



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):

>>> 1) National Green Investment Fund (Nationaal Groenfonds) – a principal domestic source enabling on-the-ground conservation action vital for migratory species corridors and habitats.

2) Programmatic approach large water systems PAGW

=====

1) The Dutch spatial and water policy has been further aligned with biodiversity goals. The National Water Plan and National Environmental Vision (NOVI) remain the guiding frameworks, complemented by the new NBSAP (2025) which integrates obligations under the CBD, CMS, and EU directives. Recent emphasis has been placed on nature-inclusive dyke reinforcement under the High Water Protection Programme (HWBP) and on freshwater resilience via the Deltaplan Freshwater.

The Marker Wadden project continues to develop as one of the largest freshwater nature restoration projects in Europe. By 2024, the 10.000 ha archipelago with new islands and wetlands were completed, expanding habitats for breeding and migratory birds. The project is now internationally recognised as a model for sediment reuse and wetland creation. It is one of the largest fresh water lakes in Western Europe, and has great value for migratory waterbirds.

2) Progress has continued on reopening migratory fish routes. At the Haringvliet sluices, monitoring in 2023–2024 confirmed large-scale passage of European eel, river lamprey, twaite shad, and Atlantic salmon, demonstrating recovery of connectivity after decades of blockage.

The Fish Migration River at Kornwerderzand, connecting the IJsselmeer with the Wadden Sea, is under development. The final construction phases are underway and it is expected to be completed by 2027. Once operational, this 4 km artificial river will provide one of Europe’s largest open connections for migratory fish, benefiting millions of individuals annually.

3) The Programme 'Towards a Rich Wadden Sea' (Naar een Rijke Waddenzee) has made further progress in strengthening ecosystem resilience. In 2023–2025, notable achievements included the expansion of seagrass meadows near tidal flats/islands Griend and Balgzand and continued growth of mussel beds, both essential for migratory waterbirds under AEWA.

Additional work under the 'Agenda Waddengebied' 2050 focused on balancing nature recovery with sustainable fisheries and energy transition. The Wadden Sea continues to host millions of migratory birds annually, underlining its CMS importance.

4) Regarding Natura 2000 conservation objectives, water quality improvements under the EU Water Framework Directive remain central. Since 2023, investments have been directed to reduce nutrient loads and restore wetlands in the Rhine–Meuse delta and Lake IJssel area. A positive outcome has been the observed recovery of marshland and freshwater birds such as the white-tailed eagle, great egret, and spoonbill. This demonstrates how EU measures indirectly but effectively improve conditions for CMS-listed migratory species.

5) Implementation of the Nature and Environment Policy Plan Caribbean Netherlands 2020–2030 has advanced. The enforcement capacity in the Yarari Marine Mammal and Shark Sanctuary was strengthened. This sanctuary now covers 2.5 million hectares and is central for protecting migratory humpback whales, dolphins, sharks, and rays.

In November 2023 was the official designation of four new Ramsar sites for Aruba. With also the extension of Spaans Lagoen, the only existing Ramsar site since 1980, the total area protected under the Convention on the island has increased from 70 to no less than 14,408 ha.

Although biodiversity is often seen as conflicting with economic growth, there are encouraging signs of change. Bonaire’s vision as the Caribbean’s first Blue Destination integrates nature with tourism planning. In addition, the EU-funded restoration project “Turning the Tide” on Aruba (2023–2025) promotes hands-on coral and coastal ecosystem recovery as a foundation for economic resilience. These examples highlight that linking biodiversity conservation with economic security is possible, but raising awareness and building acceptance remain critical challenges across the Caribbean Netherlands.

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

>>> 1) Climate change has continued to intensify pressures on migratory species. After the extremely dry summers of 2018–2021, new extremes have emerged in the form of heatwaves, heavy rainfall, and flooding

events (2023–2024). These fluctuations increase stress on wetland ecosystems and migratory birds, as both drought and flooding reduce the availability of suitable breeding and staging habitats. Scientific assessments suggest that climate extremes will negatively affect almost half of the EU Birds and Habitats Directive targets and the majority of EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) targets. Since drought and flooding often occur across Europe simultaneously, the possibilities for migratory birds and fish to relocate to more favourable habitats remain limited.

