



CMS

2025 CMS National Report

Deadline for submission of the National Reports: : 30 September 2025

Reporting period: from May 2023 to February 2025

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

National Report format is available through the CMS Family Online Reporting System (ORS), which has been successfully implemented and used by CMS, AEWA, IOSEA and Sharks MOU in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC.

Through Resolution 12.5 (Rev. COP14) and Decisions 14.27, 14.25 National Reports and 14.2 Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species, the Standing Committee and the Secretariat were tasked with developing a new format for National Reports that aligns with the SPMS. However, given that the indicators of the SPMS are not yet in place, and due to the time constraints caused by the exceptionally short intersessional period before COP15, there is insufficient time to substantially amend the National Report format to fully align it with the SPMS.

The Standing Committee therefore agreed to develop a new format for the reporting period after COP15, and to use the previous National Report format for the current reporting period, with only minor adjustments. These adjustments would include a limited number of additional questions on topics that COP14 specifically requested to be reported through National Reports.

Additionally, it was agreed not to attach the full list of species in Appendices I and II for verification by Parties, as this information was collected during previous reporting cycles but could not be fully assessed and reflected in the National Reports format due to a lack of resources. Instead, the Standing Committee agreed to collect information on Range States for species listed in the Annex to Resolution 14.19 during this reporting cycle, in accordance with Decision 14.234.

A proposal of the National Reports format was circulated by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee members on 13 December and it was agreed through communication procedure, in line with Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure.

This online version of the format strictly follows the one adopted by Standing Committee through communication procedure. In addition, as was also the case for reporting prior to COP14, it incorporates pre-filled information, notably in Sections II and III, based on data available at the Secretariat from the previous reporting cycles.

Please note that guidance is available 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 Mr. Aydin Bahramlouian, Public Information Officer, aydin.bahramlouian@un.org

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

RESOURCES FOR THE CMS NATIONAL REPORT FROM OTHER RELEVANT INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROCESSES

Convention/Agreement/Process

Information source

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

National Reports

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

Annual trade reports, Annual illegal trade reports, Implementation reports

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat

National Reports, Ramsar Information Sheets

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Country reports

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)

National Reports

United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

National Reports

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

National Communications, Biennial Reports, Update Reports

Various CMS Family Agreements and Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs)

National Reports

2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals

National Reports

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

High-level summary of key messages

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

Guidance:

This section invites you to summarise the most important positive aspects of CMS implementation in your country and the areas of greatest concern. Please limit this specifically to the current reporting period only.

Your answers should be based on the information contained in the body of the report: the intention is for this section to distil the technical information in the report into “high level” messages for decision-makers and wider audiences.

Please try also to be specific or provide specific examples where you can, e.g. “New wildlife legislation enacted in 2024 doubled penalties for poisoning wild birds” rather than “stronger laws”; “50% shortfall in match-funding for GEF project on gazelles” rather than just “lack of funding”.

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

>>> The development of the Bustard Multi-species Action Plan to conserve African, Eurasian, and Australian bustards (to be submitted by Hungary for adoption at CMS COP15) is currently ongoing. The process is coordinated by Bustards Without Borders, for which Hungary is in coordination role.

The Hungarian Red-footed Falcon population declined from 2000–2500 pairs in the mid-20th century to just 600–700 pairs by 2006. Following the 2004 conservation plan (revised in 2019), measures such as habitat restoration, nest-box installation, and power line conversion helped reverse the trend. The population has since recovered to about 1300 pairs, mainly breeding in designated bird protection areas.

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

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

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

>>> Coordination of the implementation of the Bustard MsAP (2026-2037).

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

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

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 the Party

>>> Hungary

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

>>> 01111983

Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention

>>> Not applicable

Report compiler

Name and title

>>> Ms. Éva Fejes, biodiversity advisor / Secondary NFP to CMS

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 2771

Email

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

Designated CMS National Focal Point

Name and title of designated Focal Point

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

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture

Mailing address

>>> Kossuth tér 11.

1055 Budapest

Hungary

Telephone

>>> +36 1 795 2771

Email

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

Representative on the Scientific Council

Name and title

>>> -

Full name of institution

>>> -

Mailing address

>>> Kossuth tér 11.

1055, Budapest

Hungary

Telephone

>>> -

Email

>>> -

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:

Yes, the lists are correct and up to date

Country participation in Agreements/MOUs:

Please select only one per line

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

III. Species on the Convention Appendices

III.1 Please confirm that the Excel file “Res. 14.19 species per Party” linked below correctly identifies the **Appendix II** species listed in Resolution 14.19 Guidance on the treatment of species included within aggregated families listed under Appendix II for which your country is a Range State.

The list of Resolution 14.19 species per Parties is available **here**.

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

GUIDANCE TIP:

During the last two reporting cycles, information has been collected on Appendix I and Appendix II species, and the information received still needs to be analyzed. Therefore, this reporting cycle only focuses on bird species identified under Resolution 14.19. This Resolution invites Parties to consider the list of Species in its Annex when preparing National Reports. This question aims at collecting information on Range States of species listed in the Annex to Resolution 14.19. Parties are therefore invited to review the Range State data which are available in the excel spreadsheet “Res. 14.19 species per Party”. Please confirm that the list is correct, or if amendments are needed, create a line for each species for which you wish to indicate different information from that shown in the Excel spreadsheet. Where possible, please also provide supporting evidence, such as a reference to a scientific paper. A more detailed spreadsheet with Data per countries and territories is available here as background information. The data used for these spreadsheets are based on the CMS standard references for non-passerine and passerine species, as determined by Resolution 12.27(Rev.COP14) Taxonomy and Nomenclature, using its online version HBW-BirdLife Version 9.0 (October 2024)..

