

2019 CMS National Report

Deadline for submission of the National Reports: 17 August 2019

Reporting period: from April 2017 to August 2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

High-level summary of key messages

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

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

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

> Successful conservation measures for threatened bird species, such as Imperial Eagle, Great bustard, White-tailed eagle and Lesser whitefront.

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

> Delivery on certain objectives requires effective coordination among sectors that have not been fully achieved in all cases. Increased efforts, intense inter-sectoral coordination and wide professional consensus are needed to achieve objectives of the Convention.

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

> 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. Improving the environmental conditions of the most problematic species of community importance, as well as the most endangered species.

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

> Mr. Zoltan Czirak

Full name of institution

> Ministry of Agriculture

Telephone

> (+36 1) 795-2046

Email

> zoltan.czirak@am.gov.hu

Designated CMS National Focal Point

Name and title of designated Focal Point

> Mr. Zoltán Czirák

Full name of institution

> Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address

> Kossuth tér 11

1055 Budapest

HUNGARY

Telephone

> (+36 1) 795-2046

Email

> zoltan.czirak@am.gov.hu

Representative on the Scientific Council

Name and title

> Dr. Gergő Gábor Nagy

Full name of institution

> Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address

> Kossuth tér 11

H-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:

> I indicated, where Hungary is not a range state.

Country participation in Agreements/MOUs:

Please select only one per line

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

III. Species on the Convention Appendices

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

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

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

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

Please select only one option

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

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Másolat eredetijeSection III Appendix I Hungary.xlsx](#)

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

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

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

Please select only one option

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

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Section III Appendix II Hungary.xlsx](#)

IV. Legal Prohibition of the Taking of Appendix I Species

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

Please select only one option

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

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

> 1. Act on Nature Conservation No. 43 of 1996 and
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 or territorial legislation.

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).

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

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

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

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

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

Guidance: According to Article III(5) of the Convention, exceptions to a legal prohibition against taking of Appendix I species can only be made for one (or more) of the reasons specified in sub-paragraphs (a)-(d) of that Article. For any species you list in this table, therefore, you must identify (in the second column of the table in the Excel file) at least one of the reasons that justify the exception relating to that species. In any case where you identify reason (d) as

applying, please explain (in the third column) the nature of the “extraordinary circumstances” involved. According to Article III(5), exceptions granted for any of the four reasons must also be “precise as to content and limited in space and time”. Please therefore state what the specific mandatory space and time limitations are, in each case, using the third column; and indicate the date on which each exception was notified to the Secretariat in accordance with Article III(7).

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please indicate which of the following stages of development applies

Please select only one option

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

>

- Other

>

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

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

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please indicate which of the following stages of development applies:

Please select only one option

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

>

- Other

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please indicate which of the following stages of development applies:

Please select only one option

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

>

- Other

>

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Don't know

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

> All Appendix I species, which occur in Hungary, are fully protected.

Regarding last question (Are any vessels flagged to your country engaged outside national jurisdictional limits in intentionally taking Appendix I species?) , it is not relevant to Hungary, although full protection is applied in all cases.

V. Awareness

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

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

(Select all that apply).

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

>

- No actions taken

Impact of actions

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

> Main measures are 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.
- Involving the local communities in the creation and operation of interpretation sites
- Defining a system of discounts and preferential offers to the local communities in order to promote that they should visit the interpretation sites and events.
- 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, as well as 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, as well as Natura 2000 sites.
- Subsidy schemes supporting the usage and assets of a "forest school" service.
- Increasing the 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

Please select only one option

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

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

> In Hungary, the knowledge is growing relating migratory species and their threatening factors as well.

More and more people attend events relating to raising public awareness regarding migratory species and other nature conservation topics every year.

Successful BirdLife Hungary campaigns, lectures on social media, television and radio, growing public support.