2) The Netherlands still has the highest nitrogen deposition levels in the EU, primarily from intensive agriculture and traffic. Despite significant political debate and policy measures, progress towards a transition to circular, low-nitrogen agriculture has been slow and contentious. This continues to undermine the restoration of Natura 2000 habitats essential for migratory birds. The past years have seen limited progress on this issue, and the Government won't reach the reduction targets for nitrogen deposition by 2030. A landmark ruling was issued in January 2025, in a case brought to court by Greenpeace Netherlands. The court found that the Dutch government had failed to take sufficient action to reduce nitrogen pollution in protected habitats, in violation of the EU Habitats Directive. The government must ensure that by December 31, 2030, 50% of nitrogen-sensitive Natura 2000 areas fall below the critical deposition value (CDV), with priority given to the most vulnerable sites.

3) Avian influenza (HPAI) is a serious recurring threat for migratory birds in the Netherlands. In 2022–2023, thousands of geese, ducks, and seabirds died in outbreaks along inland wetlands and the Wadden Sea. The persistence of HPAI across flyways demonstrates that this is a long-term wildlife health challenge. The risk of future mass die-offs remains high for migratory species.

4) The management of large water systems (rivers, lakes, Wadden Sea, North Sea) remains complex due to the involvement of multiple ministries, provinces, water boards, municipalities, and NGOs. Overlapping mandates and sectoral priorities (nature, flood safety, shipping, energy, fisheries) often lead to bottlenecks in decision-making. Recent debates over offshore wind expansion in the North Sea and its impact on migratory birds illustrate these governance tensions.

5) On the islands of Bonaire, St. Eustatius, and Saba, the challenges typical of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) persist: limited human and financial capacity, economic dependence on tourism, and high vulnerability to climate change. Tourism development continues to create pressure to expand into coastal zones, threatening critical habitats such as mangroves, seagrass meadows, and coral reefs, which are essential for migratory species (fish, sharks, marine turtles, birds).

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

>>> 1) Implementing the EU-Nature Restoration Regulation requires a complex and integrative planning process. In the national restoration plan aims for various regulations and environmental targets will come together. It should result in strengthening the Natura 2000 network restore degraded ecosystems and improve biodiversity.

The realization of the National Ecological Network (NEN) is due to be completed in 2027. This includes integrating ecosystem dynamics into water and land planning, making the river system more robust, and preparing for a Room for the River Programme 2.0. This allows for aligning with both CMS goals, the EU Nature Restoration Regulation and Habitat and Bird Directives.

2) Policy Alignment through the National Biodiversity Strategy (NBSAP), laying groundwork for enhanced migratory species conservation across sectors.

3) For the Caribbean Netherlands priority is addressing the structural mismatch between high biodiversity importance (for migratory species) and low institutional capacity, compounded by tourism-driven development pressures and climate vulnerability.

4) Climate change adaptation and mitigation: Dealing with sea level rise, shifts and changes in the discharges of river systems, subsidence, drought, salinisation and guaranteeing adequate freshwater supply is a matter of national survival. Mainstreaming of 'building with nature' is taking place, and must increase to combat the impacts of climate change.

A consortium has been formed in which government, knowledge institutions, NGOs and private enterprises are building a network of expertise to pool and expand knowledge on how the concept of Building with Nature can be developed and implemented in projects. The Programmatic Approach Main Water System PAGW builds upon this concept. By 2050 the Main Water System must be future-proof, contain high-quality nature and will also offer scope for economic use and development.

