with a wide range of species, including migratory birds and bats: <http://artenschutz.naturschutzinformationen.nrw.de>

Saxony: Special programme for migratory bat species (especially marking bats: *Pipistrellus nathusii*, *Nyctalus leisleri*, *Vespertilio murinus*) by the bat marking centre Dresden.

Saxony-Anhalt: Expansion of the faunistic database on bats at the Federal Environment Agency of Saxony-Anhalt; Increased number of persons involved dealing with the internet portal www.ornitho.de, introduction of a module to record resting waterbirds.

Thuringia: Implement reporting networks, coordinators, internet platforms, data bases and testing systems

Capacity assessments/gap analyses

>

Agreements at policy level on research priorities

> The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Baden-Wuerttemberg: In 2013, the strategy on nature conservation was established which includes the field of action "nature monitoring". A main focus is the introduction of meaningful bird monitorings, including migratory bird species of the EU birds directive to get data on the trends in Baden-Wuerttemberg. At the moment, this is implemented through the monitoring of common breeding birds.

Other

>

What assistance (if any) does your country require in order to build sufficient capacity to implement its obligations under the CMS and relevant Resolutions of the COP?

(select all that apply)

- Funding support
- Technical assistance
- Education/training/mentoring
- Other skills development
- Provision of equipment or materials
- Exchange of information & know-how
- Research & innovation
- Mobilizing volunteer effort (e.g. citizen science)
- Other

> More staff

XIX. Resource Mobilization

(SPMS Target 16: The mobilization of adequate resources from all sources to implement the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species effectively has increased substantially.)

During the reporting period, has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?

- Yes, made available for activities within the country
- Yes, made available for activities in one or more other countries
- No

To which particular targets in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species has this made a contribution? (Identify all those that apply).

(SPMS, including targets: www.cms.int/en/document/strategic-plan-migratory-species-2015-2023-4)

> Summ of all implemented targets listed by the Bundesländer:

Targets 1,2,3,4,5,8,10,13,14,15

The following answers were given by the Bundesländer:

Baden-Württemberg: Targets 1,4,5,8,10,13,15

Berlin: Target 8

Hesse: Target 4: The hessian NGO "Naturschutzbund Hessen" (NABU e.V.) in cooperation with the species-specialists group "Arbeitsgemeinschaft Fledermausschutz" in Hesse (AGFH) and the Hessian Ministry of the Environment takes several actions to protect hibernating sites of bats or nursery roosts of bats in buildings

North Rhine-Westphalia: Targets 1 (activities for communication and outreach), 3 (biodiversity strategy of North Rhine-Westphalia), 8 (conservation programmes for e.g. migratory waders and geese), 10 (e.g. through funding for maintaining Natura 2000 sites), 15 (capacity building activities)

Lower Saxony: Enhanced financial input for eel stocking measures

Saxony Anhalt: Support of conservation projects for Great Bustards in the EU-SPA "Fiener Bruch"; support of the society for great bustards conservation to realise the resettlement of the great bustards in the EU-SPA "Zerbster Land"; funding of the Red Kite centre; Promotion of the conservation of harriers and curlews;

Schleswig-Holstein: Targets 1,5,14,15

Thuringia: Targets 1,2

Please indicate whether the overall levels of resourcing concerned are the same or different from those in the previous reporting period:

Please select only one option

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

During the reporting period, has your country received financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please select the source(s) concerned (select all that apply):

- Multilateral investment bank
- The Global Environment Facility (GEF)
- Other intergovernmental programme
- Private sector
- Non-governmental organization(s)
- Individual country governments/government agencies (please specify)

>

Other

>

To which particular targets in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species has this made a contribution? (Identify all those that apply).

(SPMS, including targets: www.cms.int/en/document/strategic-plan-migratory-species-2015-2023-4)

>

Which migratory species have benefited as a result of this support?

>

Please indicate whether the overall levels of resourcing concerned are the same or different from those in the previous reporting period:

Please select only one option

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

Which are the most important CMS implementation priorities requiring future support in your country? (Name up to three specific types of activity).

> Bycatch reduction, habitat improvement, migration facilitation

Please add any further comments you may wish on the implementation of specific provisions in COP Resolution 10.25 (Rev. COP12) on Enhancing Engagement with the Global Environment Facility.

>