

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):

> Increasing the quantity of populations of migratory species.

Obtaining large, stable populations of big predators (wolf, bear) and increasing the quantity of populations of previously endangered species, e.g. chamois.

After completion of works on designating a network of the Natura 2000 areas, now there are works in progress to develop management plans for each site.

Projects aimed to revitalise rivers and small watercourses evolve.

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

> The results of efforts being made in Poland as part of active protection projects for bird species, e.g. common curlew, and the state of protection of a number of migratory species, obviously depend on what happens to the birds abroad. In some cases, particularly when local population of species is very small, in spite of strict protection and financial outlays incurred by Poland to protect the species within the country, the laws allowing legal migratory species hunting while they are moving through the territories of other countries, including those being the parties to the CMS, may reduce the effectiveness of undertaken protective actions and lead to deteriorated species protection in Poland.

As a result of damage done by the animals, farmers and fishermen started to see as troublesome some

species of migrant animals, populations of which have increased, including cormorants, geese, cranes, beavers, and seals. Measures applied so far, as deterrence and refund of losses may prove to be insufficient and it is necessary to undertake actions aimed to develop new solutions.

Much the same as in the whole Europe, we also observe in Poland deepening, disadvantageous behavioural status of the amphibians and some groups of invertebrates.

Works related to ecological corridors may undergo considerable delays due to the land purchase costs as well as their conflict with linear projects important for the whole country.

Changes in progress in large cities are dangerous for previously common synanthropic species, as e.g. sparrow. In order to stop this trend it is required not only to provide sufficient number of nesting boxes, but also changed approach to the issue of urban greenery maintenance (lawn mowing, hedge trimming).

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

> In circular economy, ensuring possibly greatest respect for and sustainable use of natural resources, including resources of special importance for migrant animals.

Completion of works on management plans for protected areas - both land and marine.

Maintaining or working out a reference to the issues connected with nature protection including protection of migratory species in major state strategic documents.

Provision of financing from state sources and the EU projects supporting e.g. migrant animals.

Making efforts to ensure that implemented educating actions include the issues concerning migrant animals as well.

I. Administrative Information

Name of Contracting Party

> Poland

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

> 01051996

Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention

>

Report compiler

Name and title

> Ms. Monika Lesz, Counselor to the Minister

Full name of institution

> Department of Nature Protection, Ministry of Environment

Telephone

> 48 22 3692667

Email

> monika.lesz@mos.gov.pl

Designated CMS National Focal Point

Name and title of designated Focal Point

> Ms. Monika Lesz, Counselor to the Minister

Full name of institution

> Department of Nature Protection, Ministry of Environment

Mailing address

> Wawelska St. 52/54

00-922 Warsaw

Telephone

> (+48 22) 36 92 667

Email

> monika.lesz@mos.gov.pl

Representative on the Scientific Council

Name and title

> Dr. Grzegorz Rąkowski, Senior Lecturer

Full name of institution

> Institute of Environmental Protection

Mailing address

> Krucza Str. 5/11

00-548 Warsaw

POLAND

Telephone

> (+48 22) 50-37-642

Email

> groza1@ios.edu.pl

II. Accession/Ratification of CMS Agreements/MOUs

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

Please select only one option

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

Updates or corrections:

>

Country participation in Agreements/MOUs:

Please select only one per line

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

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).

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

>

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.

>

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.

> On December 13-16, 2018, the City of Gdansk hosted a conference called "Migrant Birds as Indicators of Climate Change".

The night of bats is celebrated every year in many places in Poland.

The Polish Society for the Protection of Birds (OTOP) celebrates the Day of Migrant Birds.

Public opinion has keen interest in the fate of migrant birds, especially storks. Storks are very important and close to the Poles (they symbolise spring and life being reborn. We believe that storks' nest on the roof brings prosperity to the house). For many years now Polish embassy in Lebanon has been organising meetings, film shows, and educational actions in schools in order to show the residents the need to undertake joint, coherent efforts aimed to save the storks.

Every year, the Professor Krzysztof Skóra Sea Station celebrates the Day of Porpoise at the monument of porpoise.

According to the resolution 7.3, Oil Pollution and Migratory Species, training courses and conferences concerning this subject have been organised. It is planned to hold a two-year recurrent cycle of these meetings.