Yes, the list is correct

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

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

IV. Legal Prohibition of the Taking of Appendix I Species

IV.1. Is the taking of Appendix I species prohibited by national or territorial legislation in accordance with CMS Article III(5)?

Yes for all Appendix I species

Please identify any change in the legal statute(s) concerned that has been introduced since the last reporting:

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

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

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

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

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

[LIII_1996_nature_conservation.docx](#) - Act No. LIII. of 1996 on Nature Conservation in Hungary

IV.2 **Exceptions:** Where the taking of Appendix I species **is** prohibited by national legislation, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition during the reporting period?

No

IV.4. Are any vessels flagged to your country engaged in the intentional taking of Appendix I species outside of your country's national jurisdictional limits (consistent with the definition of "Range State" in Article I of the Convention)?

No

V. Awareness

V.1. Please indicate the actions that have been taken by your country during the reporting period to increase people's awareness of the values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems (note that answers given in section XVIII may also be relevant).
(select all that apply)

GUIDANCE TIP:

Awareness raising may include actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in various CMS documents, such as Resolution, Res. **11.9 (Rev.COP13)** (World Migratory Bird Day), as well as a number of other resolutions and decisions which include specific provisions about awareness raising, including Resolutions Res. **13.6** (Insect Decline), Res. **14.18** (Avian Influenza), Res. **14.17** (Communities and livelihoods), Res. **14.16** (Ecological Connectivity), Res. **14.15** (Action Plan to address aquatic Wild Meat Harvests), Res. **14.14** (CMS Jaguar Initiative), Res. **14.13** (Initiative for Central Asian Flyway), Res. **14.12** (Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea), Res. **14.10** (Single Species Action Plan for the Atlantic Humpback Dolphin (*Sousa teuszii*)), Res. **14.8** (Conservation and sustainable management of seagrass ecosystems), Res. **14.5** (Reducing the risk of vessel strikes for marine megafauna), Res. **14.1** (Samarkand Strategic Plan for migratory species 2024 - 2032), Res. **12.6 (Rev.COP14)** (Wildlife health and migratory species), Res. **12.11 (Rev.COP14)** (Flyways), Res. **12.17** (Conservation and Management of Whales and their Habitats in the South Atlantic Region), Res. **12.19 (Rev.COP14)** (Endorsement of the African Elephant Action Plan), Res. **12.20** (Management of Marine Debris), Res. **12.21 (Rev.COP14)** (Climate Change and Migratory Species), Res. **12.25** (Promoting Conservation of Critical Intertidal and Other Coastal Habitats for Migratory Species), Res. **11.16 (Rev.COP14)** (The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds), Res. **11.17 (Rev.COP14)** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region), Res. **11.24 (Rev.COP13)** (Central Asian Mammal Initiative), Res. **11.31 (Rev.COP14)** (Illegal and unsustainable taking of wildlife), Res. **8.12 (Rev.COP12)** (Improving the Conservation Status of Raptors and Owls in the African-Eurasian Region), and Decision 14.194 (Ecological Connectivity), Decision 14.54 (Marine Wildlife Watching) and Decision 14.223 (Impacts of Plastic Pollution on Aquatic, Terrestrial and Avian Species).

- Campaigns on specific topics
- Teaching programmes in schools or colleges
- Press and media coverage
- Community-based celebrations, exhibitions and other events
- Engagement of specific stakeholder groups
- Interpretation at nature reserves and other sites

Impact of actions

V.2. Please provide details for the actions selected in the previous question and indicate any specific elements of CMS COP Resolutions which have been particularly taken forward by these actions.

>>> Main actions taken:

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

V.3. Overall, how successful have these awareness actions been in achieving their objectives?

Tick one box

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

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

- 3. Good impact

V.4. Please identify the main form(s) of evidence that has/have been used to make this assessment.

>>> In Hungary, the knowledge related to migratory species and their threatening factors is growing. More and more people attend events related to raising public awareness on migratory species and other

nature conservation topics. The 10 national park directorates regularly organise activities, guided tours, talks, bird ringing events, bat nights, that involve migratory species. Most of the visitor centers involve topics concerning migratory species and their habitats, their vulnerability and the efforts to protect them. MME/BirdLife Hungary has been conducting successful campaigns and lectures on social media, television and radio, gaining growing public support.

VI. Mainstreaming Migratory Species in Other Sectors and Processes

VI.1. 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?

Yes

Please provide details:

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please describe how CMS objectives are incorporated in other sectoral strategies such as transport, construction, agriculture, tourism, education, spatial planning, Sustainable Development Goals and other strategies.

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

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

VI.2. Does your country integrate the 'values of migratory species and their habitats' in any other national reporting processes?

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

No

VI.3. Provide some examples of significant involvements (if any) of non-governmental organizations and/or civil society in the conservation of migratory species in your country.

>>> The civil society is involved in the work of governmental nature conservation, responsible for CMS implementation in Hungary, in many ways. Ministry and NPD staff, NGOs, and independent experts are represented in the national Great Bustard Working Group that implements the Middle-European Great Bustard MoU in Hungary. The same applies to other national working/specialist groups, such as the one on bats, and the recently found WG on Laridae and Sternidae.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI.4. Provide some examples of significant involvements (if any) of the private sector in the conservation of migratory species in your country.