VI. Mainstreaming Migratory Species in Other Sectors and Processes

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

> Rural Development Strategy of Hungary 2014-2020, which includes the following:
Investment in forest area development and improvement in the viability of forests
Green infrastructure and ecological network developments
Forest conservation
Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive
Agri-environmental program and High Natural Value Areas

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

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

> The Civil Society is involved in the work of state nature conservation, responsible for CMS implementation in Hungary, in many ways. For example, NGOs are represented in the national Great Bustard Committee that implements the Middle-European Great Bustard MoU in Hungary. The Hungarian Raptor Conservation Council consists of numerous NGOs as well as state nature conservation organisations. NGOs also participate, either as beneficiaries or as partners, in several LIFE projects that are conducted to save species protected under CMS. In February 2016, the Ministry of Agriculture signed a Partnership Agreement with MME/BirdLife Hungary, 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. MME/BirdLife Hungary are responsible for some LIFE Nature projects (main targets: eastern imperial eagle, saker falcon, etc.).

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

> Local people feed migratory birds during migration and winter.
Help in habitat conservation at resting and feeding sites of migratory species.
Participating in agricultural support programs targeting bird-friendly agriculture, e.g: in cases of the Great Bustard of the Red-footed Falcon.

VII. Governance, Policy and Legislative Coherence

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

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

Please select only one option

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

Please provide a short summary:

>

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

Please select only one option

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

Please describe briefly how this assessment was made

>

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

> Same person is working in all relevant international conventions, such as CMS, AEWA, Bern Convention, CITES and CBD as well.

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please identify the legislation, policies or action plans concerned:

>

VIII. Incentives

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

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

Please select only one option

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

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

>

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

> The Accessible Sky agreement was prepared and signed on 26 February 2008 on collaboration among all distribution companies, governmental and non-governmental conservation organisations to minimise bird mortality along power lines. Partners hold regular meetings, conferences since, among others to discuss priorities and to develop and promote best available technology. Under the agreement, MME (Birdlife Hungary), contracted by the Ministry of Environment and Water, produced a conflict map in late 2008 to 2017 prioritise all power lines in Hungary as to the urgency of retrofitting. The total length of top priority power lines was 21,700 km.

The Act on Nature Conservation No. 53 of 1996 was amended in December 2008 to only allow bird-friendly technologies in new or fully renewed power lines. Large-scale retrofitting projects are carried out from EU funding sources (LIFE, LIFE+ and EFRD): they include burial of medium-voltage power lines especially in areas where Great Bustards are threatened by collision as well as retrofitting projects to prevent electrocution. An important, self-financed initiative by the Hungarian high-voltage electricity distribution company to fit high-voltage power lines with markers where in conflict with the most important bird habitats. Thanks to improving cooperation,

energy companies also co-financed projects from the start, and since February 2011 a minimum of 25% co-financing by energy companies is a requirement under the Hungarian Environment and Energy Operational Programme. In close cooperation between energy companies and conservation experts, the best available technology

(BAT) to produce power lines in a bird friendly way is constantly updated and new solutions are field-tested. The 2007 BAT was renewed by 2011 and again in 2013.

BirdLife Hungary, in cooperation with the Ministry of Rural Development and the Hungarian Grid Operator company organised an international conference in 2011 where the Budapest Declaration was approved by the delegates of 29 European and Central Asian countries. Implementation of the Budapest Declaration has since been monitored by a mechanism of the Bern Convention. Presently, in frame of the Great Bustard LIFE project 25 km of power lines was buried between 2017-2019.

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

Please select only one option

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

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

>

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

> In Hungary there are some habitat restoration programmes (LIFE, EEEO, etc) which help the protection of the undermentioned species. The Environment and Energy Efficiency Operational Programme for 2014-2020 is fully dedicated to support direct nature conservation investments targeting Natura 2000 sites and protected areas of less developed NUTS regions of Hungary, which help the conservation and sustainable use of the undermentioned species and their habitats. In the frame of some LIFE Nature projects there were may habitat restoration measures which includes red-footed falcon, saker falcon, eastern imperial eagle, European roller. Other LIFE Nature projects concern wetland and grassland species such as waterbirds and bird species which prefer grassland habitats. Here are some important species:

Lesser White-fronted Goose: Strictly protected. Hungary participated in two international LIFE Nature projects

targeting this species, moreover a new LIFE Nature project will be submitted in 2019. Hunting legislation also takes into account migration hotspots of the species and restricts waterfowl hunting there. Wetlands restoration and habitats development projects in its habitat, banning of lead shot in wetlands since 2005, waterbird monitoring in 49 most important waterbird migration sites were carried out. Species action plans have been elaborated for the Lesser White-fronted Goose in 2013. As an AEWA party, Hungary is implementing the tasks included the AEWA action plan.