5) Implementation of the Programme towards a Rich Wadden Sea (Programma naar een Rijke Waddenzee, PRW), one of the most important wetlands within the AEWA Flyway. The Wadden Sea region is on the verge of a number of major developments: climate change, energy transition, power lines for wind energy, economic activity (fishing, shipping, agriculture etc.), increasing tourism and the threats of a deteriorating quality of life. These complex issues and dynamics demand creativity, flexibility and ingenuity from the parties involved in order to find appropriate answers. The challenges ahead offer opportunities for parties involved to join forces and lead the way in the Wadden Sea region. There is now a single integral perspective for the Wadden Sea region for 2050. The PRW is committed to implementing as many parts of the perspective as possible during this programme period, so that they are completed by 2030.

I. Administrative Information

Name of the Party

>>> Netherlands

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

>>> 1 November 1983

Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention

>>> No territories excluded.

Report compiler

Name and title

>>> Mr. Theo van der Sluis

Full name of institution

>>> Wageningen Environmental Research

Telephone

>>> +31 (0)317 484992

Email

>>> rene.henkens@wur.nl

Designated CMS National Focal Point

Name and title of designated Focal Point

>>> Anne-Marie Svoboda, Senior Policy Officer

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Mailing address

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Postbus 20401

2500 EK The Hague

The Netherlands

Telephone

>>> +31 (0)6 11376219

Email

>>> a.m.svoboda@minlnv.nl

Representative on the Scientific Council

Name and title

>>> Rob Hendriks

Full name of institution

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality.

Strategy, Knowledge and Innovation division

Mailing address

>>> Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Postbus 20401

2500 EK The Hague

The Netherlands

Email

>>> r.j.j.hendriks@minlnv.nl

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Siberian Crane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slender-billed Curlew	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Netherlands.xlsx](#) - Species list App. II NL

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.

>>> Under EU law — which directly applies in the Netherlands — species listed in CMS Appendix I are strictly protected under the EU Habitats and Birds Directives, which the Nature Conservation Act (Wet natuurbescherming) enforces domestically

The Dutch Nature Conservation Act, effective 1 January 2017 (replacing earlier acts), prohibits the capture, killing, disturbance, removal of eggs or nests of protected species — including CMS-Appendix I species — unless granted via a narrow exemption mechanism .

Complementary national laws such as the Animals Act (2011), Criminal Code and Economic Offences Act back this up with enforcement and penalties (fines, confiscation, prosecution).

The Environment and Planning Act (Omgevingswet) came into force on 1 January 2024, and plays a key role in shaping the legal framework for nature conservation in the Netherlands — but it does not provide new or additional protection specifically for CMS Appendix I species. Instead, it integrates and restructures existing environmental laws, including nature protection, spatial planning, and water management, into a single framework.

Thus, the taking prohibition under CMS Art III.5 is fully mirrored in Dutch law.

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)?

Unknown

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).

- Press and media coverage
- Community-based celebrations, exhibitions and other events
- Engagement of specific stakeholder groups
- Special publications
- Interpretation at nature reserves and other sites
- Other (please specify)

>>> World Fish Migration Day, 25 May 2024

World Migratory Mammal Species Day & world Migratory Bird day took place on May 11, 2024

Symposium: Migratory Birds under Pressure (September 2023), organised by NIOO-KNAW

Aquatic birds awareness campaign (November 2024) by Rijkswaterstaat

Annual counting days are organised for e.g. butterflies, birds, wader birds, amphibians and reptiles, bats, spiders, soil and ground arthropods etc.

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.

>>> Many (ongoing) initiatives that are covering these events or days, or specific counting days in informative programs on national radio and TV (especially 'Vroege Vogels', Early Birds radio and television programme).

Annually, the 'Noordzee dagen' are being organised: an annual 2-day conference / gathering for people involved with the future of the North Sea (science, policy, governance, industry, environmental NGOs, etc.).

Also the Wadden Sea day, to share scientific insights and foster discussion about the relationships between the Wadden Sea and its hinterland (both in ecological and socio-cultural sense). It is organized by Wadden Sea World Heritage / Trilateral Wadden Sea cooperation.

Events have usually coverage on Bluesky, X, etcetera

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.