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

Requirements for financial support under CAP (Common Agricultural Policy in the EU) in the current period (2023-2027) include crop diversification, protection of permanent grasslands and designation of ecological target areas, and other biodiversity-friendly elements in greater proportion than in the previous period. Agri-environment payment schemes can be applied for on a voluntary basis. They provide payments to farmers on cca one million hectares which accounts for one fifth of the arable land in Hungary. These payments can help preserve migratory bird populations in grasslands and agricultural ecosystems.

VI.5. Are legislation and regulations in your country concerning Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) considering the possible impediments to migration, transboundary effects on migratory species, and of impacts on migratory patterns and migratory ranges?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please refer to Resolution **7.2 (Rev.COP14)** (Impact Assessment and Migratory Species).

Yes

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

>>> -

VI.6. To what extent have biodiversity and migratory species considerations been specifically integrated into national energy and climate policy and legislation?

GUIDANCE TIP

Please refer to Resolutions **12.21 (Rev.COP14)** (Climate Change and Migratory Species), Res. **11.27 (Rev.COP13)** (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species), Res. **10.11 (Rev.COP13)** (Power Lines and Migratory Birds), and Decision **14.207** (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species) for more information.

>>> Excerpt from the National Climate Change Strategy:

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

During the development of the second National Climate Change Strategy (hereinafter: NÉS-2) for the period 2018-2030, which also provides an outlook for the period up to 2050, the public policy goal was to create a national climate change strategy, which lays down the objectives, with the implementation of which the effects caused by climate change can be treated in the long term.

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

Specific targets:

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

Please provide any examples related to such policy and legislation.

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

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

VII. Governance, Policy and Legislative Coherence

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

VII.1. Have any governance arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migration systems in your country, or in which your country participates, resulted in improvements during the reporting period?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

No, because existing arrangements are considered to be sufficient

VII.2. Has any committee or other arrangement for liaison between different government agencies/ministries, sectors or groups been established at a national and/or subnational level in your country that addresses CMS implementation issues?

GUIDANCE TIP:

There is no fixed model for what these arrangements may involve, and it is for each Contracting Party to decide what best suits its own circumstances. Examples could include a steering group that includes representatives of territorial administration authorities, a coordination committee that involves the lead government department (e.g. environment) working with other departments (e.g. agriculture, industry); a forum that brings together government and NGOs; a liaison group that links with business and private sector interests; a stakeholder forum involving representatives of indigenous and local communities; a coordination team that brings together the National Focal Points for each of the biodiversity-related MEAs to which the country is a Party (see also question VII.3); or any other appropriate mechanism.

These mechanisms may be specifically focused on migratory species issues, or they may address CMS implementation in conjunction with related processes such as NBSAP coordination, a National Ramsar Committee, etc.

The Manual for National Focal Points for CMS and its Instruments may be helpful in giving further context.

No

VII.3. Does collaboration between the focal points of CMS and other relevant global or regional Conventions take place in your country to develop the coordinated and synergistic approaches described in paragraphs 29, 30 and 32 of **Res. 11.10 (Rev.COP14)** (Synergies and partnerships) and in paragraph 7 of **Res. 14.3** (Engagement in CBD processes including the Global Biodiversity Framework) ?

GUIDANCE TIP:

Relevant Conventions may include other global agreements such as biodiversity-related Conventions and Agreements, UNFCCC, UNCCD, as well as regional agreements, including CMS Agreements. Such collaboration may also be relevant to aligning efforts related to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, and NBSAPs as described in **Dec. 14.6** (CMS Engagement in CBD Processes Including Global Biodiversity Framework) and **Res. 8.18 (Rev.COP12)** (Integration of Migratory Species into NBSAPs and into On-going and Future Programmes of Work under CBD). Guidance documents for integrating considerations relevant to Migratory Species in NBSAPs are available at CMS website.

Yes

Please provide details:

>>> There is close collaboration between the very few people involved in the work related to international treaties for nature and biodiversity (CMS, AEWA, AEML WG, EUROBATS, Great Bustard MoU, Bern Convention (handled by the same person), Raptors MoU, CITES, Ramsar Convention, CBD, all working at the Department for Biodiversity and Gene Conservation and the Department for Nature Conservation at the Ministry of Agriculture in Hungary.

There is regular contact with the Focal Points and other experts in other countries, particularly within the EU.

VII.4. Has your country or any jurisdictional subdivision within your country adopted legislation, policies, initiatives or action plans during the reporting period that promote community involvement in conservation of CMS-listed species?

No

VIII. Incentives

VIII.1. Has there been any elimination, phasing out or reforming of harmful incentives in your country during the reporting period resulting in benefits for migratory species?

Partly / in some areas

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

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

VIII.2. Has there been development and/or application of positive incentives in your country during the reporting period, resulting in benefits for migratory species?

Partly / in some areas

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

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

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

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

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

The following subschemes are relevant for Turtle Dove habitat management:

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

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

IX. Sustainable Production and Consumption

IX.1. During the reporting period, has your country implemented plans or taken other steps concerning sustainable production and consumption which are relevant for conservation of migratory species?

