



CMS

2022 CMS National Report

Deadline for submission of the National Reports: 26 April 2023

Reporting period: from February 2020 to April 2023

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 13.14 requested the Secretariat to develop a proposal to be submitted for the approval of the 52nd meeting of the Standing Committee (StC52) for a revision of the format for the national reports to be submitted to the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and subsequently. The new format was adopted by StC52 in October 2021 and made available as an offline version downloadable from the CMS website also in October 2021. The 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 StC52. In addition, as requested by StC52, 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 several guidance documents 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). As requested by different COP13 Decisions, additional guidance is also provided in separate documents on how to report on the implementation of actions to address the impact of climate change and infrastructure development on migratory species, actions to address connectivity in the conservation of migratory species, and actions concerning flyways.

For any question, please contact Mr. Aydin Bahramlouian, Public Information Officer, aydin.bahramlouian@un.org

NOTICE: Before clicking on the hyperlinks in this questionnaire, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

RESOURCES FOR THE CMS NATIONAL REPORT FROM OTHER RELEVANT INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROCESSES

Convention/Agreement/Process

Information source

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

National Reports

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)

Annual trade reports, Annual illegal trade reports, Implementation reports

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat

National Reports, Ramsar Information Sheets

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Country reports

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)

National Reports

United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

National Reports

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

National Communications, Biennial Reports, Update Reports

Various CMS Family Agreements and Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs)

National Reports

2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals

National Reports

Note: These reporting processes of other relevant intergovernmental frameworks are examples of information resources to be used when filling out this national report, which may assist in identification and strengthening of synergies among these processes. This list is **not** exhaustive. There are many other sources of information that may also be of relevance for migratory species, their habitats and migrations systems.

High-level summary of key messages

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

Guidance:

This section invites you to summarise 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 “high level” messages for decision-makers and wider audiences.

Please try also to be specific or provide specific examples where you can, e.g. “New wildlife legislation enacted in 2018 doubled penalties for poisoning wild birds” rather than “stronger laws”; “50% shortfall in match-funding for GEF project on gazelles” rather than just “lack of funding”.

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

>>> Successful conservation measures for threatened bird species, such as Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*), Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*), Eastern Imperial Eagle (*Aquila heliaca*), White-tailed Eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*) and European Roller (*Coracias garrulus*).

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

>>> Delivery on certain objectives requires effective coordination among sectors, e.g. agriculture, forestry, water management and game management, that have not been fully achieved in all cases. Increased efforts, intense inter-sectoral coordination and wide professional consensus are needed to achieve the objectives of the Convention on a national level.

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

>>> Improving the condition of Natura 2000 sites, protected natural areas and those subject to international environmental protection treaties, and ensuring satisfactory environmental management.

Improving the environmental conditions of the most problematic species of community importance and of the most endangered species.

Development of fundamental intersectoral coordination, achieving professional consensus with sectors affecting and affected by the implementation of the Convention.

Developing a knowledge base serving the successful and effective preservation of species in need of protection and of community importance, as well as habitat types of community importance.

Improving public awareness and judgement of biodiversity, natural values of community significance, as well as protected natural areas and Natura 2000 sites via knowledge dissemination, attitude shaping and interpretation.

I. Administrative Information

Name of Contracting Party

>>> Hungary

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

>>> 01111983

Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention

>>> Not applicable

Report compiler

Name and title

>>> Ms. Éva Fejes, biodiversity advisor

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 2771

Email

>>> eva.fejes@am.gov.hu

Designated CMS National Focal Point

Name and title of designated Focal Point

>>> Mr. Levente Kőrösi, head of Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Department

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address

>>> Kossuth tér 11.

1055 Budapest

Hungary

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 2771

Email

>>> eva.fejes@am.gov.hu

Representative on the Scientific Council

Name and title

>>> Dr. Gergő Gábor Nagy, Natura 2000 officer

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address

>>> Kossuth tér 11.

1055, Budapest

Hungary

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 5864

Email

>>> gabor.gergo.nagy@am.gov.hu

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

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

There are cases where it may be difficult to determine what a “normal” migration route is, and for example to distinguish this from aberrant or vagrant occurrences. As per **Decision 13.140**, the Scientific Council has been requested to develop a practical guidance and interpretations of the terms ‘Range State’ and ‘vagrant’. In the meantime, if in doubt, please make the interpretation that you think will best serve the wider aims of the Convention. Feel free to consult the Secretariat in this regard.

A note on the application of the Convention to Overseas Territories/Autonomous Regions of Parties is found **here**. References 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 list is correct (please upload the file as your confirmation of this, and include any comments regarding individual species)
- No, amendments are needed, and these are specified in the amended version of the Excel file provided (in the file, please select all the species that apply, including the source of information supporting the change, and upload the amended file using the attachment button):

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Section III Appendix I Hungary 2023.xlsx](#) - Revised list of Appendix I species of Hungary (notes added, no major changes)

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: Please consider the guidance tip in question III.1 concerning the interpretation of “Range State”.

Please select only one option

- Yes, the list is correct (please upload the file as your confirmation of this, and include any comments regarding 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 Hungary 2023.xlsx](#) - Revised list of Appendix II species of Hungary (notes added, no major changes)

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

Please provide links and clearly identify the relevant statute(s) by providing the title, date, etc.

>>> 1. Act No. LIII of 1996 on Nature Conservation in Hungary, Article 43

2. Decree of the Minister of Environment No. 13/2001 (V. 9.) KÖM on the protected and strictly protected plant and animal species, strictly protected caves as well as on the plant and animal species of Community importance.

According to these two legislation documents the taking of Appendix I species is prohibited by national legislation.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[LIII 1996_nature_conservation.docx](#) - Act No. LIII. of 1996 on Nature Conservation in Hungary

[13_2001_protected_and_strictly_protected_species.docx](#) - Decree of the Minister of Environment No. 13/2001. on protected and strictly protected species of plants and animals

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

If yes, please indicate individual cases and provide details of the circumstances in the Excel file linked 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 TIP:

Parties are requested to provide specific information on cases wherein an exception has been granted during the reporting period. This would not include information on what exceptions might be theoretically possible or exceptions that occurred before the reporting period. 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 the table, 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”. Therefore, please 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).

Please consider consulting reports submitted to CITES that may be relevant when answering this question.

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

Please provide links and clearly identify the relevant statute(s) by providing the title, date, etc.

>>>

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 update existing legislation or 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 provide further information about the circumstances

>>>

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 update existing legislation or 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 provide further information about the circumstances

>>>

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 update existing legislation or 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 provide further information about the circumstances

>>>

Are any vessels flagged to your country engaged in the intentional taking of Appendix I species outside of your country's national jurisdictional limits?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Please provide information on the circumstances of the taking(s), including where possible any future plans in respect of such taking(s)

>>>

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.)

Please indicate the actions that have been taken by your country during the reporting period 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)

GUIDANCE TIP:

Awareness raising that demonstrates work towards achieving Target 1 may include actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in various CMS documents, such as Resolutions **11.8 (Rev.COP12)** (Communication, information and outreach plan), **11.9 (Rev.COP13)** (World Migratory Bird Day), as well as a number of other resolutions and decisions which include specific provisions about awareness raising, including Resolutions **13.6** (Insect Decline), **12.6** (Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species), **12.11 (Rev.COP13)** (Flyways), **12.17** (Conservation and Management of Whales and their Habitats in the South Atlantic Region), **12.19** (Endorsement of the African Elephant Action Plan), **12.20** (Management of Marine Debris), **12.21** (Climate Change and Migratory Species), **12.25** (Promoting Conservation of Critical Intertidal and Other Coastal Habitats for Migratory Species), **11.16 (Rev.COP13)** (The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds), **11.17 (Rev.COP13)** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region), **11.24 (Rev.COP13)** (Central Asian Mammal Initiative), **11.31** (Fighting Wildlife Crime and Offences within and beyond Borders), **8.12 (Rev.COP12)** (Improving the Conservation Status of Raptors and Owls in the African-Eurasian Region), Decisions **13.95** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog) and Decision **13.113** (Improving Ways of Addressing Connectivity in the Conservation of Migratory Species).

- 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)

>>>

- No actions taken

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Bats of Hungary](#) - Website for bat populations and their research and protection in Hungary

[Conservation of the European Roller](#) - Website of the LIFE project dedicated to the conservation and strengthening of the population of the European Roller in the Carpathian Basin

[Conservation of the Imperial Eagle](#) - Conservation of the Eastern Imperial Eagle in the Pannonian Region. Covers topics, including IKB, concerning other species of birds of prey, too.

[Great Bustard](#) - Page dedicated to the conservation of the Hungarian population of the Great Bustard

[BirdLife Hungary Bird Ringing](#) - Page dedicated specifically to bird ringing and satellite tagging

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.