- 4. Large positive impact

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

>>> Specific evidence on how successful the awareness actions on migratory species have been is difficult to give. Based on the current status and positive trend in biodiversity awareness in the Netherlands and the ongoing initiatives however, it can be concluded that awareness is relatively high and still increasing. Government increasingly delegates the responsibility for awareness raising to NGOs, private parties and businesses and provides financial support to organise awareness raising. They provide funding to the organisations involved (and overseeing) monitoring of species.

The relatively large (and stable) number of citizen science involved in monitoring in the Netherlands (incl. Dutch Caribbean) shows that NGOs are very successful in organising activities to increase public awareness and involve citizens in their activities. Thousands of volunteers are active in nature and landscape management.

A large number of volunteers submits species counts to websites like waarneming.nl, observation.org, obsidentify or trektellen.nl (specifically meant for migratory birds). The number of participants involved in the annual garden bird count has more than doubled in 5 years time going from 65,000 in 2018 to almost 114.000 in 2024. Similar initiatives are now being executed like on butterflies and bees.

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.

>>> The Netherlands has designated 162 terrestrial, fresh water or marine Natura 2000-sites. These sites are protected under the European Bird and Habitat Directives. The sites have been designated among others to maintain or restore a favorable conservation status of migratory species, like non-breeding birds and anadromous fish species. New developments, strategies or plans in or near Natura 2000-sites are generally subject to Environmental Impact Assessments and may be halted or require mandatory compensation and/or mitigation measures.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands has completed and submitted its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). In the annex also Curaçao and Aruba are covered. The document was submitted some months after the official deadline of October 2024, set by the CBD.

The Netherlands also integrates migratory species conservation into national biodiversity strategies, environmental policies, and local spatial planning, focusing on habitat protection and sustainable land use, benefiting both wildlife and livelihoods. Dutch development programs do promote migratory species conservation indirectly through sustainable agriculture and community-based projects abroad, but due to political changes the priorities have changed with a stronger focus on export promotion.

Additionally, the Netherlands participates in international agreements like CMS and AEWA, ensuring cross-border cooperation to protect migratory species and their habitats.

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.

Yes

Please provide details:

>>> These values are an integral part of national reporting on a.o. Agenda 2030, the Convention of Biological Diversity, the Bird and Habitat Directives, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the International Whaling Commission.

Migratory species and their habitats are implicitly included under these goals.

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.

>>> Since 2023, Dutch NGOs and civil society have played major roles in migratory species conservation efforts:

BirdLife NL co-leads the East Atlantic Flyways Initiative, funding local grassroots partners across West Africa with small grants to protect migratory bird habitats.

BirdLife Netherlands has deepened its collaboration with around 130 dairy and cattle farmers on meadow-bird protection in agricultural landscapes, boosting landowner awareness and conservation actions.

The Global Flyway Network, supported by Dutch sponsors, continues long-term satellite-tracking of emblematic migratory birds like Black-tailed Godwits and Eurasian Spoonbills, offering real-time data on global ecological change

The IUCN NL Land Acquisition Fund continues to support civil society in securing habitat for endangered species worldwide. In 2023, they invited NGOs and CSOs to acquire and protect critical nature areas, connecting habitats for migratory and endangered species.

Greenpeace NL launched legal action in July 2023 against the Dutch government's nitrogen policy, arguing it failed to safeguard protected habitats—and thus migratory and breeding grounds—under EU law. They have won this court case against the Dutch state, which is required to take immediate action.

Dutch civil society helped integrate invasive alien species efforts into IPBES assessments. The Ministry responded in March 2024 with a national management plan for invasive species—critical, since invasive species threaten both resident and migratory wildlife.

Sea Ranger Service, a Dutch social enterprise, has continued offshore restoration, including seagrass monitoring and marine ecosystem regeneration on the North Sea—indirectly benefiting migratory marine species.

Dutch gov/NGO partners worked with OECD and CE Delft in 2024–2025 to evaluate subsidies harmful to biodiversity—critical for migratory species conservation—contributing to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Overall, Dutch NGOs and civil society have contributed through local action funding, legal and policy advocacy, international partnerships, on-the-ground habitat restoration, and data & finance solutions — all supporting the conservation of migratory species from wetlands and forests to marine ecosystems and across continents.