Yes

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

>>> Sustainable land-use and small-scale, biodiversity-friendly agriculture is promoted on agricultural areas that are habitat to the Great Bustard. Farmers are compensated for implementing the measures prescribed.

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

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

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

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

Intentional Taking

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Legal hunting	Aythya nyroca (I), Anatidae (II).	Anatidae: 3, P. carbo: 1
Illegal hunting	Aquila heliaca (I), Haliaeetus albicilla (I), Falco cherrug (I), Accipitridae (II). In addition to that, Microcarbo pygmaeus (II) can be affected during the legal shooting of Phalacrocorax carbo.	3
Other harvesting and take	Scolopax rusticola (II), spring shooting is legal under BD Art. 9.	3
Illegal trade	Not relevant	3
Deliberate poisoning	Aquila heliaca (I), Haliaeetus albicilla (I), Accipitridae (II)	2

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

- >>> - rise in poisoning cases in 2025
- decreasing long-term trend
- training courses in the frame of NEST (National Environmental Security Task Force)

Unintentional Taking

	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details
Bycatch	N/A	N/A
Catch in Abandoned, Lost or otherwise Discarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG)	2	Mostly Mute Swans get engangled in fishing gear, but gulls (Laridae, any species) and Pygmy Cormorants are also affected.
Other forms of unintentional taking	3	N/A

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **12.22**(Bycatch), Res. **12.20** (Management of Marine Debris), Res. **11.21** (Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean), Res. **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for

Cetaceans), and Res. **13.3** (Chondrichthyan species) and Dec. 14.31 b) and c). Parties are encouraged to report on the implementation of the recommendation included in Drynan and Baker 2023 “Technical mitigation techniques to reduce bycatch of sharks” provided in Annex 1 to UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.1.1/Rev.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
Wind turbines	Potentially <i>Aquila heliaca</i> (I), <i>Coracias garrulus</i> (I), <i>Falco cherrug</i> (I), <i>Falco vespertinus</i> (I), <i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i> (I), <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i> (II), <i>Buteo buteo</i> (II), <i>Buteo rufinus</i> (II), <i>Ciconia ciconia</i> (II), <i>Ciconia nigra</i> (II), <i>Circaetus gallicus</i> (II), <i>Falco peregrinus</i> (II), <i>Falco tinnunculus</i> (II), <i>Milvus milvus</i> (II)	3
Other collisions	Collision with powerlines: <i>Otis tarda</i> (I-II), <i>Ciconia ciconia</i> (II), shorebirds and other waterbirds (II). Bats are less affected by collisions (including those with wind turbines due to the low number of the turbines.)	1
Electrocution	<i>Aquila heliaca</i> (I), <i>Falco vespertinus</i> (I), <i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i> (I), <i>Falco cherrug</i> (I), <i>Accipitridae</i> (II), <i>Grus grus</i> (II)	3
Vessel strikes	N/A	N/A

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

>>> Cables recently buried in the most problematic areas:

Vaskút-Csátalja-Gara 20 kV line: retrofitting 450 m, groundcabling 750 m, for the safety of White Storks visiting the nearby dump - MVM DÉMÁSZ (2024)

Hódmezővásárhely-Székkutas 22 kV line: retrofitting 5 km, for the safety of White Storks - MVM DÉMÁSZ (2024)

Makó-Rákos-Csanádalberti 132 kV line: BFDs on 6,5 km for the safety of Great Bustards - MVM DÉMÁSZ (2024)

Pusztazámor: groundcabling for the safety of White Storks visiting the nearby dump - EON (2024)

Monitoring of different types of BFDs, by MAVIR:

- 220 kV lines: B&W balls, RIBE-KLAMP10 arrangement, DELTA LIGHT luminous BFD

- 400 kV lines: LAJ balls, spirals, spikes, RIBE-KLAMP10 arrangement, DELTA LIGHT BFD

Csanádpalota 2023-2024, MAVIR:

- Sándorfalva Arad 400 kV line: 866 KLAMP10, 192 RIBE (+241 in progress in 2025)

- for the safety of Great Bustards

Szentistván 2023-2025, MAVIR:

- Mezőcsát-Sajószöged line: 966 KLAMP10, 220 DELTA LIGHT luminous BFDs

- for migratory birds

Nádudvar 2024-2025, MAVIR:

- Józsa-Airsa 400 kV: 214 KLAMP10, 200 DELTA LIGHT luminous BFDs

- for migratory birds.

OPUS (2024)

Hajdúszoboszló-Balmazújváros 22 kV line: retrofitting 2118 m

Polgár-Hajdúböszörmény 22 kV line: retrofitting 6418 m

Mezőtúr-Túrkeve 22 kV line: retrofitting + BFD 4700 m

Berettyóújfalú-Szeghalom 132 kV line: BFD 6300 m

Debrecen 22 kV line: 800 m powerline buried

The 'Accessible Sky' agreement (2008) still serves as the frame of all bird-friendly interventions involving the electricity suppliers, the ministry responsible for nature conservation (currently the Ministry of Agriculture), MME/BirdLife Hungary and other stakeholders as signatories. The main tasks: enhancing legislation, elaborate bird-friendly designs in joint effort, prioritisation of power lines and scheduling of retrofitting, provision of funding.

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolution **7.4** (Electrocution of Migratory Birds), **7.5 (Rev.COP12)**(Wind Turbines and Migratory Species, **10.11 (Rev. COP13)** (Power Lines and Migratory Birds), **11.17 (Rev.COP14)** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region), **11.27 (Rev.COP13)** (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species), **12.10 (Rev.COP14)** (Conservation of African Eurasian Vultures), Res. **14.5** (Reducing the risk of vessel strikes for

marine megafauna), Res. **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans) and Decision 14.48.