Ferruginous Duck: strictly protected. Wetlands restoration and habitat development projects in its habitat, restrictions on waterfowl hunting in the most important breeding and migration sites, banning of lead shot in wetlands since 2005, waterbird monitoring in 49 most important waterbird migration sites. Species action plan will be prepared for this species between 2017-2020. As an AEWA party, Hungary is implementing the tasks included the AEWA action plan. We wrote the Hungarian Species Action Plan, it finished in 2019.

Saker Falcon: Strictly protected. Hungary participated in two international LIFE Nature projects targeting this species, moreover a new LIFE Nature program started in July 2014 that focuses on the prey species of Saker Falcon and Eastern Imperial Eagle. In frame of this new project conservation research is studying the habitat use and predator - prey relation for those two species in order to better target conservation measures. Highlighted monitoring program every breeding sites.

Quail: Protected. A large number of its habitats are also protected. Measures include agri-environmental schemes, bird-friendly mowing, grazing, elimination of invasive plant species. Highlighted monitoring program from 2017 in the most important breeding sites.

Corncrake: Strictly protected. Agri-environmental schemes, habitat restoration in wet grasslands (supporting grazing rather than mowing, elimination of invasive plants and shrubs), restrictions on cultivation around nest sites and compensation. Highlighted monitoring program in the most important breeding sites. As an AEWA party, Hungary is implementing the tasks included the AEWA action plan.

Aquila heliaca: Strictly protected. Highlighted monitoring program every breeding sites. Between 2016 and 2022 in the frame of the "Conservation of the eastern imperial eagle in the Pannonian Region by decreasing human-caused mortality" LIFE Nature project there are a lot of important activities about to handle deliberate and accidental/indirect poisoning. The project is in line with the conservation priorities of the EU and Hungary. The Eastern Imperial Eagle (*Aquila heliaca*) is a globally threatened species, which is strictly protected in Hungary since 1954, and it is on Annex I of the Birds Directive. The recently appeared high mortality rate of the species, mainly caused by human persecution in Hungary, urges the need of novel and direct conservation efforts. The recent project proposal builds on the experiences and results of the previous HELICON LIFE-Nature project and extends its result within the Pannonian region, effectively mixing best practice and demonstrative actions for the fight against illegal human activities adversely affecting the Imperial Eagle and other raptors. Predator persecution incidents, especially illegal poisoning is the main threat for the species in Pannonian region, representing more than 30% of known mortality causes. The same threats are also affecting other protected raptor species like the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), which is therefore the secondary target species of the project, as all measures against such bird crimes directly effect this species as well. According to the threats identified in the background of the problem, the following concrete objectives have been targeted by the project to handle the increasing prevalence of human-eagle conflicts in the region:

1. Decrease the direct adverse effects of persecution incidents on the Pannonian imperial eagle population.
2. Increase the chance of detecting illegal activities and imposing precedent judgments in the case of bird persecution incidents.
3. Increase stakeholder awareness about the overestimated effect of raptor species on game populations and about alternative eagle-friendly game management methods.
4. Increase public awareness about the conservational importance of imperial eagles and about the possible consequences of persecution incidents.

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

> All CMS-listed species are fully protected, therefore any use of them are prohibited, with the following exceptions:

greylag, bean and greater white fronted goose, mallard, coot and woodcock can be hunted during an open season, with daily bag limits.

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

> The open season is short, 3 month for greylags, 4 months for bean and greater whitefronts, 5 month for coot and 5 and half for mallards. Currently no open season is established for woodcock, the latter species can be hunted with special licence.

The daily bag limits 4 geese and 8 coots and mallards.

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?