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

>>> Sea Ranger Service – Marine Conservation as a Business

BlueInvest & private investors: In April 2023, the EU's BlueInvest programme helped Sea Ranger Service refine its business model, leading to €2 million in growth capital from private and institutional investors, including support from companies like PwC and IKEA.

Wind Energy Sector & Bird Safety

Dynamic turbine shutdowns: Starting May 2023, offshore wind farms in the southern North Sea, operated by private energy companies, participated in an “international first”—automatic turbine curtailments during peak nocturnal bird migration—based on models developed by UvA and energy firms to prevent bird strikes.

Private Sponsorship in Flyway Research

Global Flyway Network: Since 2023, their migratory bird-tracking research has received support from private foundations like the Gieskes-Strijbis Foundation, MAVA Foundation, Triodos Foundation, and anonymous donors. This has directly funded satellite tagging of species such as Black-tailed Godwit and Bar-tailed Godwit, enhancing protection of critical migratory habitats.

These initiatives illustrate how private-sector investments, partnerships with energy and consumer goods companies, and support from private foundations have driven innovation, habitat restoration, and proactive measures to safeguard migratory species in the Netherlands

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.

>>> The Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) prepares mandatory and voluntary advisory reports for government (national, provincial and local) on the scope and quality of environmental assessments.

The NCEA reviews all environmental impact assessments of spatial plans and makes recommendations.

The Netherlands is facing considerable pressures which requires balancing of needs: the energy transition (including building windmill parks), realising hundred thousands of new houses, a nitrogen crises and improvement of the water quality (WFD). There is currently a lot of political pressure to ease the environmental requirements to allow progress with e.g. energy and housing infrastructure.

Although no brand-new NCEA report focuses solely on migratory species since 2023, the 2021 linear infrastructure guidance provides essential foundational recommendations.

The 2023 annual report highlights persistent institutional challenges—emphasizing that biodiversity integration (including for migratory species) still needs much stronger weaving into SEA/EIA processes.

To strengthen protection of migratory species in the Netherlands through EIA/SEA, efforts should focus on:

- Scaling up from projects to flyways
- Embedding species needs into early scoping and planning
- Ensuring SEAs are mandatory for spatial strategies
- Equipping practitioners with adaptive tools and ecological expertise

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.

>>> The Dutch Climate Agreement (2019), a broad policy framework, sets out the Dutch strategy for reaching climate neutrality by 2050. However, biodiversity concerns are treated as secondary, and migratory species

receive little or no direct mention.

Offshore wind is central to Dutch climate policy, and this is where biodiversity and migratory species integration is strongest. The Dutch North Sea Programme (part of the National Water Programme) includes specific measures to minimize impacts on birds, bats, and marine mammals (many of which are migratory). The Ecological Programme for Offshore Wind (Wozep) studies ecological impacts of wind farms, including collision risks and disturbance to migratory species. For permitting purposes the Framework for Ecology and Cumulation (KEC) has been developed, to assess the cumulative impact of noise, initially primarily for wind farm construction, but recently UXO's have been added to the KEC. Permit conditions for offshore wind farms require monitoring and mitigation of impacts on biodiversity, especially for birds and marine mammals. Besides this, the Netherlands is signatory of AEWA, the Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperatio, OSPAR and HELCOM which all include obligations on migratory species and impact of offshore wind energy.

Please provide any examples related to such policy and legislation.

>>> The Nature Conservation Act (Wet natuurbescherming) transposes the EU Birds and Habitats Directives into Dutch law, protecting migratory birds and habitats. This means any new energy infrastructure must undergo appropriate assessment (Habitats Directive Article 6) if it could impact Natura 2000 sites or protected species.

Environmental Management Act and Environmental Permitting (General Provisions) Act require EIAs or appropriate assessments for energy projects, considering biodiversity impacts.

The Water Act integrates ecological quality as part of water system management, relevant for hydropower and cooling water intake impacts on migratory fish.

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.