>>> -

Other mortality

	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details
Disease, including highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI)	1	Laridae (II), particularly Black-headed Gulls, Mediterranean Gulls, and Common Terns in May-June 2023, Common Cranes in fall 2023.
Unexplained stranding events	N/A	N/A
Accidental/indirect poisoning	3	Black-headed Gull (II) is known to have been poisoned by foraging on chemically treated fields
Disease	3	West Nile disease has been affecting Accipiter gentilis for decades

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[HPAI outbreaks in Hungary 2023.docx](#)

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

>>> -

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **11.15 (Rev.COP14)** (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Species), Res. **12.6** (Rev.COP14) (Wildlife health and migratory species), Res. **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative), Res. **13.6** (Insect Decline), Res. **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans), Res. 14.18 Avian influenza and Decisions 14.148-14.150 (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures).

>>> -

Alien and/or invasive species

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Alien and/or invasive species	Norway Rat (<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>) invades nesting colonies of Laridae (e.g. <i>Ichthyaeetus melanocephalus</i> , <i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i> , <i>Sterna hirundo</i>).	2

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

>>> -

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

>>> -

Disturbance and disruption

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

Disturbance	Great Bustard (I-II); waterbirds (I-II) by hunting	2
-------------	--	---

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

>>> In October 2018, the Tata city council adopted a municipal bylaw banning the use of fireworks in the wider area of the Old Lake (essentially the entire area of the town) to protect the tens of thousands of wild geese and other waterfowl resting on the Old Lake during the winter months. This bylaw is unique in Hungary and is a very effective contribution to the protection of birds. The bylaw is very popular with NGOs and residents, and there is a broad cooperation to monitor and enforce the ban. This is why many tourists wishing to spend the end of the year in peace and quiet come to Tata for New Year's Eve.

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans), Res. **12.16 (Rev.COP14)** (Recreational In-Water Interaction with Aquatic Mammals), Res. **11.29 (Rev.COP12)** (Sustainable Boat-based Wildlife Watching), Res. **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative) and measures to mitigate threats to Important Shark and Ray Areas under Decision **14.61**.

>>> -

Pollution

	Species/species groups affected (provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Marine debris (including plastics)	N/A	N/A
Light pollution	Rhinolophidae (II), Vespertilionidae (II)	2
Underwater noise	N/A	N/A
Other pollution	N/A	N/A
Fish aggregating devices (FADs)	N/A	N/A

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

>>> -

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans), Res. **13.5 (Rev.COP14)** (CMS international light pollution guidelines for migratory species), Res. **12.14** (Adverse Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Cetaceans and Other Migratory species), Res. **12.17** (Action Plan for the Protection and Conservation of south Atlantic Whales), Res. **12.20** (Management of Marine Debris), Res. **7.3 (Rev.COP12)** (Oil Pollution and Migratory species), and Decision **14.223** (Impacts of Plastic Pollution on Aquatic, Terrestrial and Avian Species).

>>> -

Habitat destruction/degradation

	Species/species groups affected (please provide names and indicate whether Appendix I and/or Appendix II); and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Landscape fragmentation/loss of ecological connectivity, physical barriers	Mostly the species tied to arable lands and grasslands: Otis tarda (I-II), Falco vespertinus (I-II), Tetrax tetrax (I-II) and all other Appendix II. species	2
Habitat degradation	All species tied to wetlands (Appendix II.)	1-2

Mineral exploration/extraction	Laridae, Sternidae (II), their nesting sites can be affected by mining activity	2
Unsustainable land/resource use	Mostly the species tied to arable lands and grasslands: Otis tarda (I-II), Falco vespertinus (I-II), Tetrax tetrax (I-II) and all other Appendix II. species	1-2
Urbanization	Insectivorous birds, forest passerines (II); indirectly: Great Bustard (I-II) by infrastructure (habitat fragmentation, collision)	2
Mineral exploration/extraction, incl. deep-seabed mineral exploitation	N/A	N/A
Fire	N/A	N/A
Physical barriers	N/A	N/A

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

>>> -

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **14.6** (Deep-seabed mineral exploitation activities and migratory species) **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans), Res. **13.3** (Chondrichthyan species), Res. **13.6** (Insect Decline), Res. **12.11 (Rev.COP14)** (Flyways), Res. **12.12 (Rev.COP14)**(Action Plans for Birds), Res. **12.13** (Important Marine Mammal Areas), Res. **12.17** (Conservation and Management of Whales and their Habitats in the South Atlantic Region), Res. **12.19 (Rev.COP14)** (Endorsement of the African Elephant Action Plan), Res. **12.24**(Promoting Marine Protected Areas Networks in the ASEAN Regions), Res. **12.25** (Promoting Conservation of Critical Intertidal and Other Habitats for Migratory species), Res. **11.17 (Rev.COP14)** (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region), Res. **11.18 (Rev.COP14)** (Saker Falcon Global Action Plan), Res. **11.21** (Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean), Res. **11.24 (Rev.COP13)** (Central Asian Mammal Initiative), Res. **14.16** (Ecological Connectivity), and Decisions **14.148-14.150** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures).

>>> -

Climate change

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

Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.