>

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

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

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

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

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

Direct killing and taking

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Illegal hunting	Aythya nyroca (I.), Anatidae (II.)	2
Legal hunting	Aythya nyroca (I.), Anatidae (II.)	2
Other harvesting and take	Not relevant	3
Illegal trade	Not relevant	3
Deliberate poisoning	Aquila heliaca, Haliaeetus albicilla, Falco cherrug (I.), Accipitridae (II.)	1

Bycatch

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Bycatch	Not relevant	3

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, Falco vespertinus, Haliaeetus albicilla, Falco cherrug, Otis tarda (I.), Accipitridae (II.), Grus grus (II.)	1
Wind turbines	Aquila heliaca, Falco vespertinus, Haliaeetus albicilla, Falco cherrug, Otis tarda (I.), Accipitridae (II.), Grus grus (II.)	2
Other collisions	Not relevant	3

Other mortality

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

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	Not relevant	3

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	Aquila heliaca, Haliaeetus albicilla, Falco cherrug, Otis tarda, Anser erythropus, Branta ruficollis (I.)	2
Light pollution	Not relevant	3
Underwater noise	Not relevant	3

Habitat destruction/degradation

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Habitat loss/destruction (including deforestation)	Branta ruficollis, Anser erythropus, Coracias garrulus, Falco vespertinus (I.), Scolopacidae (II.)	2
Habitat degradation	Branta ruficollis, Anser erythropus, Coracias garrulus, Falco vespertinus (I.), Scolopacidae (II.)	2
Mineral exploration/extraction	Not relevant	3
Unsustainable land/resource use	Not relevant	3
Urbanization	Not relevant	3
Marine debris (including plastics)	Not relevant	3
Other pollution	Not relevant	3
Too much/too little water	Aythya nyroca (I.), Anatidae (II.)	2
Fire	Not relevant	3
Physical barriers	Not relevant	3

Climate change

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

Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.

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

Other (please specify)

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
	Nothing	3

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

> Between 2016 and 2022 in the frame of the "Conservation of the eastern imperial eagle in the Pannonian Region by decreasing human-caused mortality" LIFE Nature project there are a lot of important activities about to handle deliberate and accidental/indirect poisoning. The project is in line with the conservation priorities of the EU and Hungary. The Eastern Imperial Eagle (*Aquila heliaca*) is a globally threatened species, which is strictly protected in Hungary since 1954, and it is on Annex I of the Birds Directive. The recently appeared high mortality rate of the species, mainly caused by human persecution in Hungary, urges the need of novel and direct conservation efforts. The recent project proposal builds on the experiences and results of the previous HELICON LIFE-Nature project and extends its result within the Pannonian region, effectively mixing best practice and demonstrative actions for the fight against illegal activities adversely affecting the Imperial Eagle and other raptors. Predator persecution incidents, especially illegal poisoning is the main threat for the species in Pannonian region, representing more than 30% of known mortality causes. The same threats are also affecting other protected raptor species like the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), which is therefore the secondary target species of the project, as all measures against such bird crimes directly effect this species as well.

According to the threats identified in the background of the problem, the following concrete objectives have been targeted by the project to handle the increasing prevalence of human-eagle conflicts in the region:

1. Decrease the direct adverse effects of persecution incidents on the Pannonian imperial eagle population.
2. Increase the chance of detecting illegal activities and imposing precedent judgments in the case of bird persecution incidents.
3. Increase stakeholder awareness about the overestimated effect of raptor species on game populations and about alternative eagle-friendly game management methods.
4. Increase public awareness about the conservational importance of imperial eagles and about the possible consequences of persecution incidents.

From an EU-funded project, Hungary will renew the conflict map of powerlines versus wild birds between

2018-2020. In the frame of this project, the package of bird-friendly pylon designs is also renewed, in cooperation with electricity suppliers and designing engineers. Environmental authorities and national park directorates are also involved, to increase efforts to survey power lines and to enforce retrofitting of pylons or increasing the visibility of power lines where bird carcasses are found (due to electrocution or collision with power lines).

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

> Despite the fact that the Hungarian nature conservation (state and private sector too) apply considerable energy to handle deliberate and accidental/indirect poisoning and prevent these harmful activities, unfortunately direct and indirect poisoning is still occur. For example, in 2017 3, in 2018 8 eastern imperial eagles were poisoned.