Yes

Please provide details:

>>> Between late 2022 and end-2024, the FLYWAY project, under the trilateral Wadden Sea Flyway Initiative (the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark), was implemented to enhance monitoring of migratory waterbirds along the East Atlantic Flyway. The project produced a roadmap for applying advanced technologies—drones, satellite imagery, radar-based forecasting of migration intensity, and vital rate modeling—to strengthen conservation decision-making.

Also, in May 2023, the Netherlands launched a pilot project shutting down or slowing turbines (max ~2 rpm) during intense nocturnal migration nights (e.g. at Borssele III-IV), marking an international first for such wildlife-friendly turbine curtailment. This governance measure involves ministries, wind operators, researchers, grid operator TenneT, and NGOs collaborating to activate turbine curtailment with 48-hour lead time

To what extent have these improvements helped to make relevant policy, legislative and implementation processes more coherent, accountable, transparent, participatory, equitable and inclusive?

2. Partial contribution

Please describe how this assessment was made

>>> Experts best estimate

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:

>>> Several focal points work at the same ministry or are themselves focal point for several conventions. They maintain close contact with the Dutch OCTs in the Caribbean: Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao, Saba, St. Eustatius and St. Maarten.

Besides that they are supported in national reporting by the same experts from Wageningen University and Research. This stimulates a coordinated and synergistic approach.

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?

Yes

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

>>> - Dutch implementation of the Natura 2000 framework (which protects many CMS-listed migratory species)

has shifted heavily toward stakeholder co-creation and landscape-scale management collectives;

- IPE Deltanatuur LIFE+ project (involving the Ministry, nature NGOs including Vogelbescherming Nederland and ARK, provinces, water boards, local governments) specifically focuses on ensuring stakeholder involvement from an early phase, enabling community stakeholders to jointly develop and implement solutions for Natura 2000 implementation in major delta wetlands and coastal areas

- Across Dutch provinces, agricultural-environmental collectives now coordinate ecologically focused management by contracting local farmers. These collectives operate at landscape level aiming to benefit farmland birds

- The Dutch Action Agenda for Biodiversity — published as part of the national implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework – includes over 150 initiatives from non-state actors, with support from IUCN NL and government.

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 early 2024, the Dutch government, in collaboration with OECD and CE Delft, developed and adopted a standardized methodology to identify and assess public financial incentives harmful to biodiversity (BHS). The goal: by 2025, pinpoint harmful subsidies; and by 2030, eliminate, phase out, or reform them. This process focuses particularly on agricultural, forestry and fisheries subsidies

The respondent has been involved in evaluation sessions, and last evaluations are now being concluded. This is a technical advice, which is submitted to the Ministry and Members of Parliament. It remains to be seen when the Government can handle the advise, and if the proposal can be discussed soon, awaiting elections later in 2025.

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?

Yes

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

>>> since 2023, the Netherlands has introduced and expanded positive financial and policy incentives that deliver tangible benefits to migratory (CMS-listed) species, particularly meadow birds and waterbirds, through agri-environmental schemes and landscape restoration incentives.

Since September 2024, the province of South Holland has offered CAP-funded investment grants (€25,000–€225,000 per application) to farmers and gardeners for installing nature-friendly infrastructure: ditches with vegetated banks, herb-rich field margins, ponds and buffers. These features create habitat for insects, plants, and farmland birds—especially godwit and lapwing—providing food and shelter during breeding and migratory periods.

In its 2024 funding round, the Netherlands expanded SDE++ (Renewable Energy Support Scheme) to include projects that are "nature-inclusive", such as solar parks with ecological design—e.g. pollinator-friendly groundcover and wildlife corridors.

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

>>> The current Dutch cabinet was sworn in on 2 July 2024. In June 2025, one coalition partner resigned, leading to the fall of the government. Since then, the cabinet has continued in a caretaker (demissionary) capacity, focusing on ongoing business until a new government is formed.