>>> Main actions taken:

- Development of the infrastructural background necessary to the interpretation of biodiversity, protected natural values and those under community importance, and Natura 2000 sites, with the involvement of the local communities.
- Presenting biological and landscape diversity as key topics at presentation sites and in public collections.
- Tracking the number of visitors to interpretation sites and events, as well as the share of the local community within the overall number of visitors.
- Targeted attitude-shaping efforts aimed at preserving natural values under protection and of community importance, protected natural areas and Natura 2000 sites.
- General attitude-shaping efforts (events, campaigns), publications and education tools aimed at preserving natural values under protection and of community importance, protected natural areas and Natura 2000 sites.
- Subsidy schemes supporting the usage and assets of a "forest school" service.
- Increasing number of events held by national park directorates aimed at the preservation of biodiversity.
- Qualitative development of communication on the Internet.

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

Tick one box

GUIDANCE TIP:

If the impact of awareness actions has been assessed by (for example) project evaluation studies or follow-up audience attitude surveys during the reporting period, those provide a basis for answering this question. If the assessment has involved any type of quantitative measure of the impact, please specify. It is recognized that such assessment studies may not always be available, in which case it is acceptable to base your answer on an informed subjective judgement. Alternatively, if there is genuinely no basis for forming such a judgement, please select "Unknown".

Question V.4 gives you the opportunity to explain the basis on which you have answered question V.3.

Please select only one option

- 1. Very little impact
- 2. Small impact
- 3. Good impact
- 4. Large positive impact
- Unknown

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

>>> In Hungary, the knowledge related to migratory species and their threatening factors is growing. More and more people attend events related to raising public awareness on migratory species and other nature conservation topics. The 10 national park directorates regularly organise activities, guided tours, talks, bird ringing events, bat nights, that involve migratory species. Most of the visitor centers involve topics concerning migratory species and their habitats, their vulnerability and the efforts to protect them. (Links to the websites of the national parks are attached.)

BirdLife Hungary has been conducting successful campaigns and lectures on social media, television and radio, gaining growing public support.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Website of Órségi National Park](#)

[Website of Körös-Maros National Park](#)

[Website of Kiskunsági National Park](#)

[Website of Hortobágy National Park](#)

[Website of Fertő-Hanság National Park](#)

[Website of Duna-Ipoly National Park](#)

[Website of Duna-Dráva National Park](#)

[Website of Bükk National Park](#)

[Website of Balaton-felvidéki National Park](#)

[Website of Aggtelek National Park](#)

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 details:

GUIDANCE TIP:

Note that these strategies/planning processes may be relevant for objectives, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in various CMS documents, such as Decisions **13.95** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog), and **13.116** (Transfrontier Conservation Areas for Migratory Species). Please make reference to any relevant CMS documents in your response as appropriate.

>>> Agri-environment payment schemes can be applied for on a voluntary basis. They currently provide payments to farmers on cca one million hectares which account for one fifth of the arable land in Hungary. These payments can help preserve migratory bird populations in many ways.

Agri-environmental program and High Natural Value Areas benefit several protected migratory species, including the Great Bustard and the Red-footed Falcon, both Appendix I. species.

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

E.g. Agenda 2030, reporting for International Whaling Commission, CBD, EU Nature Directives, etc.

GUIDANCE TIP:

Responses to this question should be focused on the reporting processes of the country rather than on plans and regulations within the country. This question intends to understand if the values of migratory species and habitats are featured in other national reporting that your country participates in, such as reporting to other biodiversity MEAs, the International Whaling Commission, European Commission etc.

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide details:

>>>

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

>>> The civil society is involved in the work of governmental nature conservation, responsible for CMS implementation in Hungary, in many ways. NGOs are represented in the national Great Bustard Committee that implements the Middle-European Great Bustard MoU in Hungary.

BirdLife Hungary has carried out several LIFE Nature projects, such as:

"Conservation of the Eastern Imperial Eagle by decreasing human-caused mortality in the Pannonian Region (LIFE15 NAT/HU000902 PannonEagle Life)" 2017-2022; HU, SK, CZ, AT, SR;

"Recovering the Saker Falcon population of the North-Hungarian Plain (LIFE21-NAT-HU-LIFE SakerRoads)" 2022-2028;

and participate in the following project, along with other non-governmental and several governmental organisations:

"Long term conservation of Pannonian grasslands and related habitats through the implementation of PAF strategic measures (LIFE-IP GRASSLAND-HU)" 2019-2026.

Hortobágy Természetvédelmi Egyesület (Hortobágy Environmental Association) is the project coordinator of the following project in which six other non-governmental bodies participate:

"Restoration of natural watercourses to reduce water deficit on sodic wetland system in the Hortobágy (LIFE21-NAT-HU-SODIC WETLAND SYSTEM)" 2022-2027

The Partnership Agreement between the Ministry of Agriculture and BirdLife Hungary (MME) signed in 2016 is still ongoing, covering the following fields of collaboration: mutual exchange of bird monitoring data, collaboration against illegal killing, trapping and trading of birds, mutual exchange of data on bird mortality along power lines, and collaboration on bird ringing.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[LIFE Sodic Wetland System on LIFE Public Database](#)

[LIFE-IP Grassland on LIFE Public Database](#)

[LIFE SakerRoads on LIFE Public Database](#)

[PannonEagle Life on LIFE Public Database](#)

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

>>> Participating in agricultural support programs targeting bird-friendly agriculture, e.g: in cases of the Great Bustard.

Requirements for financial support under CAP (Common Agricultural Policy in the EU) in the previous period (2015-2022) include crop diversification, protection of permanent grasslands and designation of ecological target areas. Agri-environment payment schemes can be applied for on a voluntary basis. They currently provide payments to farmers on cca one million hectares which account for one fifth of the arable land in Hungary. These payments can help preserve migratory bird populations in many ways.

Hungarian Fish Farming Operational Program (January 1, 2018 - December 31, 2022)

The aim of the measures defined in the Hungarian Fish Farming Operational Program (hereinafter: MAHOP) is to support extensive fish production based on traditional techniques to preserve and improve nature and biological diversity, as well as landscape elements additional costs and lost income related to the services provided for their protection are partially compensated.

Within the framework of this Call, Hungary is launching the "Wetland and Waterfowl Habitat Protection Target Program". Participation in the program is voluntary. Participants must use "green" aquaculture methods for five years to support aquatic life. According to the experiences previously gained, these measures undertaken in extensive fishponds actually increase the number of bird species, which results in their increased fish consumption.

The general objective of this Call is the increased conservation and development of wetlands, providing habitats and areas for breeding and feeding, reduction of environmental burden, and preservation of freshwater resources through extensive aquaculture technologies that renew natural resources.

Target species: *Microcarbo pygmaeus*, *Platalea leucorodia*, *Anser erythropus*, *Recurvirostra avosetta*, *Aythya nyroca*, *Botaurus stellaris*, *Ixobrychus minutus*, *Nycticorax nycticorax*, *Ardeola ralloides*, *Egretta garzetta*, *Ardea alba*, *Himantopus himantopus*, *Sterna hirundo*, *Chlidonias hybrida*, *Chlidonias niger*, *Emys orbicularis*, *Lutra lutra* (the last two are not on the appendices of CMS).

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[MAHOP-2.5-2018 Felhivas-1.pdf](#)

Are legislation and regulations in your country concerning Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) considering the possible impediments to migration, transboundary effects on migratory species, and of impacts on migratory patterns and migratory ranges?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please refer to Resolution **7.2 (Rev.COP12)** (Impact Assessment and Migratory Species) and Decision **13.130** (Infrastructure Development and Migratory Species) for more information on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Please select only one option

Yes

No

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[314/2005. \(XII. 25.\) Government decree on the environmental impact assessment and the unified environmental use licensing procedure](#)

Please describe any hindrances and challenges to the application of EIA and SEAs with respect to migratory species, lessons learned, and needs for further capacity development.

>>> -

To what extent have biodiversity and migratory species considerations been specifically integrated into national energy and climate policy and legislation?

GUIDANCE TIP

Please refer to Resolutions **12.21** (Climate Change and Migratory Species), **11.27 (Rev.COP13)** (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species), **10.11 (Rev.COP13)** (Power Lines and Migratory Birds), and Decision **13.108** (Support to the Energy Taskforce) for more information.

>>> Excerpt from the National Climate Change Strategy:

(Even though there are no specific considerations for migratory species listed in the strategy, the goals and targets cover a wide range of measures which will have an overall positive effect on biodiversity, species and habitats if implemented.)

During the development of the second National Climate Change Strategy (hereinafter: NÉS-2) for the period

2018-2030, which also provides an outlook for the period up to 2050, the public policy goal was to create a national climate change strategy, which lays down the objectives, with the implementation of which the effects caused by climate change can be treated in the long term.