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

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

>

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

Resolution 12.22 on by-catch.

Resolution 12.14 on underwater noise.

Resolution 12.20 on marine debris.

Resolution 7.3 (Rev. COP12) on oil pollution

Resolution 11.22 (Rev. COP12) on live captures of cetaceans (and Decision 12.48).

Resolutions 7.5 (Rev. COP12) and 11.27 (Rev. COP12) on renewable energy.

Resolutions 7.4 and 10.11 on power lines and migratory birds.

Resolution 11.15 (Rev. COP12) on poisoning of migratory birds.

Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP12) on illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds (and Decision 12.26).

Resolution 11.31 on wildlife crime.

Resolution 12.21 on climate change (and Decision 12.72).

Resolution 11.28 on invasive alien species.

Resolution 12.6 on wildlife disease.

Resolution 12.25 on conservation of intertidal and coastal habitats.

Resolution 10.2 on conservation emergencies

Resolution 7.2 (Rev. COP12) on impact assessment.

> No further comments.

XI. Conservation Status of Migratory Species

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

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

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

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

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

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

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats)

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

Aquatic mammals

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

Bats

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)
		Hungarian Habitat Directive National Report 2018	down	Rhinolophus euryale (II.)
		Hungarian Habitat Directive National Report 2018	down	Rhinolophus hipposideros (II.)

Birds

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)
		Hungarian Bird Directive National Report 2018	up	Coracias garrulus (I.)

		Hungarian Bird Directive National Report 2018	up	Aquila heliaca (I.)
		Hungarian Bird Directive National Report 2018	down	Falco cherrug (I.)
		Hungarian Bird Directive National Report 2018	up	Haliaeetus albicilla (I.)
		Hungarian Bird Directive National Report 2018	down	Limosa limosa (II.)

Reptiles

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

Fish

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

Insects

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

XII. Cooperating to Conserve Migration Systems

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please specify which countries have been approached:

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

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please describe the results of these actions achieved so far:

> There is a good international corporation to conserve lesser white-fronted geese (with Norway and Greece), great bustard and saker falcon (with all our neighbouring countries)

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please provide details:

>

XIII. Area-Based Conservation Measures

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

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

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

Please select only one option

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

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

> Approx. 10% of Hungary's territory has been designated as nationally protected area. As a member state of the EU, the Natura 2000 network covers the most important habitats of migratory bird, fish and bat species in Hungary. 56 SPA sites have been designated, in line with the EU Birds Directive to include the Ramsar sites that

had been designated for migratory birds. The Natura 2000 network covers 21.39% of the country's territory and has been officially declared complete by the European Commission. This ecological network of the EU legislation includes the most important breeding, roosting and stopover sites of migratory birds as well as the most important habitats of migratory fish and bat species. The Natura 2000 network consists of disjunct sites, however, it is embedded into the National Ecological Network, which comprises about 36% of the country's territory and is incorporated into the Act on Regional Policy and thus the National Regional Policy Plan. These sites include both the most important terrestrial and aquatic habitats in a natural or near-natural state. There is no national database from which these two types could be separated and quantified. Also, some habitat wetland types (shallow alkaline lakes, wet meadows) are typically seasonal and their water coverage depends on the actual precipitation, and can thus be interpreted both as terrestrial (seasonally and in some years) and as aquatic (in wet years for example) stopover sites of migratory birds as well as the most important habitats of migratory fish and bat species. The Natura 2000 network consists of disjunct sites, however, it is embedded into the National Ecological Network, which comprises about 36% of the country's territory and is incorporated into the Act on Regional Policy and thus the National Regional Policy Plan. Green Infrastructure projects are ongoing to be financed from ERDF (EU) funding in the 2014-2020 budgetary period.

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.

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

Please select only one option

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

Please provide a short summary:

> According to the Bird Directive (article 12) and Habitat Directive (article 17) in 2018 two national reports

were made. As both national reports were finished recently, the detailed analysis has not been finished yet.

Please provide a short summary:

>

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/or summarise what is covered:

> According to the Bird Directive (article 12) and Habitat Directive (article 17) in 2018 two national reports were made. As both national reports were finished recently, the detailed analysis has not been finished yet. These analyses will contain management effectiveness too.