The project known as "Polish programme for the support for boroughs and counties in nature protection management" being implemented by Krajowe Stowarzyszenie Inicjatyw (Polish Association of Initiatives) assumes implementation of active education in ecology. It concerns biological diversity protection regarding environment management and planning of protective actions, with particular consideration of preparing planning instruments and promotion of good practices in nature protection management. The task includes e.g. organisation of 105 country-wide educational panels called: "Chances, possibilities and potential of boroughs in nature protection management", in total for ca. 2.100 representatives of local government units. It is estimated that the overall number of project users will reach ca. 82.700 people throughout Poland. The project is co-financed by the EU within the Operational Programme Infrastructure and Environment, and co-financed by the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management (NFOSiGW).

13-16 grudnia 2018 r. w Gdańsku odbyła się konferencja pn. "Migrant Birds as Indicators of Climate Change".

W wielu miejscach Polski corocznie obchodzona jest noc nietoperzy. Ogólnopolskie Towarzystwo Ochrony Ptaków świętuje dzień ptaków migrujących. Corocznie Stacja Morska im. profesora Krzysztofa Skóry obchodzi dzień morświna pod pomnikiem morświna. Zgodnie z rezolucją 7.3, Oil Pollution and Migratory Species, zorganizowano szkolenia i konferencje poświęcone temu zagadnieniu. W planach jest utrzymanie dwuletniego powtarzalnego cyklu takich spotkań. Opinia społeczna jest żywo zainteresowana losami ptaków migrujących, szczególnie bocianów. Bociany są dla Polaków bardzo ważne i bliskie (są symbolem wiosny i odradzającego się życia, wierzymy że gniazdo bocianie na dachu zapewnia domowi pomyślność). Od wielu lat ambasada polska w Libanie poprzez spotkanie, filmy, akcje edukacyjne w szkołach stara się uczulić mieszkańców na potrzebę podejmowania wspólnych, spójnych wysiłków na rzecz ratowania bocianów.

Projekt „Ogólnopolski program wsparcia gmin i powiatów w zakresie zarządzania ochroną przyrody” realizowany przez Krajowe Stowarzyszenie Inicjatyw, zakłada realizację aktywnej edukacji ekologicznej. Dotyczy on ochrony różnorodności biologicznej w zakresie zarządzania środowiskiem i planowania działań ochronnych, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem opracowania instrumentów planistycznych oraz promocji dobrych praktyk w zakresie zarządzania ochroną przyrody. Zadanie obejmuje m.in. organizację 105 ogólnopolskich paneli edukacyjnych pn.: „Szanse, możliwości i potencjał gmin w zarządzaniu ochroną

przyrody” łącznie dla ok. 2 100 przedstawicieli JST. Szacuje się, że sumaryczna liczba odbiorców projektu wyniesie ok. 82 700 osób z terenu całej Polski. Projekt jest współfinansowany ze środków Unii Europejskiej w ramach Programu Operacyjnego Infrastruktura i Środowisko oraz dofinansowany ze środków Narodowego Funduszu Ochrony Środowiska i Gospodarki Wodnej.

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.

>

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:

>

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:

> In reports and studies linked to biodiversity.

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

> The Minister of Environment controls almost 800 (768) foundations involved in environment protection operations. Numerous non-governmental organisations are involved in the protection of migrant animals. These organisations handle either species groups (as the Polish Society for the Protection of Birds (OTOP) or the Polish Society for the Protection of Bats (OTON), large predators (as Association for Nature WOLF, the Eagle Protection Committee (KOO), or single species (as the Association of Bison Lovers). These organisations implement various projects for the species they support.

In order to get funds for these projects they apply both to Polish and the EU institutions, and to the industry representatives. Moreover, these organisations are financed from voluntary contributions of citizens.

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

> Protection of electrical networks against collision with birds (Energa). Installation of safe platforms for nests on power poles (Tauron). Financing of a multiannual programme for reintroduction of grey seals in the Baltic Sea (Lotos). Cooperation in rescuing oil-laden animals (Lotos). Bee protection (ZT Kruszwica, Carrefour). The "flower-covered meadow" project (Żywiec Zdrój). The "River for life" project (UPM Raflatac), and many other actions undertaken as part of the "Business for biodiversity" initiative.

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:

> Biological diversity protection through the implementation of a network of land ecological corridors within Poland.

The following actions are supported as part of the afforestation carried out under the Rural Development Programme (PROW) for the years 2014-2020 (and previously Rural Development Plan for the years 2004-2006, and the PROW for the years 2007-2013): preventing fragmentation of forest complexes, making new plantings fitted to habitat conditions, protection of newly established forest crops, and strengthening the immunity through farming measures. Among other things, afforestation operations under the PROW contribute to maintaining and improving ecological stability of woodlands by way of combining dispersed forest complexes into dense and continuous landscape structures, the so-called ecological corridors constituting migration routes for animals.