In line with international efforts, we must moderate the emission of greenhouse gases and, keeping in mind the interests of our country, we must increase our carbon dioxide absorption capacities. These steps contribute to international climate protection cooperation, which, if successfully implemented, can reduce the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases in the long term, which leads to a reduction in the rate of further increase in global atmospheric temperature. In addition to reducing CO2 emissions and increasing absorption capacity, an objective evaluation of the effects on the country's territory is also necessary.

Specific targets:

- Decarbonisation
- Geospatial basis for the territorial investigation of climate vulnerability
- Adaptation and preparation
- Securing a climate partnership

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[23/2018. \(X. 31.\) parliamentary resolution on the second National Climate Change Strategy for the period between 2018-2030, providing an outlook for the period up to 2050](#)

Please provide any examples related to such policy and legislation.

>>> Reflecting on the previous question "Are legislation and regulations in your country concerning Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) considering the possible impediments to migration, transboundary effects on migratory species, and of impacts on migratory patterns and migratory ranges?" and also related to this one: there are some national regulations which take wildlife, including migratory species into account in land use and planning decisions. Government Decree No. 314/2005 provides for Environmental Impact Assessments and Government Decree No. 2/2005 provides for Strategic Environmental Assessments. EIA is compulsory for major projects that may have a serious impact on wildlife (the decree lists in an appendix for which projects an EIA is compulsory) and EIA may be required by the environmental authority for smaller projects especially in nationally protected areas and in Natura 2000 sites (another appendix identifies the types of projects that fall under this provision). SEA is required for plans or programmes in the agricultural, forestry, fishing, energy, transport, traffic, waste management, water management, electronic communication, tourism and regional development that include elements covered by Government Decree 314/2005 and may have significant detrimental effects on Natura 2000 sites, nationally protected areas or certain water bodies.

The former Ministry of Environment and Water issued guidance on the nature and landscape conservation aspects of the planning and location of wind turbines in Hungary in 2005. The guidance includes the zones that are not recommended for such developments. Government Decree No. 314/2005 provides for environmental impact assessments to be carried out for wind turbines and wind farms: EIA is compulsory if the total capacity of the wind turbine/wind farm is above 10 MW and it is planned for a nationally protected area. On the basis of the same Government Decree, the environmental authority may decide to prescribe an EIA after screening any wind farm/wind turbine project whose capacity is above 600 kW, or whose capacity is above 200 kW and it is planned for a nationally protected area, or a Natura 2000 site or a cave protection zone. Government Decree 2/2005 provides for Strategic Environmental Assessments. This decree also applies for plans or programmes in the energy sector that include elements covered by government Decree 314/2005 and may have significant detrimental effects on Natura 2000 sites, nationally protected areas or certain water bodies.

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?

GUIDANCE TIP:

This question is intended to understand improvements in governance arrangements in your country, which may potentially include improvements in policy, legislation, governance processes, plans etc. Please also consider the guidance below in VII.2.

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 details:

>>>

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 how this assessment was made

>>>

Has any committee or other arrangement for liaison between different government agencies/ministries, sectors or groups been established at a national and/or subnational level in your country that addresses CMS implementation issues?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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 may be helpful in giving further context.

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please provide details:

>>>

Does collaboration between the focal points of CMS and other relevant global or regional Conventions take place in your country to develop the coordinated and synergistic approaches described in paragraphs 25-27 of **Resolution 11.10 (Rev. COP13)** (Synergies and partnerships)?

Relevant Conventions may include other global agreements such as biodiversity-related Conventions and Agreements, UNFCCC, UNCCD, as well as regional agreements, including CMS Agreements. Such collaboration may also be relevant to aligning efforts related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, and NBSAPs as described in **Resolution 13.1**(Gandhinagar Declaration on CMS and the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework) and **Resolution 8.18 (Rev.COP12)**(Integration of

Migratory Species into NBSAPs and into On-going and Future Programmes of Work under CBD).

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please provide details:

>>> There is close collaboration between the very few people involved in the work related to international treaties for nature and biodiversity (CMS, AEWA, AEML WG, EUROBATS, Great Bustard MoU, Bern Convention (handled by the same person), Raptors MoU, CITES, Ramsar Convention, CBD, all working at the Department for Biodiversity and Gene Conservation and the Department for Nature Conservation at the Ministry of Agriculture in Hungary. There is no direct contact with the focal points and their colleagues involved in other conventions.

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please identify the legislation, policies, initiatives, or action plans concerned:

>>>

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 during the reporting period 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.

>>> In the previous period of CAP (Common Agricultural Policy in the EU) between 2017-2022, the extent of natural and natural habitat patches decreased, wetlands disappeared, fringe habitats eroded due to the intensification of agriculture. Farmers were encouraged in performing agricultural activities on the largest scale possible as financial support under CAP was area-based. In the new (or current) CAP 2023-2027, there are much more environmental criteria included in the conditionality in order to enhance agri-biodiversity. The regulations apply to almost the entire area under agricultural use, five million hectares. Crop diversification, protection of permanent grasslands and the designation of ecological target areas have become part of the conditionality framework. These basic requirements must be met even without applying for financial support. Among the new elements, a significant habitat change can be expected from the preservation of non-productive areas and landscape elements. Until now, farmers were interested in eliminating microhabitats as the area-based support increased with each square meter cultivated.

Please indicate what measures were implemented and the time periods concerned:

>>>

Has there been development and/or application of positive incentives in your country during the reporting period, 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.

>>> Participating in agricultural support programs targeting bird-friendly agriculture, e.g: in cases of the Great Bustard.

Requirements for financial support under CAP (Common Agricultural Policy in the EU) in the previous period (2015-2022) include crop diversification, protection of permanent grasslands and designation of ecological target areas. Agri-environment payment schemes can be applied for on a voluntary basis. They currently provide payments to farmers on cca one million hectares which account for one fifth of the arable land in Hungary. These payments can help preserve migratory bird populations in many ways.

Agri-environmental program and High Natural Value Areas benefit several protected migratory species, including the Great Bustard and the Red-footed Falcon, both Appendix I. species. Please see an excerpt from the 2021 report on Turtle Dove, sent to EU COM in 2022.

Agri-environmental payment scheme in 28 High Nature Value Areas in the country was available on a total of 1 059 640 hectares. These 28 sites show a large overlap with protected /Natura 2000 areas, but some of them are not or not fully protected.

The following subschemes are relevant for Turtle Dove habitat management:

- Great Bustard conservation in grasslands (farmland receiving payments: 50793 ha),
- Bird conservation in grasslands of the Great Plain (farmland receiving payments: 28573 ha),
- Bird conservation in grasslands of uplands (farmland receiving payments: 4818 ha),
- Great Bustard conservation in arable lands (farmland receiving payments: 16310 ha),
- Bird conservation in arable lands of the Great Plain (farmland receiving payments: 14395 ha),
- Red-footed Falcon conservation in arable lands (farmland receiving payments: 1709 ha),

Bird conservation in arable lands of uplands (farmland receiving payments: 276 ha).

This scheme is planned to be continued on a similar scale.

Hungarian Fish Farming Operational Program (January 1, 2018 - December 31, 2022)

The aim of the measures defined in the Hungarian Fish Farming Operational Program (hereinafter: MAHOP) is to support extensive fish production based on traditional techniques to preserve and improve nature and biological diversity, as well as landscape elements additional costs and lost income related to the services provided for their protection are partially compensated.

Within the framework of this Call, Hungary is launching the "Wetland and Waterfowl Habitat Protection Target Program". Participation in the program is voluntary. Participants must use "green" aquaculture methods for five years to support aquatic life. According to the experiences previously gained, these measures undertaken in extensive fishponds actually increase the number of bird species, which results in their increased fish consumption.

The general objective of this Call is the increased conservation and development of wetlands, providing habitats and areas for breeding and feeding, reduction of environmental burden, and preservation of freshwater resources through extensive aquaculture technologies that renew natural resources.

Target species: *Microcarbo pygmaeus*, *Platalea leucorodia*, *Anser erythropus*, *Recurvirostra avosetta*, *Aythya nyroca*, *Botaurus stellaris*, *Ixobrychus minutus*, *Nycticorax nycticorax*, *Ardeola ralloides*, *Egretta garzetta*, *Ardea alba*, *Himantopus himantopus*, *Sterna hirundo*, *Chlidonias hybrida*, *Chlidonias niger*, *Emys orbicularis*, *Lutra lutra* (the last two are not on the appendices of CMS).

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

>>>

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

>>>

What is preventing progress?

>>> For example the EU's Common Agricultural Policy doesn't encourage sustainable production of grazing livestock.

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.

Intentional Taking

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please note that as per Article 1(i) of the Convention, "Taking" means taking, hunting, fishing, capturing, harassing, deliberate killing, or attempting to engage in such conduct.