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

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in levels of

knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc?

>>> -

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

>>> -

Other (please specify)

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

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

>>> -

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

>>> -

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

CMS Article III(4)(b) states 'Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor...to prevent, remove, compensate for or minimize, as appropriate, the adverse effects of activities or obstacles that seriously impede or prevent the migration of the species.'

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

No

XI. Conservation Status of Migratory Species

XI.1. What (if any) major changes in the conservation status of migratory species included in the CMS Appendices (e.g. national Red List category changes) have been recorded in your country during the reporting period?

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

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

The emphasis of this question is on “major changes” during the reporting period. Information is expected to be provided here only where particularly notable shifts in status have occurred, such as those that might be represented by a re-categorisation of national Red List threat status for a given species (or subspecies, where relevant). Please record if any CMS listed species has become extinct or extirpated from your country - or reintroduced/re-established/established - during the reporting period (or before if not previously reported to CMS).

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

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats)

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

Aquatic mammals

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

Bats

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

Birds

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

Reptiles

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

Fish

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

Insects

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

XII. Cooperating to Conserve Migration Systems

XII.1 During the reporting period, has your country initiated or participated in the development of any proposals for new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II species?

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

Yes

Please provide details:

>>> Bustards Without Borders (BWB):

Hungary is in the coordinating role of BWB, a consortium established in the frame of AEMLAP and CMS, in 2024, for the conservation of African, Eurasian, and Australian bustards.

BWB aligns with the aim of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan (AEMLAP) adopted as Annex to CMS Resolution 11.17 (Rev.COP14), to improve the conservation status of migratory landbird species along the African-Eurasian region through coordinating actions at the international scale and through catalyzing actions at national level.

A Multi-species Action Plan (MsAP) for the conservation of all 26 bustard species is being developed by BWB, and is planned to be submitted by Hungary for adoption at CMS COP15. The first draft was circulated among Range States on 3 July 2025.

XII.2. During the reporting period, have actions been taken by your country to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?

No

XII.3. During the reporting period, has your country participated in the implementation of Concerted Actions under CMS (as detailed in Resolution **12.28 (Rev.COP14)**) to address the needs of relevant migratory species?

No

XII.4. Have any other steps been taken which have contributed to enhancing cooperation on the conservation of migratory species in ways that fully reflect a migration systems approach?

E.g. steps implementing Resolutions **12.11 (Rev.COP14)** (Flyways) and Res. **12.17** (South Atlantic Whales), and Decisions 14.130 (Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds), 14.137 (Flyways), and 14.207 (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species).

Yes

Please provide details:

>>> -

XII.5. Has your country mobilized resources and/or taken steps to promote and address ecological connectivity and its functionality in relevant international processes?

E.g., Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, etc.

GUIDANCE TIP:

Please describe initiatives aimed at implementing Decision 14.194.

No

XIII. Area-Based Conservation Measures

XIII.1. Have critical habitats and sites for migratory species been identified (e.g. by an inventory) in your country?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

Helpful reflections on the issue can be found in the Resolution **Res. 14.16** (Ecological Connectivity) and in “**Strategic Review of Aspects of Ecological Networks relating to Migratory Species**” presented to COP11 and the “**Critical Site Network Tool**” developed under the auspices of AEWA and the Ramsar Convention. For sharks and rays please refer to <https://sharkrayareas.org>. For marine mammals, please refer to <https://www.marinemammalhabitat.org/imma-eatlas/>.

Yes, fully

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

>>> -

XIII.2. Has any assessment been made of the contribution made by the country’s protected areas network specifically to migratory species conservation?

Yes

Please provide details:

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

The “contribution” may relate to those of the identified **Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs)** (www.marinemammalhabitat.org) and support to identification of new **Important Shark and Ray areas (ISRAs)** (<https://sharkrayareas.org>).

Regarding Birds of Prey, the “contribution” may relate to the Internationally Important Raptors Sites (relevant to the range of the Raptors MOU, as sites listed in table 3 of Annex 3 of the Raptors MOU).

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

>>> According to the Birds Directive (Article 12) and Habitats Directive (Article 17) two national reports were submitted in 2025. Migratory birds, their population size and trend, their presence (b, p, w), and the threats they face are listed in the BD report.

XIII.3. 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”)?

No

XIII.4. 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?

Yes

Please provide a reference and details on what is covered:

>>> Management effectiveness can be measured and evaluated in several ways. All NPDs (10 altogether) provide a thorough annual report containing management of their areas. The reports are available on the NPD websites.

Habitats of certain protected species are continuously monitored to ensure the best available practice for the needs of the species. Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*) is one of the best monitored species in Hungary.

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

XIII.5. Beyond Protected Areas, are other effective area-based conservation measures implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?

Yes

Please provide details:

>>> Natura 2000 compensation payments in agricultural areas - Agri-environmental payments:

The figures are from a study on the 2024 applications for payments. Decision on the applications is ongoing, it is likely that all applications will be supported (and thus payments will indeed be paid and measures will be applied in the 2025-2030 period). Bird-friendly mowing is a package of measures, including from centre to the outside, bird-scaring chain, max 4 m mowing width and max 8 km/h mowing speed.