On the dossier of nitrogen reduction for nature improvement, progress has been challenging over the past years. The original aim was to reduce nitrogen deposition in half of the high-deposition zones by 2030 (74 % by 2035). To achieve this, the previous government had established a €24.3 billion transition fund through the National Rural Area Program, intended to reduce nitrogen emissions and restore nature across Natura 2000 sites up to 2035. The current coalition adjusted this budget to €5 billion. The debate on the implementation of nitrogen reduction measures is still ongoing.

In line with the Global Biodiversity Framework, particularly Target 18, the Netherlands began in early 2024 to systematically identify and review subsidies potentially harmful to biodiversity. This process is ongoing, and findings will soon be submitted to Parliament for consideration.

The Netherlands has also advanced its global commitments by officially adopting NBSAP v.5 on 25 March 2025. Although adoption was delayed compared to the CBD deadline (COP16 in October–November 2024), the strategy (2025–2030) is fully aligned with CBD obligations, including global targets such as Target 18. It covers nature protection, restoration, subsidy reform, sustainable production and consumption, and biodiversity mainstreaming. The adoption was welcomed by civil society, with a joint statement from major Dutch NGOs (including IUCN NL, BirdLife NL, WWF-NL, and Natuurmonumenten) highlighting their active participation in the process.

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

>>> There is currently little progress observed as a result of the measures taken.

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	Great cormorant (derogation); waterbirds of App 2.	3
Illegal hunting	songbirds, wolf	3
Other harvesting and take	European Eel (App. II)	3
Illegal trade	Mainly birds of prey (App. II)	3
Deliberate poisoning	Mallard, Wigeon, Mute Swan and several geese species (App. II)	3

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

>>> Green BOAs (rangers) ensure compliance with access and wildlife protection rules in key habitats, target criminal threats to migratory species (e.g. illegal hunting or collection), and support broader enforcement networks across provinces. While they don't directly manage migrations, their role in preserving habitat integrity and preventing disturbance and infractions indirectly—but critically—supports the conservation of migratory species, notably in sensitive zones like Natura 2000 reserves during migration and breeding seasons. In 2024, the budget was 5.5 Million Euro. In 2025 after initial budget cuts the budget was raised to 7.2 Million Euro, for 2026 it is aimed to make this budget structural. In addition, Provinces contribute additional funds for BOAs activities.

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Resolutions **14.9** (Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans), Res. **14.15** (Action Plan to Address Aquatic Wild Meat Harvests in West Africa), Res. **13.3** (Chondrichthyan Species), Res. **13.4** (African Carnivore initiative), Res. **12.10 (Rev.COP14)** (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), Res. **12.11 (Rev.COP14)** (Flyways), Res. **12.12 (Rev.COP14)**(Action Plans for Birds), Res. **12.15** (Aquatic Wild Meat), 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. **11.15 (Rev.COP14)** (Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds), 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. **11.18 (Rev.COP14)**(Saker Falcon Global Action Plan), Res. **11.21**(Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean), Res. **11.22 (Rev.COP12)** (Live Capture of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes), Res. **11.24 (Rev.COP13)** (Central Asian Mammal Initiative), Res. **11.31** (Rev.COP14) (Illegal and unsustainable taking of wildlife), and Decisions 14.148-14.150 (Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures), 14.119-14.121 (Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean), 14.125 (Asia Pacific Illegal Taking of Migratory Birds Intergovernmental Task Force), Decision 14.126 (South-West Asia Illegal Taking of Migratory Birds Intergovernmental Task Force).

>>> Overall figures are not available but the the Green Boa's believe that wildlife crime, like poaching, has

increased in recent years (see above).

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	3	No CMS species documented as bycatch since 2023
Catch in Abandoned, Lost or otherwise Discarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG)	3	No specific species reported
Other forms of unintentional taking	2 & 3	Sharks and Rays (2), European Eel (3; App. II) and the Harbour Porpoise (3; App II)

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.

>>> Since 2023, the Netherlands has implemented several measures to reduce bycatch of CMS Appendix-listed species, particularly marine mammals like the harbour porpoise. These efforts align with EU regulations and international CMS commitments. E.g. Remote Electronic Monitoring (REM) and Technical Measures Regulation (TMR).