	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
Deliberate poisoning	Aquila heliaca, Haliaeetus albicilla, Falco cherrug (I), Accipitridae (II)	1
Illegal trade	Not relevant	3
Other harvesting and take	Scolopax rusticola (II), spring shooting is legal under BD Art. 9. According to BD Art.9., 3238 birds were killed in 2021, and 2172 birds in 2020. The numbers have declined over the years significantly, and are the fraction of the numbers of other countries.	3
Illegal hunting	Aythya nyroca (I), Anatidae (II)	3
Legal hunting	Aythya nyroca (I), Anatidae (II). In addition to these groups, Microcarbo pygmeus (II) can be affected during the legal shooting of Ph.carbo.	3

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing intentional taking?

>>> Following the most serious case of bird poisoning (141 poisoned baits and 118 poisoned animals - mostly birds of prey - were found in Tura, in the operational area of the local hunting association in 2021), some important and promising steps were taken to prevent such events from happening in the future.

- In December, 2021 the Parliament voted for the Act nr. CXXVIII of 2021, on the basis of which the sanctions related to poisoning crimes were tightened. In the case of animal cruelty and nature crime, the crime committed with poison is now considered a highlighted case and the preparation of the activity has also become a criminal act. In the justification of the law, among other things, the affected raptor species and the poison involved in the Tura case were all mentioned.
- At the invitation of the National Bureau of Investigation, Birdlife Hungary joined the National Environmental Safety Working Group, whose members consist of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Innovation and Technology, the National Tax and Customs Administration, the National Disaster Management Directorate General (Ministry of Internal Affairs), the National Food Chain Safety Office, the Pest County Government Office, National Police Headquarters and the international NGO, TRAFFIC. The working group deals with several priority environmental and nature protection topics among one of them is wildlife poisoning crimes.
- After a wave of social outrage, several organizations involved in game management openly condemned bird poisoning. An article was published in the Nimród hunting magazine entitled "Call for the protection of wildlife" by the National Hungarian Hunting Chamber (OMVK) and the National Hunting Protection Association, in which they draw the attention of those entitled to hunt to protect wildlife and habitats and to hunt for the sake of social recognition and everything in the prevention of possible poisoning. The OMVK also chose the problem area as the central topic of the mandatory annual further training of professional hunters. The first evidence appeared in 2020 in the case of misuse of legal traps to target protected birds of prey. After

successful investigation, charges were brought against a hunter January 2023, for animal cruelty, based on the recordings of wildlife cameras. The court case is currently ongoing.

A strictly protected Cinereous Vulture carrying a GPS transmitter was shot in 2021, along with four Common Buzzards. Thanks to the excellent canine unit of BirdLife Hungary, the transmitter, some remains of the birds and other clues were found. Following a successful investigation, the perpetrators were caught. Court case in progress.

The investigation in the case of the illegal taking of protected Goshawk chicks out of their nests resulted in charging 13 perpetrators in 2022.

(Source: imperialeagle.eu, see links attached)

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Successful investigation in the case of illegal taking of Goshawk chicks - Investigation started in 2019 by the National Bureau of Investigation. Charges were brought against 13 perpetrators in 40 cases altogether in 2022. (Article in Hungarian)

GPS tagged Cinereous Vulture was shot - The Cinereous Vulture was GPS tagged by the Bulgarian conservation group Green Balkans.

Vulture killing hunters were caught - Four hunters prosecuted for killing strictly protected GPS tagged Cinereous Vulture and four Common Buzzards in 2021

Common Buzzards in the trap, suspected animal cruelty is under investigation

Charges brought against hunter for animal cruelty - Evidence provided by wildlife camera recordings for misuse of legal traps to illegal trapping and taking of protected birds of prey.

Largest bird poisoning case of Hungary is still under police investigation - 118 poisoned animals and 140 poisoned baits found with the help of the canine unit of BirdLife Hungary. The scale of the case caused public outcry.

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning intentional taking?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **13.3** (Chondrichthyan Species), **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative), **12.10** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), **12.11 (Rev.COP13)** (Flyways), **12.12 (Rev.COP13)**(Action Plans for Birds), **12.15** (Aquatic Wild Meat), **12.17** (Conservation and Management of Whales and their Habitats in the South Atlantic Region), **12.19**(Endorsement of the African Elephant Action Plan), **11.15 (Rev.COP13)** (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds), **11.16 (Rev.COP13)**(The prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds), **11.17 (Rev.COP13)**(Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region), **11.18 (Rev.COP12)**(Saker Falcon Global Action Plan), **11.21**(Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean), **11.22 (Rev.COP12)** (Live Capture of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes), **11.24 (Rev.COP13)** (Central Asian Mammal Initiative), **11.31** (Fighting Wildlife Crime and Offenses within and beyond Borders), and Decisions **13.50** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), **13.27-28** (Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean), **13.74** ((Live Capture of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes) and **13.94** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog).

>>> It is very interesting to see the trends in the numbers of poisoning cases over a longer period, in this case between 2005 and 2022. The graph attached clearly shows a periodical increase and decrease of numbers every few years, the peaks being 5-7 years apart. The downfall can be attributed to the wide publicity the cases got thanks to the articles, interviews and media presence of BirdLife Hungary and other colleagues both in the governmental and non-governmental sector involved. These cases cause public outrage and result in an increasing pressure on the sector affiliated with the illegal killing of raptors. The wide publicity of the cases and the success of the investigations, especially when the perpetrators are found and prosecuted, can have a deterring effect from committing such crimes - for a while.

The most horrendous poisoning case in Hungary happened in 2021 in Tura. The number of cases in that year was not outstanding, but the number of detected victims and the baits used was record high, which is at least partly due to the efficient work of the canine unit. Our joint effort to push the numbers lower, to discourage the possible perpetrators and to bring these cases to light is constant and relentless.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

poisoning cases GaborDeak MME 2022.jpg - Number of detected poisoning cases, specimens and baits in Hungary, 2005-2022

Unintentional Taking

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

Catch in Abandoned, Lost or otherwise Discarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG)	2	Mostly Mute Swans get engangled in fishing gear, but gulls (Laridae, any species) and Pygmy Cormorants are also affected.
Bycatch	3	Not relevant

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing bycatch or catch in ALDFG?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **12.22**(Bycatch), **12.20** (Management of Marine Debris), **11.21** (Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean), **10.15 (Rev.COP12)** (Global Programme of Work for the Cetaceans) and **13.3** (Chondrichthyan species).

>>> -

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning bycatch?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please provide information on any significant trend in bycatch of CMS-listed species, notably those listed on App. I. Related to the guidance given on the overarching part of Question X.1, this is a key example where you are encouraged to think about activities outside national jurisdictional limits of any vessels flagged to your country (in addition to any other circumstances in which bycatch is a noteworthy pressure on relevant species).

>>> -

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	Aquila heliaca, Coracias garrulus, Falco cherrug, Falco vespertinus, Haliaeetus albicilla (I), Aquila chrysaetos, Buteo buteo, Buteo rufinus, Ciconia ciconia, Ciconia nigra, Circaetus gallicus, Falco peregrinus, Falco tinnunculus, Milvus milvus (II)	1
Other collisions	Collision with powerlines: Otis tarda (I and II), Ciconia ciconia (II), shorebirds and other waterbirds (II). Bats are less affected by collisions (including those with wind turbines due to the low number of the turbines.)	1
Wind turbines	Aquila heliaca, Falco vespertinus, Haliaeetus albicilla, Falco cherrug (I), Otis tarda (I and II), Accipitridae (II), Grus grus (II),	2

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing collisions and electrocution?

>>> Collision with powerlines poses a very serious threat to migratory birds. It is the primary cause of mortality of adult Great Bustards. The only long-term solution to that is burying cables in priority areas, see details below. A conflict map had been made and was renewed in 2022 by BirdLife Hungary using distribution maps of bird species most threatened by powerlines, either by collision or electrocution, taking into account retrofitting projects, updated bird distribution maps and actual powerline network. Projects founded by the EU and distribution companies have been launched to retrofit powerlines.

In 2021, a guidance (BAT and more general) was distributed to utility companies in video clip packages, field manuals and a comprehensive document designed for powerline technicians on one hand and engineers and technologists on the other.

Cables recently buried in the most problematic areas:

29 km (25 km medium-voltage, 4 km low-voltage) in Kiskunság, 2022 by E.ON

2.24 km in Hanság (to replace 7 km powerline) by 2022, E.ON

35 km in Kiskunság (Kunpeszér), 2018-2021 by MVM DÉMÁSZ

3.5 km in Bélmegyér, 2018-2021 by MVM DÉMÁSZ

2.3 km at the dump at Hejópapi, work in progress in 2023 by MVM ÉMÁSZ

10 km in Mátra Hill, 20 km Bükk Hill, 2022 by MVM ÉMÁSZ

18.4 km in Túrkeve, 2020-2023 by OPUS TITÁSZ

Attached are the effects of 20 kV MVPLs on the selection of mating sites by Great Bustards, and the effects of the burial of MVPLs on the occurrences of the Great Bustard in Kiskunság. (Based on the presentation by Miklós Lóránt, Kiskunság National Park Directorate.)