Thematic subschemes 2024 application

Natura 2000 arable (new scheme) 8 444 ha

HNVA Great Bustard Conservation arable 17 730 ha

HNVA Bird Conservation arable 18 112 ha

HNVA Red-footed Falcon Conservation arable 2 492 ha

Horizontal grassland 103 125 ha

HNVA Habitat Conservation grassland 124 142 ha

Horizontal arable + bird-friendly mowing 833 511 ha

Natura 2000 grassland compensation (excluding overlap with agri-environmental subschemes) 126 068 ha

Total 1 233 624 ha

XIV. Ecosystem Services

XIV.1. Has any assessment of ecosystem services associated with migratory species been undertaken in your country since the last reporting?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

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

Partly / in progress

Please provide details (including source references where applicable):

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

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

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

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

Further 4 thematic layers are available for use:

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

XV. Safeguarding Genetic Diversity

XV.1. Are strategies of relevance to migratory species being developed or implemented to minimize genetic erosion of biodiversity in your country?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

No

XVI. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans

XVI.1. Does your country's National Biodiversity Strategy or Action Plan (NBSAP), or other relevant plans or strategies used in your country, explicitly address obligations under CMS, priorities for the conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, and ecological connectivity?

Yes

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

>>> The National Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 is the third comprehensive plan to preserve the natural resources, and the diversity of species and habitats in Hungary. It was approved on 8 August 2023.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[2030_NBS_jovahagyott_kozzetett_fedolappal_2023-08-08.pdf](#) - National Biodiversity Strategy of Hungary 2030

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

[National Biodiversity Strategy of Hungary for 2030](#)

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

>>> Target 1.2: Improving the connectivity of protected areas.

Actions:

Expanding the ecological network by developing existing and potential green infrastructure elements based on an assessment of their ecological status, ecosystem services, and spatial connections.

Ensuring, through regulatory instruments, that green corridors and ecological connectivity are fully preserved in all cases in the context of construction or construction projects.

Target 15.2: Development of urban elements of the green infrastructure network.

Action: Prohibition of fireworks and internal combustion engine vehicle races in natural areas that are considered wetlands and/or resting and feeding places for migratory bird species.

Other relevant targets (not specifically for the benefit of migratory species only):

Target 2.1: In the case of wetlands, intervention and restoration activities are being carried out on at least 34,000 hectares to prevent further deterioration of the natural state.

Target 2.2: In the case of permanent grasslands, intervention and restoration activities are carried out on at least 35,000 hectares to prevent further deterioration of the natural state, with a view to preserving the long-term natural value of degraded grasslands and creating the necessary ecological conditions.

Target 2.3: In the case of forest ecosystems, intervention and restoration activities are being carried out on at least 136,000 hectares to prevent further deterioration of the natural state and to create the ecological conditions necessary for the long-term preservation of the natural values of degraded forest habitats.

Target 3.1: The conservation status and population trends of species of Community interest that are currently unfavorable or poor will not deteriorate, and at least 30% of them will achieve a favorable conservation status or at least show improvement.

Target 3.2: Improving the conservation status of other protected species of non-Community importance.

Target 3.3: Identification of certain unprotected key species and improvement of their conservation status.

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

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

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

XVI.2. Please provide information on the progress of implementation of other relevant action plans (single species, species group, etc.), initiatives, task forces, and programmes of work in your country that have not been addressed in previous questions.

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

>>> AEMLAP:

Hungary is represented in the Coordination Unit of Bustards Without Borders (BWB), a consortium of experts, organizations and government institutions committed to sustainable bustard conservation worldwide. The BWB team has undertaken the development of a Multi-species Action Plan (MsAP) to conserve all 26 bustard species across four continents.

BWB aligns with the aim of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan (AEMLAP) adopted as Annex to CMS Resolution 11.17 (Rev.COP14), to improve the conservation status of migratory landbird species along the African-Eurasian region through coordinating actions at the international scale and through catalyzing actions at national level.

Through Resolution 11.17 (Rev.COP14), the CMS Conference of the Parties at its 14th meeting (COP14, Samarkand, Uzbekistan, 2024), specifically addresses the necessity of mitigating threats to migratory bustards. The COP 'Further calls on Parties to urgently take practical measures to address threats to migratory bustards, a highly threatened and declining group of migratory landbird species under particular pressure from illegal killing, unsustainable taking, collision with energy infrastructure and habitat loss and degradation including as outlined in relevant Species Action Plans;'

The Bustard MsAP is planned to be submitted by Hungary for adoption at CMS COP15.

ETF:

The 'Accessible Sky' agreement was signed in 2008 by signed by the ministry responsible for nature conservation, MME/BirdLife Hungary on one hand and all three distribution companies and the transmission company on the other. Collaborative efforts have been taken to resolve the birds vs powerline conflict. The work is ongoing, many important steps (retrofitting projects, policymaking, underground cabling) have been taken, and more are planned in the future.

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

>>> -

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

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

XVII.1. During the reporting period, have actions been taken in your country to foster consideration for the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that are relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

Not applicable

XVII.2. During the reporting period, have actions been taken in your country to promote and foster effective participation and involvement of indigenous and local communities in the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

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)

Other

>>> not applicable

Please provide details on the implementation of the actions concerned.

GUIDANCE TIP

Responses to these questions may involve actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolution **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans).

>>> not applicable

XVII.3. How would you rank progress since the previous report in your country in the area of traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species?

1. Little or no progress

Please provide details on the progress made (where applicable).