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

> Indicators of the task include: the area of woodlands in ecological corridors, the number of crossing places for animals built during the reporting period, and the length of cleared river sections. Boroughs have shown 5,704.5 ha as the area of woodlands in ecological corridors. GDDKiA (the General Directorate for National Roads and Highways) has built 1,552 crossing places for animals. 31 fish passes were built in watercourses administered by the President of the National Water Management Authority in the years 2014-2017. Total length of cleared river sections reached 1243.542 km.

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:

> Development of a network of central level state administration employees responsible for the issues of nature conventions, species protection and environmental monitoring. The members of this network are permanently in contact with each other and share continuously updated knowledge on the situation, needs, risks and actions undertaken by individual network participants, also including the issues concerning migrant animals.

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.

>

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

Please select only one option

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

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

>

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

>

IX. Sustainable Production and Consumption

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- In development / planned
- No

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

>

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

>

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

> Circular economy is a concept aiming at rational use of resources and reduction of negative impact on environment of manufactured products, which - same as materials and raw materials - should remain in the economy as long as possible, and production of wastes should be reduced to minimum.

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

> On the initiative of the Ministry of Environment, a pilot programme was established in 2017, called "Circular Economy in a Borough", and financed by the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management (NFOSiGW). The pilot programme dedicated for 5 Polish boroughs will be continued until 2020.

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		
Legal hunting		
Other harvesting and take		
Illegal trade		
Deliberate poisoning		

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	Phocena phocena	1

Collisions and electrocution

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

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		
Disease		
Accidental/indirect poisoning		
Unexplained stranding events		

Alien and/or invasive species

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

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	Bats	2
Light pollution	Bats	2
Underwater noise		

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)		
Habitat degradation		
Mineral exploration/extraction		
Unsustainable land/resource use		
Urbanization		
Marine debris (including plastics)		
Other pollution		
Too much/too little water		
Fire		
Physical barriers		

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		

Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.

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

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
	More and more information about collision of birds with: buildings, energy networks, surfacing screens.	3 birds

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).

>

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

>

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.

>

XI. Conservation Status of Migratory Species

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

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

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

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

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

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

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats)

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

Aquatic mammals

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

Bats

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

Birds

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

Reptiles

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

Fish

	Comments	Source reference	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)
	Jesiotr zachodni (<i>Acipenser sturio</i>) jest uznawany w Polsce za wymarły od lat 60. XX w. Polska, wraz z innymi krajami Regionu Bałtyckiego jest zaangażowana w program restytucji jesiota bałtyckiego (<i>Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus</i>), który obecnie jest uznawany jako jedyny gatunek jesiota rodzimy dla polskich wód terytorialnych i jest objęty ochroną ścisłą. Prace nad odbudową populacji jesiota w polskich wodach trwają od 1996 r., są koordynowane przez Instytut Rybactwa Śródlądowego w Olsztynie, i są częściowo finansowane z funduszy unijnych. W Polsce działa kilka ośrodków hodowli jesiota. Zarybienia są prowadzone od 2006 r. Od tej pory narybek jesiota wypuszczono do rzek Drawy, Gwdy, Warty i Baryczy w dorzeczu Odry oraz do Drwęcy w dorzeczu Wisły. Wyrośnięte osobniki jesiota wypuszczane są natomiast do Bałtyku w Zatoce Pomorskiej.		decreasing	<i>Acipenser sturio</i>

Insects

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

XII. Cooperating to Conserve Migration Systems

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide a short summary:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please specify which countries have been approached:

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

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please describe the results of these actions achieved so far:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please provide details:

>

XIII. Area-Based Conservation Measures

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

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

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

>

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:

> This action is being implemented on the basis of the project “Inventory of valuable natural habitats in Poland, species appearing in them, and development of a Data Bank on Natural Resources”. The project is implemented as part of the Operational Programme Infrastructure and Environment 2014–2020, Action 2.4 Nature protection and ecological education, and has been planned for the years 2017–2022. The basic purpose of the project is to eliminate the gap in the process involving management of natural resources in Poland, by eliminating the problem of the lack of complete environmental information and the system for collecting, analysing, sharing and systematic update of spatial data concerning the nature.