The 'Accessible Sky' agreement (2008) still serves as the frame of all bird-friendly interventions involving the electricity suppliers, the ministry responsible for nature conservation (currently the Ministry of Agriculture), BirdLife Hungary and other stakeholders as signatories. The main tasks: enhancing legislation, elaborate bird-

friendly designs in joint effort, prioritisation of power lines and scheduling of retrofitting, provision of funding.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[GB_MVPL_Kiskunsag.pdf](#) - Effects of medium-voltage powerlines before and after their burial on Great Bustards in Kiskunság

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning collisions and electrocution?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolution **7.4** (Electrocution of Migratory Birds), **7.5 (Rev.COP12)**(Wind Turbines and Migratory Species, **10.11 (Rev. COP13)** (Power Lines and Migratory Birds, **11.17 (Rev.COP13)** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region), **11.27 (Rev.COP13)** (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species), **12.10**(Conservation of African Eurasian Vultures).

>>> Electrocution of White Storks (*Ciconia ciconia*) at garbage dumps

There is a very specific problem occurring at four dumps in Hortobágy National Park. The dumps attract - apart from the usual Laridae crowd - a huge number of white storks, as they serve as easily accessible food sources. The problem mounts in August when clumsy juvenile birds appear at the dumps, 100-200 per location, and up to 500 specimens at one of them. Juvenile storks are prone to all kinds of accidents due to their lack of experience and their dimensions (long wings, long legs). There is also a sewage treatment plant near the dump attracting the most juv storks, with the STP being an extra attraction to them as it serves as a wetland, thus another abundant food source.

There are several pillars around the dump, out of which five can be held accountable for the numerous deaths. In August 2021, more than 20 dead storks were found by the dump. These pillars had been retrofitted before by the distribution company, and by now every measure possible has been taken to make them safe for birds. The problem is the number of birds using the pillars, often 7-8 young storks balancing on them, flapping their wings, thereby closing the circuit. The only solution would be the elimination of all pillars by the burial of the cables around the dump. The burial is a costly option and the question of financing these interventions is yet to be resolved. The rangers of Hortobágy NPD continuously monitor the dumps. The electrocutions have likely been occurring for longer than the monitoring started.

Other mortality

	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details
Disease	3	Not relevant
Accidental/indirect poisoning	1	<i>Aquila heliaca</i> , <i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i> , <i>Falco cherrug</i> (I.), Accipitridae (II.), <i>Grus grus</i> (II.)
Unexplained stranding events	3	Not relevant
Predation	3	Not relevant

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Accidental agricultural poisoning](#) - Raptors and corvids fall regularly due to rodenticides used against Common Vole.

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in countering other mortality?

>>> -

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning other mortality?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **11.15 (Rev.COP13)** (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Species), **12.6**(Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species), **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative), **13.6** (Insect Decline), and Decisions **13.50** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures) and **13.94** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog).

>>> -

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	Norway Rat (<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>) invades nesting colonies of Laridae (e.g. <i>Ichthyaeetus melanocephalus</i> , <i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i> , <i>Sterna hirundo</i>).	2

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing alien and/or invasive species?

>>> -

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning alien and/or invasive species?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolution **11.28** (Future CMS Activities related to Invasive Alien Species).

>>> -

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	Not relevant	3

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing disturbance & disruption?

>>> -

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning disturbance and disruption?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **12.16** (Recreational In-Water Interaction with Aquatic Mammals), **11.29 (Rev.COP12)** (Sustainable Boat-based Wildlife Watching), **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative) and Decision **13.66** (Marine Wildlife Watching).

>>> -

Pollution

	Species/species groups affected (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
Other pollution		
Underwater noise		
Light pollution	Rhinolophidae, Vespertilionidae (II)	2
Marine debris (including plastics)		

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing pollution?

>>> A general guideline on light pollution prepared in 2020 includes a special section in relation to bat conservation. However, it has not really been implemented in practice.

Boldogh, S.A. 2020. Aspects for the elimination of light pollution for bat protection, the implemented interventions and their results in the Aggtelek National Park Directorate (NE-Hungary). In: Árgay, Z. (ed.) 2020. About light pollution – clearly and simply! Pp. 57-60. Ministry of Agriculture & Hortobágy National Park Directorate, 82 p.

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning pollution?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **13.5** (Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife), **12.14** (Adverse Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Cetaceans and Other Migratory species), **12.17** (Action Plan for the Protection and Conservation of south Atlantic Whales), **12.20** (Management of Marine Debris), **7.3 (Rev.COP12)** (Oil Pollution and Migratory species), and Decision **13.122** (Impacts of Plastic Pollution on Aquatic, Terrestrial and Avian Species).

>>> -

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
Physical barriers	n/a	
Fire	n/a	
Too much/too little water	All species tied to wetlands (Appendix II.)	1-2
Urbanization	n/a	
Unsustainable land/resource use	Mostly the species tied to arable lands and grasslands: Otis tarda (I. and II.), Falco vespertinus (I. and II.), Tetrax tetrax (I. and II.) and all other Appendix II. species	1-2
Mineral exploration/extraction	n/a	
Habitat degradation	All species groups	1-2
Habitat loss/destruction (including deforestation)	All species groups	1-2

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[HU Article 17 National Summary.docx](#) - National Summary under EU Habitats Directive (Article 17)

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in addressing habitat destruction/degradation?

>>> Loss of habitats and fragmentation are serious pressures on Hungary’s biodiversity. However, the National Ecological Network protects remaining natural or near-natural habitats. It includes Natura 2000 sites and protected natural areas. The network consists of core areas, ecological corridors and buffer zones. This Network is taken into account in the spatial planning policies where core areas, buffer zones and ecological corridors are identified as an important tool enabling or restricting certain areas to assist biodiversity protection. The corridors area is 8657 km², core areas are on 18401 km², while buffer zones cover over 6300 km². Thus, 36% of Hungary is in the Ecological Network. The Ecological Network is integrated into spatial planning at all levels and is determinant in decision-making.

In the 2014-2020 EU budgetary period, nature restoration and development projects co-financed from the EU Environmental and Energy Efficiency Programme included 32 projects targeting wetlands, which used 51% of the total budget spent on nature conservation from this funding (21.17 billion HUF). The sum of the target areas of these projects was nearly 50 000 hectares. Some of these projects targeted wetlands, including peatlands and some smaller bogs.

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning habitat destruction/degradation?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **13.3** (Chondrichthyan species), **13.6** (Insect Decline), **12.7 (Rev.COP13)**(The Role of Ecological Networks in the Conservation of Migratory Species), **12.11 (Rev.COP13)** (Flyways), **12.12 (Rev.COP13)**(Action Plans for Birds), **12.13** (Important Marine Mammal Areas), **12.17** (Conservation and Management of Whales and their Habitats in the South Atlantic Region), **12.19** (Endorsement of the African Elephant Action Plan), **12.24**(Promoting Marine Protected Areas Networks in the ASEAN Regions), **12.25** (Promoting Conservation of Critical Intertidal and Other Habitats for Migratory species), **12.26 (Rev.COP13)** (Improving Ways of Addressing Connectivity in the Conservation of Migratory Species), **11.17 (Rev.COP13)** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region), **11.18 (Rev.COP12)** (Saker Falcon Global Action Plan), **11.21** (Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean), **11.24 (Rev.COP13)** (Central Asian Mammal Initiative), and Decisions

13.50 (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), **13.94** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog).

>>> The latest EU Habitats Directive (Article 17) national summary (2019) covers the period 2013-2018.

According to the report, 22 of the 45 Annex I habitat types were reported to have unfavourable - bad conservation status, 17 habitat types were in unfavourable - inadequate conservation status and only 6 were reported to have favourable conservation status. 56% of the habitats had a decreasing trend, while 44% had a stable trend, and none showed an improving trend. Out of the 212 species covered by the Habitats Directive in Hungary, 25 had unfavourable - bad conservation status, 113 had unfavourable - inadequate conservation status and 74 had favourable conservation status. The trend was improving in 5% of the species, stable in 34%, decreasing in 20% and unknown in 41% of the species.

According to the latest national report under the EU Birds Directive (Article 12) from 2019, out of the 239 bird species reported in 2019, the short-term population trend was increasing in 34 (13.6%), decreasing in 45 (18%), stable in 84 (33.6%), fluctuating in 43 (17.2%), uncertain in 16 (6.4%) and unknown in 28 (11.2%). Out of all ecosystem types, the loss of wetland habitats is the most severe in Hungary, but the 97 wetland species protected by the Habitats Directive showed favourable conservation status in 44%, unfavourable - inadequate in 46%, and only 5% (5 species) had unfavourable - bad conservation status. As for the 80 bird species dependent on wetlands, the short-term population trend was increasing in 9 (11.3%), decreasing in 19 (23.8%), stable in 22 (27.5%), fluctuating in 25 (31.2%), and unknown in 5 (2.5%).