>>> not applicable

XVIII. Knowledge, Data and Capacity-Building

XVIII.1 During the reporting period, which steps taken in your country have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in the area of knowledge, data and capacity building? (Answers given in Section V may be relevant)

(select all that apply)

- Education campaigns in schools
- Public awareness campaigns
- Capacity building
- Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives
- Research by academia, research organizations and other relevant stakeholders

XVIII.2 Please describe the contribution these steps have made towards achieving the results defined in Target 15:

GUIDANCE TIP

Steps taken may include actions, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans), Res. **13.3** (Chondrichthyan Species), Res. **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative), Res. **13.5 (Rev.COP14)** (CMS international light pollution guidelines for migratory species), Res. **13.6** (Insect Decline), and Decisions 14.130/14.131 (AEMLAP), 14.134 (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds), 14.148-14.151 (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), Decisions 14.207-14.208 (Renewable Energy and Migratory Species), and 14.182 (Illegal and Unsustainable Taking of Wildlife).

Education campaigns in schools

>>> BirdLife Hungary is the main participant in the public awareness raising regarding conservation of species or habitats, therefore migratory species also, mostly by environmental education.

There are many educational events through the year mostly for children, like birding camps or the bird-friendly school campaign, and there are also bird watching programs for teachers. Moreover, the experts visit many schools and kindergarten, holding many lectures and courses for children, mainly about problems connecting to certain species, such as swallows or the red-footed falcon, but also about all the migratory species.

Some experts introduce specifically migratory bird species to children by taking live birds (with permit) along, or catching them at or nearby the school by mistnets (also with permit), and ring them there on the spot.

Groups of children regularly visit bird ringing camps either during field trips or during summer camps organised by the school. These open ringing sessions are extremely informative and if a school group attends, the ringing personnel target the age group with lots of relevant information about the species and animal migration, the routes, the strategies, interesting highlights, and offer a close encounter with the birds. No other activity can bring children closer to migratory species.

Day of Birds and Trees is organised annually by national park directorates, NGOs and schools throughout the country (10 May).

Public awareness campaigns

>>> National park directorates and BirdLife Hungary take part in numerous events related to environment and nature, e.g. the yearly Weapon, Fishing and Hunting Show, scientific platforms and events.

Annual events raising public awareness about migratory species: Wild Goose Festival in November (organised by NGOs and Duna-Ipoly NPD), Crane Festival in Hortobágy (organised by Hortobágy NPD).

BirdLife Hungary and some of the NPDs regularly post public awareness raising articles and topics on- and offline, on the radio and also on billboards and television. All NPDs offer guided tours and events concerning migratory species.

Capacity building

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

Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives

>>> There is an agreement between the Ministry of Agriculture and BirdLife Hungary about data-sharing, and there are numerous joint projects (e.g. on the conservation of Great Bustard, Eastern Imperial Eagle, or the Accessible Sky agreement with energy distribution companies to reduce powerline-related mortality) that are based on gathering and assessing data jointly.

Research by academia, research organizations and other relevant stakeholders

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

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

A few examples:

One of the ringing stations is specialised in waterbirds, especially shorebirds that occur in migration at the westernmost alkaline wetland of Europe. The activity has been carried out by employees of Fertő-Hanság National Park Directorate with the help of many volunteers for 20 years. A wide range of shorebirds and Anatidae (especially *Anser anser*) get ringed and are recovered at the station. The recovery rate is much higher (5-6 %) than of the songbirds, due to the better visibility of both the color rings and the waterbirds. Sadly, there was no ringing activities carried out at this excellent site in the reporting period, due to unfavorable water level (too high in 2025 and 2024, drought in 2023).

Other NPDs, research projects and individuals are also involved in color-ringing and GPS tagging of waterbirds. Balaton Limnological Research Institute aims at studying the migration patterns and territorial behaviour of Great Cormorants nesting around Lake Balaton, 30 specimens have been equipped with GPS tags since 2021. Ringing and GPS tagging of *Falco vespertinus* has resulted in new discoveries on routes and roosting and wintering sites (see *Falco* project in previous topics). The expedition carried out in 2019 brought exceptional results in finding the biggest known roostsite of raptors in Huambo, Angola. During the expedition in March 2023, 40 specimens got equipped with GPS tags to gain more data of their migration routes, wintering sites and possibly more roostsites. The valuable data are used for the conservation of the species and its habitats. *Acrocephalus melanopogon*: Hungarian NGO has been organising and carrying out ringing and monitoring sessions along the migration route at the wintering sites of *A. melanopogon* at the Balkans (Albania, Croatia, Greece, Italy) for 20 years. Since 2020, 15 specimens have been equipped with radio transmitters (10 in Hungary, 5 along the migration route to the Balkans), the project is currently halted due to lack of funds. (The European population has been declining at an alarming rate, due to loss of habitats. 10% of the European population nests in Hungary. There is not much reliable data of the global population.)

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Madárgyűrűzési Központ 2024. évi beszámolója.pdf](#) - Hungarian Bird Ringing Center_annual report 2024

XVIII.3 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
- Provision of equipment or materials
- Exchange of information & know-how
- Research & innovation

XIX. Resource Mobilization

XIX.1 During the reporting period, has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

Yes, made available for activities within the country

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

The same

XIX.2. During the reporting period, has your country received financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?

Yes

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

Other

>>> LIFE program (L'Instrument Financier pour l'Environnement) of the European Union

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

The same

XIX.3. Which are the most important CMS implementation priorities requiring resources and support in your country during future reporting periods?

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

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

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

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