The planned project results include:

- Completed environmental knowledge concerning distribution of habitats and species, and the state of their behaviour (field inventories) in planning documents, and other evaluated needs;
- Development of an IT system – Bank of Data on Natural Resources, collecting the results of natural inventories in Poland;
- Preparing a procedure including the instructions for carrying out inventory and environmental monitoring using modern remote and teledetection methods;
- Developing a spatial data standard according to the requirements of the Directive 2007/2/EC (INSPIRE) for the purposes of the IT system – Bank of Data on Natural Resources.

Data harmonisation and development of the IT tool (database) has been commenced during the project. It is planned to enter 500,000 records in the Bank of Data on Natural Resources at the end of project implementation, that’s by December 31, 2022.

It is worth emphasising that actions intended to increase knowledge concerning the value of natural areas are carried out by regional units as a result of execution of various environmental projects or studies (e.g. project implemented by Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection in Warsaw “Increasing the knowledge on the subjects of protection within the Natura 2000 areas – inventory of habitats and species”).

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:

>

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:

>

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.

>

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):

> The mapping and assessment of ecosystems and their services on national level has been completed in 2015. The project was realized as a contract of the Polish Ministry of Environment. Since January 2015 Environmental Monitoring Programme in Poland is carrying out the programme covering mapping and assessment ES in different types of geoecosystems representative for the Polish landscape. In July 2015 National Ecosystem Services Partnership Network in Poland has been established. The Polish National ESP Network is leading by staff of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań.

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://biodiv.gdos.gov.pl/wdrazanie-konwencji/programme-conservation-and-sustainable-use-biodiversity/biodiversity-programme-and-action-plan-2015-2020-pl.pdf>

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

> A. III. Improvement of the nature protection system. Improvement of the network of protected areas to increase effectiveness of biodiversity protection. Mobilisation of funds on implementation of protective action in the protected areas. Improving effectiveness of protected species. Protection and restoration of valuable natural habitats. D II point 40 Elimination of barriers on species migratory routes.

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

> An expert qualitative analysis has been carried out due to the lack of measurable strategy implementation indicators. The analysis has proven that the trend of implementation has been satisfactory for more than 50% of strategy objectives, although further actions need to be continued.

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.

> More than 1000 products have been entered in the Traditional Products' List.

The first in Poland project for the in-situ preservation of plant genetic resources is in progress in the Lower Vistula Valley Landscape Park, which contains old orchards and roadside plantings of fruit trees from before World War I and the interwar period.

In the European strategy for the protection of biological and landscape diversity for the years 1996-2000, the Lower Vistula Valley Landscape Park was listed among the 10 most valuable objects in the category of water courses. The Park was also established to protect precious cultural and historical heritage of the Vistula Valley. The programme for preserving and restoring the culture of old, local apple tree varieties and traditional methods used to store and process fruit is in progress here.

Old fruit tree varieties form a "genes bank" that allow saving species and varieties that perish. Fruits of former varieties have completely different taste than fruits sold today in stalls - they are highly aromatic, sweet, and have excellent medicinal properties. Cultivation of older varieties does not require using large volumes of plant protection products, because the plants are immune to fungal diseases and pests. Orchards have great ecological importance - they provide nesting and living space for numerous species of birds and other living organisms. Tree planting among fields prevents water and wind erosion. Old orchards are also subject to protection due to aesthetic and landscape reasons.

Moreover, the State Bank of Biological Materials (KBMB) opened in spring 2014 allows protecting genetic resources with the ex-situ methods, through the collection and storage of genetic material in form of seeds, germs or oocytes subject to cryopreservation.

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

Please select one option:

Please select only one option

- 1. Little or no progress

- 2. Some progress but more work is needed
- 3. Positive advances have been made
- 4. Target substantially achieved (traditional knowledge is fully respected and there is effective participation from communities)

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

>

XVIII. Knowledge, Data and Capacity-Building

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

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

(select all that apply)

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

>

- 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

>

Public awareness campaigns

>

Capacity building

> Development of a network of central level state administration employees responsible for the issues of nature conventions, species protection and environmental monitoring. The members of this network are permanently in contact with each other and share continuously updated knowledge on the situation, needs, risks and actions undertaken by individual network participants, also including the issues concerning migrant animals.

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)

>

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

Please select only one option

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

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

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

>

Other

>

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

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

>

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

>

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

Please select only one option

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

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

>

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.

> Financial support for state operations involving biological biodiversity protection in the years 2015-2017 was as below:

2015 - PLN 811.28 million

2016 - PLN 1,997.40 million

2017 - PLN 1,227.89 million

Data for earlier years are available here:

<https://chm.cbd.int/database/record/2638812E-6F5C-5CB9-1DFF-02C9C2139DDE>