Climate change

	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details
Climate change	1	Aythya nyroca (I), Branta ruficollis, Anser erythropus, Scolopacidae (II), Otis tarda (I and II), Ardeidae (II), Rhinolophidae, Vespertilionidae (II)

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report concerning climate change?

>>> Please see above (restoration of wetlands and peatlands).

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning climate change?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Decision **13.126** (Climate change and Migratory Species).

>>> -

Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.

	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details
Inadequate enforcement of legislation	2	all species
Lack of knowledge	3	Not relevant
Inadequate legislation	3	Not relevant
Inadequate transboundary management	3	Not relevant

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc?

>>> An important step forward regarding legislation is the inclusion of all species of raptors, including owls, of the world in the scope of the Decree Nr. 13/2001. (V. 9.) on protected and strictly protected species. The rules on falconry have been tightened in the same legislation.

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.?

>>> -

Other (please specify)

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

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in other pressures?
>>> -

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning other pressures?
>>> -

During the reporting period, has your country adopted new legislation or other domestic measures in response to CMS Article III(4) (b) specifically addressing obstacles to migration?
CMS Article III(4)(b) states '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.'

GUIDANCE TIP:

This question is intended to specifically report on any new legislation or domestic measures **addressing obstacles to migration**. Relevant information would not include general conservation measures.

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

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

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 (e.g. national Red List category changes) have been recorded in your country during the reporting period?

“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).

If more rows are required, please upload an Excel file detailing a longer list of species.

GUIDANCE TIP:

The emphasis of this question is on “major changes” during the reporting period. Information is expected to be provided 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 record if any CMS listed species has become extinct or extirpated from your country - or reintroduced/re-established/established - during the reporting period (or before if not previously reported to CMS).

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)

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

Aquatic mammals

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

Bats

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

Birds

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

	decline (trend derived from data analysis 1999-2022)	Hungarian Monitoring of Common Birds (MMM) report attached, courtesy translation included (see page 7 for species in question)	Hungarian Monitoring of Common Birds programme, Annual reports of NPDs	Botaurus stellaris II.
	decline (BD 2019 report covering 2013-2018, compared to data from 2019-2021)	Database of all rare and colonial nesting species attached	BD (Art. 12) National report 2019, Anjua reports of NPDs	Limosa limosa II.
	increase (BD 2019 report covering 2013-2018, compared to data from 2019-2021)	Database of all rare and colonial nesting species attached	BD (Art. 12) National report 2019, Anjua reports of NPDs	Milvus milvus II.
	increase (BD 2019 report covering 2013-2018, compared to data from 2019-2021)	Database of all rare and colonial nesting species attached	BD (Art. 12) National report 2019, Anjua reports of NPDs	Aquila heliaca I., II.
	increase (BD 2019 report covering 2013-2018, compared to data from 2019-2021)	Database of all rare and colonial nesting species attached	BD (Art. 12) National report 2019, Anjua reports of NPDs	Haliaeetus albicilla I., II.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Rare and colonial nesting bird species 2021.xls](#) - Numbers of rare and colonial nesting bird species in Hungary (containing numbers from BD 2013 and BD 2019 reports, and numbers between 2015-2021 for each species)

[MMM_1999-2022 Jelentes.docx](#) - Report of the Hungarian Monitoring of Common Birds (MMM) programme 1999-2022 (Hungarian)

[MMM_report_2022_ENG.doc](#) - Trends in the populations of the breeding bird species according to the Hungarian Monitoring of Common Birds (MMM) programme (English)

Reptiles

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

Fish

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

Insects

	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Comments	Source reference	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.)

During the 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?

E.g. Developments following the advice in Resolutions **12.8** and **13.7**.

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide details:

>>>

During the 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

During the reporting period, has your country participated in the implementation of Concerted Actions under CMS (as detailed in Resolutions **12.28 (Rev.COP13)** to address the needs of relevant migratory species?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please describe the results of these actions achieved so far:

GUIDANCE TIP:

If any progress report on implementation of Concerted Actions has been submitted to the COP and/or the Scientific Council in the period under consideration, Parties can refer to that report rather than restating the same information in replying to this question (please indicate the document number)

>>>

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)?

E.g., steps implementing Resolutions **12.11 (Rev.COP13)** (Flyways) and **12.17** (South Atlantic Whales), and Decisions **13.36** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds), **13.41** (Flyways), **13.95** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog) and **13.108** (Support to the Energy Task Force).

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please provide details:

>>>

Has your country mobilized resources and/or taken steps to promote and address ecological connectivity and its functionality in relevant international processes?

E.g., Post-2020 framework, 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, etc.

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please describe initiatives aimed at implementing Decision **13.113 a)**

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 (e.g. by an inventory) in your country?

GUIDANCE TIP:

The CMS does not have a formal definition of what constitutes a “critical” site or habitat for migratory species. It is left to report compilers to work with any interpretations which may be in existing use at national level, or to use informed expert judgement.

Helpful reflections on the issue can be found in the “**Strategic Review of Aspects of Ecological Networks relating to Migratory Species**” presented to COP11 and the “**Critical Site Network Tool**” developed under the auspices of AEWA and the Ramsar Convention.

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?

>>> -

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

The “contribution” may relate to habitat types, and/or geographical coverage/distribution factors, and/or coverage of particular priority species or species groups, and/or factors concerning functional connectivity, and/or any other factor considered relevant to the achievement of SPMS Target 10.

(If you have information on assessments of management effectiveness, please do not include that here, but provide it instead in your response to question XIII.4).

Please select only one option

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

Please provide details:

>>> According to the Birds Directive (Article 12) and Habitats Directive (Article 17) two national reports were made in 2019. The lists of species for the EU biodiversity pledge for 2030 have been created based on these reports, the current trends and the practical experience in the field.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Birds Directive and Habitats Directive National Reports](#)

Please provide details:

>>>

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:

>>>

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 details on what is covered:

>>> Management effectiveness can be measured and evaluated in several ways. All NPDs (10 altogether) provide a thorough annual report containing management of their areas. They can be accessed on their websites (see links; the reports of Körös-Maros NPD are not included). Habitats of certain protected species are continuously monitored to ensure the best available practice for the needs of the species. Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*) is one of the best monitored species in Hungary. The slight growth of our population would not be possible without habitat management.

BD and HD National Reports also cover the habitats included in the EU directives.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Annual reports of Órség NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Kiskunság NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Hortobágy NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Fertő-Hanság NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Duna-Ipoly NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Duna-Dráva NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Balaton-felvidék NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Bükk NPD](#)

[Annual reports of Aggtelek NPD](#)

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 provide details:

>>> Agri-environmental program and High Natural Value Areas, which mainly benefit the Great Bustard. Please see an excerpt from the 2021 report on Turtle Dove, sent to EU COM in 2022.

Agri-environmental payment scheme in 28 High Nature Value Areas in the country was available on a total of 1 059 640 hectares. These 28 sites show a large overlap with protected /Natura 2000 areas, but some of them are not or not fully protected.

The following subschemes are relevant for Turtle Dove habitat management:

Great Bustard conservation in grasslands (farmland receiving payments: 50793 ha),
Bird conservation in grasslands of the Great Plain (farmland receiving payments: 28573 ha),
Bird conservation in grasslands of uplands (farmland receiving payments: 4818 ha),
Great Bustard conservation in arable lands (farmland receiving payments: 16310 ha),
Bird conservation in arable lands of the Great Plain (farmland receiving payments: 14395 ha),
Red-footed Falcon conservation in arable lands (farmland receiving payments: 1709 ha),
Bird conservation in arable lands of uplands (farmland receiving payments: 276 ha).

This scheme is planned to be continued on a similar scale.

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

Resolution 12.7 (Rev.COP13) 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.

Resolution 13.3 on Chondrichthyan Species

Decision 13.116 on Transfrontier Conservation Areas for Migratory Species

>>> -

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?

GUIDANCE TIP:

The phrase "associated with" migratory species allows you to report on any assessments that cover ecosystem services of systems, habitats or species assemblages that include migratory species. The question is therefore not expecting you to limit this to assessments focused solely on one or more migratory species.

For a broader biodiversity assessment to be relevant here, the migratory species involved must be making some identifiable contribution to the ecosystem services concerned.

Note also the particular aspects to be taken into account that are specified in the wording of the SPMS target. For the CMS definition of "favourable conservation status", see Article I(1)(c) of the Convention text.

Please select only one option

- Yes
 Partly / in progress
 No

Please provide details (including source references where applicable):

>>>

Please provide details (including source references where applicable):

>>> Referring to the Guidance Tip above, "The phrase "associated with" migratory species allows you to report on any assessments that cover ecosystem services of systems, habitats or species assemblages that include migratory species.", assessment of habitats also used by migratory species have been completed on a national level, however, the species themselves were not the subject of the assessment.