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please describe:

> Agri-environmental program and High Natural Value Areas

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

Resolution 12.7 on ecological networks.

Resolution 12.13 on Important Marine Mammal Areas.

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

Resolution 12.25 on intertidal and other coastal habitats.

> No further comments.

XIV. Ecosystem Services

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly / in progress
- No

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

>

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

>

XV. Safeguarding Genetic Diversity

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

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

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

>

XVI. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans

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

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

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

> http://www.biodiv.hu/convention/cbd_national/nemzeti-biodiverzitas-strategia/national-strategy-conservation-biodiversity-2015-2020

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

> 1. objective: 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.

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

3. objective: 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.

4. objective: 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.

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

> The National Strategy for the Conservation of Biodiversity 2015–2020 (hereinafter: Strategy) was adopted by the National Assembly on 9 June 2015 with no votes against.

The Strategy aims to halt the loss of biodiversity and the further decline of ecosystem services, and to potentially improve their condition, in Hungary by 2020.

This interim review about the implementation of the Strategy aims to assess the progress towards the desired targets. Progress has been measured on the basis of the measures taken and the results thus achieved.

The mid-term data show different levels of progress in different strategic areas. Some of the legislative tasks necessary to achieve the objectives have already been achieved.

Delivery on certain objectives requires effective coordination among sectors that have not been fully achieved in all cases. Increased efforts, intense inter-sectoral coordination and wide professional consensus are needed to achieve these objectives by 2020. Changes in the institutional framework led to fragmentation of environmental responsibilities at national level.

An increasing proportion of Natura 2000 sites have a “Natura 2000 management plan”, and the share of protected natural areas of national significance with “management plan of nationally protected natural area” has also increased. The area of protected natural sites of national significance established by separate laws has increased by 712 hectares; the area of ex lege protected natural sites delimited by an administrative decision has also increased; the 24 artificial underground cavern systems have been subjected to nature conservation; and the Starry Sky Park in the Bükk Mountain Range has been established, which is also important for the conservation of the protected species. In order to lay the professional foundations of effective environmental management, data is being collected specifically about the environmental conditions of 45 habitat types, 218 bird species and 25 other animal species.

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

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

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

Please select only one option

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

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

Please select only one option

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

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

(select all that apply)

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

>

Please add comments on the implementation of the actions concerned.

> 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 one option:

Please select only one option

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

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

> 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.)

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

(select all that apply)

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

>

- No steps have been taken

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

Education campaigns in schools

> The 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.

Public awareness campaigns

> BirdLife Hungary can be found at every event during a year connecting to the environment or nature, from the yearly Weapon, Fishing and Hunting Show to the scientific platforms and events regarding these topics. There are several campaigns and events through the year raising public awareness regarding the knowledge about migratory species, for example the Wild Goose Festival in every November, or the Crane Festival in Hortobágy, which is organized by the Hortobágy National Park Directorate. Moreover the BirdLife Hungary is constantly posting public awareness raising articles and topics on- and offline, on the radio and also on billboards and television.

Capacity building

>

Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives

>

Capacity assessments/gap analyses

>

Agreements at policy level on research priorities

>

Other

>

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

(select all that apply)

- Funding support
- Technical assistance
- Education/training/mentoring
- Other skills development
- Provision of equipment or materials
- Exchange of information & know-how

- Research & innovation
- Mobilizing volunteer effort (e.g. citizen science)
- Other

>

XIX. Resource Mobilization

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

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

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

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

(SPMS, including targets: www.cms.int/en/document/strategic-plan-migratory-species-2015-2023-4)
> mainly targets no. 1, 8, 9, 10 and 13.

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

Please select only one option

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

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

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

>

- Other

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

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

(SPMS, including targets: www.cms.int/en/document/strategic-plan-migratory-species-2015-2023-4)
> mainly targets no. 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13.

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

> saker falcon, lesser white-fronted and red-breasted goose, great bustard, European roller, red-footed falcon, imperial and white-tailed eagle

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

Please select only one option

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

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

- > 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.

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

> No further comments.