The Ecosystem Map of Hungary (2019) was created within the frame of an EU-co-financed project named: "Strategic Assessments supporting the long-term conservation of natural values of community interest as well as the national implementation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020".

The map has full coverage of the Hungarian territory and shows the actual distribution, extent and frequency of our ecosystems on national level. Although mapping of agricultural and urban ecosystems was also a goal, the primary target areas of mapping were semi-natural areas.

All information on how the map and its layers can be used can be found on the website.

Further 4 thematic layers are available for use:

1. Distinction of trees and bushes
2. 4th level forest classification of the Ecosystem Map
3. Vegetation within urban areas
4. Saline lakes and pans.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Description of the project KEHOP-4.3.0.-VEKOP-15-2016-00001.](#) - Strategic Assessments supporting the long term conservation of natural values of community interest as well as the national implementation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020

[Description of the Ecosystem Map of Hungary \(in English\)](#)

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?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Strategies to be considered under this section do not necessarily have to specifically address migratory species but be of sufficient relevance in relation to the objective of safeguarding the genetic diversity of wild populations.

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

>>>

Please describe the Captive breeding strategy:

>>>

Please describe the captive breeding & release strategy:

>>>

Please describe the gene typing research strategy:

>>>

Please describe the reproductive material archives/repositories strategy:

>>>

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.)

Does your country's National Biodiversity Strategy or Action Plan (NBSAP), or other relevant plans or strategies used in your country, explicitly address obligations under CMS, priorities for the conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, and ecological connectivity?

Please select only one option

Yes

No

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

>>> <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a15h0028.OGY>

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Specify page numbers, section/paragraph numbers etc., where possible.

>>> The Draft National Biodiversity Strategy 2030 is yet to be approved by the government. The currently valid NBS covers the period 2015-2020. It contains 6 strategic areas, 20 targets within the areas, and many objectives, measures and indicators within the targets.

First strategic area: Preservation of the protected natural areas and values, improvement of their conservation status, and creation of the necessary conditions for the full domestic implementation of the EU Bird Directive and Habitat Directive

Target 1: Improving the condition of Natura 2000 sites as well as protected natural areas and those subject to international environmental protection treaties, and ensuring satisfactory environmental management.

Target 2: Improving the environmental conditions of the most problematic species of community importance, as well as the most endangered species.

Target 3: Developing a knowledge base serving the successful and effective preservation of species in need of protection and of community importance, as well as habitat types of community importance.

Target 4: Improving public awareness and judgement of biodiversity, natural values of community significance, as well as protected natural areas and Natura 2000 sites via knowledge dissemination, attitude shaping, and interpretation.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[NBS 2015-2020](#) - Page introducing the National Biodiversity Strategy 2015-2020

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

>>> Please see an excerpt from the OECD report on the plans for the improvement of the conservation status of species and habitats of community interest, including numerous migratory species, and habitats used by them:

Within the Environment and Energy Efficiency Operational Programme Plus (EEEOP Plus) for 2021-2027, approved by the European Commission in December 2022 a total amount of EUR 112.4 million is allocated to support the implementation of nature conservation investments. More than 75% of this allocation is to support projects directly targeting the restoration of degraded habitats and ensuring the necessary background for the long term management of sites. As a result further improvements are expected on at least 100 thousand hectares of protected land constituting approximately 5% of the Natura 2000 network of Hungary and 10% of areas protected according to the national legislation.

(Background: In the 2014-2020 EU budgetary period, nature restoration and development projects co-financed from the EU Environmental and Energy Efficiency Programme included 32 projects targeting wetlands, which used 51% of the total budget spent on nature conservation from this funding (21.17 billion HUF). The sum of the target areas of these projects was nearly 50 000 hectares.)

Please provide information on the progress of implementation of other relevant action plans (single species, species group, etc.), initiatives, task forces, and programmes of work in your country that have not been addressed in previous questions.

E.g. AEMLAP, Great Green Wall, Bonn Challenge, Action Plans for Birds, Action Plan for the Protection and Conservation of South Atlantic Whales, Energy Task Force, Programme of Work on Climate Change and Migratory Species, etc.

>>> Ongoing work of the national Great Bustard Working Group, including to renew the national SAP for the species. Drafting of SAPs for Lesser Spotted Eagle, Montagu's Harrier, Short-toed Eagle, Eurasian Curlew,

Black-tailed Godwit, Common Redshank and Northern Lapwing.

Please describe the monitoring and efficacy of measures taken in regard to these relevant action plans, initiatives, task forces, and programmes of work and their integration into delivery against other relevant international agreements.

GUIDANCE TIP:

In answering this question, compilers can provide link to relevant reports under other agreements.

>>> -

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.)

Note that progress in achieving Target 13 of the Strategic Plan considers indigenous and local communities.

In the absence of a national definition of 'indigenous and local communities', please refer to the Convention of Biodiversity document **Compilation of Views Received on Use of the Term "Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities"** for helpful guidance on these terms.

During the reporting period, 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

During the reporting period, have actions been taken in your country to promote and foster effective participation and involvement 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 (e.g. as part of development projects)
- Formal recognition of rights
- Inclusion in governance mechanisms (legislation, policies, etc.)
- Management strategies, programmes and action plans that integrate traditional & indigenous interests
- Other

>>> not applicable

Please provide details on the implementation of the actions concerned.

GUIDANCE TIP

Responses to these questions may involve actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as those described in Decisions **13.95** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog), and **13.116** (Transfrontier Conservation Areas for Migratory Species).

>>> not applicable

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 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 provide details on the progress made (where applicable).

>>> not 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.)

During the 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? (Answers given in Section V may be relevant)

(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
- Research by academia, research organizations and other relevant stakeholders
- Other (please specify):

>>>

- No steps have been taken

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

GUIDANCE TIP

Steps taken may include actions, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **13.3** (Chondrichthyan Species), **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative), **13.35** (Light Pollution), **13.6** (Insect Decline), and Decisions **13.37** (AEMLAP), **13.39** (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds), **13.50** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), **13.90** (Conservation and Management of the African Lion), **13.95** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog), **13.106** (Support to the Energy Task Force), **13.110** (Addressing Unsustainable Use of Terrestrial and Avian Wild Meat), and **13.113** (Improving Ways of Addressing Connectivity in the Conservation of Migratory Species).

Education campaigns in schools

>>> BirdLife Hungary is the main participant in the public awareness raising regarding conservation of species or habitats, therefore migratory species also, mostly by environmental education. There are many educational events through the year mostly for children, like birding camps or the bird-friendly school campaign, and there are also bird watching programs for teachers. Moreover, the experts visit many schools and kindergarten, holding many lectures and courses for children, mainly about problems connecting to certain species, like swallow or red-footed falcon, but also about all the migratory species. Some experts introduce specifically migratory bird species to children by taking live birds (with permit) along, or catching them at or nearby the school by mistnets (also with permit), and ring them there on the spot. Groups of children regularly visit bird ringing camps either during field trips or during summer camps organised by the school. These open ringing sessions are extremely informative and if a school group attends, the ringing personnel target the age group with lots of relevant information about the species and animal migration, the routes, the strategies, interesting highlights, and offer a close encounter with the birds. No other activity can bring children closer to migratory species. Day of Birds and Trees is organised annually by national park directorates, NGOs and schools throughout the country (10 May).

Public awareness campaigns

>>> National park directorates and BirdLife Hungary take part in numerous events related to environment and nature, e.g. the yearly Weapon, Fishing and Hunting Show, scientific platforms and events. Annual events raising public awareness about migratory species: Wild Goose Festival in November (organised by NGOs and Duna-Ipoly NPD), Crane Festival in Hortobágy (organised by Hortobágy NPD). BirdLife Hungary and some of the NPDs regularly post public awareness raising articles and topics on- and offline, on the radio and also on billboards and television. All NPDs offer guided tours and events concerning migratory species.

Capacity building

>>> Capacity building is relevant predominantly at bird ringing camps, which operate at a voluntary basis. They attract mainly young people who help with the activities either in their free time or as an intern. The experienced permanent staff at the ringing camps share both their knowledge about the species and migration, and the importance of ringing and GPS tracking in research.

Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives

>>> Apart from the agreement between the Ministry of Agriculture and BirdLife Hungary about data-sharing, and the numerous joint projects (e.g. on the conservation of Great Bustard, Eastern Imperial Eagle, or the Accessible Sky agreement with energy distribution companies to reduce powerline-related mortality), a detailed bird atlas was published as the product of a joint venture of the two organisations, in 2021. Citing the Introduction by the Editors: "...when data gathering started for the second European Breeding Bird Atlas (EBBA2 - Keller et al. 2020) on a 50 km resolution, Hungarian ornithologists decided to carry out a more detailed survey, to lay the foundation of a national bird atlas." The Bird Atlas of Hungary contains 420 species which were observed until 2019, out of which are 59 migratory, 10 winter visitor and 134 rare species (which are also migratory). The second, revised edition was published in 2022, containing 4 more migratory species.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[The Bird Atlas of Hungary 1st edition](#) - The entire book can be viewed online, free access to the 1st edition

[The Bird Atlas of Hungary](#) - Introduction of the Bird Atlas in English language

Capacity assessments/gap analyses

>>>

Agreements at policy level on research priorities

>>>

Other

>>>

Research by academia, research organizations and other relevant stakeholders

>>> Research concerning bird migration is mainly carried out by university students and teachers, or sometimes independent researchers, national park employees specialised in studying bird migration, and by ringing stations run by BirdLife Hungary and other NGOs and NPDs.

Bird ringing started in 1908, Hungary being the 3rd country in the world to apply this tool to study bird migration. The nearly 120-year-old ringing activity has brought outstanding results in the region. In the EURING atlas application, the number of data in Hungary is relatively high for the following bird species, so they are of outstanding importance at European level: Pygmy Cormorant, Black-crowned Night Heron, Squacco Heron, Great Egret, Purple Heron, Black Stork, Glossy Ibis, Eurasian Spoonbill, Short-toed Eagle, Long-legged Buzzard, European Imperial Eagle, Red-footed Falcon, Saker Falcon, Mediterranean Gull, European Roller, Syrian Woodpecker, Sand Martin, Moustached Warbler, Lesser Grey Shrike and in case of archive data: Rufous-tailed Rock Thrush, Rosy Starling. Currently there are 12 permanent ringing stations, they are responsible for generating about half of the data, while the rest comes from individual ringers. According to the reports of the Hungarian Bird Ringing Centre, 225 948 specimens of 227 species were tagged in 2021, and there were 38 515 records of recovery of ringed specimens of 134 species. 2020: 209 909 specimens of 233 species were tagged, and there were 34 231 records of recovery of ringed specimens of 120 species. GPS tagging of numerous species have been providing valuable data also used for their conservation on their migration routes and wintering sites (e.g. *A. heliaca*, *C. garrulus*, *F. vespertinus*).

A few examples:

One of the ringing stations is specialised in waterbirds, especially shorebirds that occur in migration at the westernmost alkaline wetland of Europe. The activity has been carried out by employees of Fertő-Hanság National Park Directorate with the help of many volunteers for 20 years. A wide range of shorebirds and Anatidae (especially *Anser anser*) get ringed and are recovered at the station. The recovery rate is much higher (5-6 %) than of the songbirds, due to the better visibility of both the color rings and the waterbirds. Other NPDs, research projects and individuals are also involved in color-ringing and GPS tagging of waterbirds. A currently running project by the Balaton Limnological Research Institute aims at studying the migration patterns and territorial behaviour of Great Cormorants nesting around Lake Balaton, 30 specimens have been equipped with GPS tags since 2021.

Papers on *Platalea platalea* (strictly protected species in Hungary) based on GPS tagged specimens are attached.

Ringing and GPS tagging of *Falco vespertinus* has resulted in new discoveries on routes and roosting and wintering sites (see Falcoproject in previous topics). The expedition carried out in 2019 brought exceptional results in finding the biggest known roostsite of raptors in Huambo, Angola. During the expedition in March 2023, 40 specimens got equipped with GPS tags to gain more data of their migration routes, wintering sites and possibly more roostsites. The valuable data are used for the conservation of the species and its habitats. *Acrocephalus melanopogon*: Hungarian NGO has been organising and carrying out ringing and monitoring sessions along the migration route at the wintering sites of *A. melanopogon* at the Balkans (Albania, Croatia, Greece, Italy) for 20 years. Since 2020, 15 specimens have been equipped with radio transmitters (10 in Hungary, 5 along the migration route to the Balkans), the project is currently halted due to lack of funds. (The European population has been declining at an alarming rate, due to loss of habitats. 10% of the European population nests in Hungary. There is not much reliable data of the global population.)

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[madargyuruzesi kozpont 2021. evi beszamoloja.pdf](#) - Annual report of the Hungarian Bird Ringing Center 2021
[madargyuruzesi kozpont 2020. evi beszamoloja.pdf](#) - Annual report of the Hungarian Bird Ringing Center 2020
[8469-Fullarticle-41647-1-10-20221031.pdf](#) - Winter distribution and migratory strategies of Eurasian Spoonbills (Platalea leucorodia) from the Pannonian breeding population: are they long-distance migrants? - by Csaba Pigniczki
[OrnisHungarica_vol301_p146-157.pdf](#) - Observations on parental care of the Eurasian Spoonbill (Platalea leucorodia) during the post-fledging dispersal - by Csaba Pigniczki
[OrnisHungarica_vol251_p1-24.pdf](#) - Dispersal and migration of a specialist waterbird: Where do Eurasian Spoonbills (Platalea leucorodia) come to Hungary from? - by Csaba Pigniczki

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Falconproject Hungary](#) - Research and conservation of the Red-footed Falcon (Falco vespertinus) in Angola

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 (please specify):

>>>

- No assistance required

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?

GUIDANCE TIP:

The “resources” that are relevant here can be financial, human or technical. In addition to funding, “in-kind” forms of support such as staff time or administrative infrastructure could be relevant, as could the loan of equipment, provision of data processing facilities, technology transfer, training or mentoring schemes and other initiatives for capacity building.

Further comments on resource mobilization issues in the CMS context can be found in the **Strategic Plan for Migratory Species**, Chapter 4.

Further examples could include providing resources to actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolution **13.4** (Joint CMS-CITES African Carnivore Initiative, and Decisions **13.23** (Review Mechanism and National Legislation Programme, **13.25** (Conservation Status of Migratory Species, **13.32** (Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the EAAF), **13.36** and **13.37** (AEMLAP), **13.39** (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds), **13.41** (Flyways), **13.50** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), **13.69** (Marine Turtles), **13.76** (European Eel), **13.80** (Global Programme of Work for Cetaceans), **13.90** (Conservation and Management of the African Lion), **13.95** (Conservation and Management of the Cheetah and African Wild Dog), **13.102** (Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity), **13.106** (Support to the Energy Task Force), **13.113** (Improving Ways of Addressing Connectivity in the Conservation of Migratory Species), **13.120** (Community Participation and Livelihoods), **13.122** (Impacts of Plastic Pollution), and **13.134** (Infrastructure Development).

- 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**, and which initiatives, plans and programmes has this made a contribution? (Identify all those that apply).

>>> Mainly targets no. 1, 9, 10, 13 and 15.

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
- Unknown

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

>>> LIFE program (L'Instrument Financier pour l'Environnement)

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

>>> mainly targets no. 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 15.

Target 15: the science base and the technologies better understood to improve the habitats and the conservation status of migratory species can be applied to the better availability of data sets and the ongoing research on migratory species (birds and bats). There is significant amount of data produced regularly, due to the ongoing bird ringing and tagging activity and bat research, adding to the already enormous database that

fund the national and international studies on animal migration, trends, routes, roosting and wintering sites. The LIFE project aimed at the research and conservation of Red-footed Falcon (*Falco vespertinus*) is a good example for applied science and technologies to understand animal migration, provide previously unknown data which are used to protect a declining population of an Annex I. species (IUCN status: Near Threatened) and the habitats used for nesting, feeding, roosting and wintering. The project is also getting wider publicity, sometimes featuring in national media due to the attractiveness of the species and the dedication of the team. National parks and the National Museum of Natural History have taken part in the project alongside BirdLife Hungary.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Falcoproject Hungary](#) - Research and conservation of the Red-footed Falcon (*Falco vespertinus*)

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

>>> Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*)

Eastern Imperial Eagle (*Aquila heliaca*)

White-tailed Eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*)

Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*)

Red-footed Falcon (*Falco vespertinus*)

Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*)

European Roller (*Coracias garrulus*)

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[lifegb_project_description_short.pdf](#) - Great Bustard LIFE 2016-2023 short description

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[LIFE STEPPE ON BORDER](#) - Long-term conservation of Great Bustard and Red-footed Falcon in border region of Hungary and Slovakia

[Great Bustard LIFE 2016-2023](#) - Basic info, main targets, partners

[Rollerproject](#) - Conservation of the European Roller (*Coracias garrulus*) in the Carpathian Basin (LIFE13/NAT/HU/000081)

[LWfG LIFE](#) - Providing a climate resilient network of critical sites for the Lesser White-fronted Goose in Europe (LIFE19 NAT/LT/000898)

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

Unknown

Which are the most important CMS implementation priorities requiring resources and support in your country during future reporting periods?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please consider answers provided in HLS.3 when answering this question where appropriate, as they may be of relevance.

>>> 1. Habitat restoration projects in the most important breeding, feeding and resting sites of migratory species, in particular wetlands.

2. Integration of conservation aspects of migratory species into the EU operational programmes and the Common Agricultural Policy

3. Raising awareness for migratory species among stakeholders, such as farmers, hunters etc.