The Fishing for Litter scheme, active in Dutch ports since 2001, involves fishermen voluntarily collecting waste—including abandoned or discarded fishing gear—found in their nets and bringing it to shore for disposal. Although annual data for 2023 isn't publicly reported yet, past participation by around 140 vessels has led to hundreds of tonnes of litter—including ghost nets—being removed annually from the North Sea. Annual voluntary clean-up of ghost nets around wrecks in the North Sea by Stichting Duik de Noordzee Schoon.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[bijlage-updated-conservation-plan-for-the-harbour-porpoise-phocoena-phocoenain-the-netherlands.pdf](#) - Updated Conservation Plan for the Harbour Porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* in the Netherlands (2020)

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

>>> No significant trend in bycatch of CMS-listed species has been observed during past reporting period.

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	herons, owls, sandpipers, snipes, lapwings (App. II), White-tailed Eagle and Osprey (Annex 1)	2
Other collisions	migratory birds with power lines.	3
Electrocution	Raportors and owls, storks and corvids	3
Vessel strikes	Harbour porpoise and dolphins (App 2)	

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

collisions and electrocution?

>>> Bird migration forecasts from the University of Amsterdam and coordination with stakeholders like Vogelbescherming Nederland and Rijkswaterstaat have resulted in shutting off offshore wind turbine parks during peak migration hours.

Plans were set in motion to equip turbines at Zeewolde with camera-based detection systems. When certain large raptors enter a designated danger zone, nearby turbines would automatically shut down.

The national power network agency TenneT conducted the Netherlands' first drone-based installation of "Firefly" markers along a high-voltage line near Wageningen. Trials showed these markers could reduce bird collisions by up to ~90%.

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.

>>> Collisions and electrocution are still a concern but there is no significant negative trend since previous reporting period.

Rare but high-impact fatalities (e.g., Bearded Vulture) continue; risk persists for raptors flying at rotor height

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 & 2	colonial sea birds, terns, gulls, geese and raptors (App. 1 & II)
Unexplained stranding events		
Accidental/indirect poisoning		
Disease		

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

>>> The Dutch Wildlife Health Centre (DWHC), in partnership with Sovon and the Bird Flu App, has strengthened national surveillance of wild bird mortality, especially for avian influenza (HPAI). Reporting pipelines and testing by WBVR have been scaled up through 2024 and 2025, enabling detailed monthly infection tracking and rapid response. Public outreach campaigns (e.g. "Keep a look-out for bird flu") educate professionals, volunteers, and citizens about safe handling of dead birds, biosecurity, and timely reporting via DWHC form.

These measures reinforce CMS obligations for monitoring migratory bird populations and responding swiftly to disease outbreaks.

A high-profile Dutch study launched in late 2023 investigated avian influenza exposure in domestic and stray cats (a spillover risk scenario); about 12 % of stray cats showed antibodies, prompting closer integration of veterinary, public health, and conservation sectors to monitor risk at the human-wildlife interface.

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 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).

>>> Land-use intensification continues to exert pressure on habitats and populations of migratory and farmland-dependent species. According to CBS data (2024), farmland bird populations have declined by 45% up to 2023, including CMS-listed species such as Black-tailed Godwit, Northern Lapwing, and Eurasian

Oystercatcher, despite the implementation of agro-environmental measures. Research on pesticide impacts remains a concern. While no direct poisoning events have been officially reported, sub-lethal and chronic effects are increasingly documented. A recent WUR meta-analysis (2024) indicated that neonicotinoids may negatively affect insectivorous bird species—including migratory species—through reduced survival, orientation difficulties, and other physiological impacts. Habitat protection and effective implementation remain essential for the breeding success and long-term survival of relevant migratory species. In July 2024, the European Commission initiated an infringement procedure regarding meadow bird protection under the Birds Directive, reflecting the continued importance of strengthening conservation measures at national and European level.

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	Black-tailed Godwit, Northern Lapwing, and Eurasian Oystercatcher affected by Egyptian Goose (<i>Alopochen aegyptiaca</i>), eggs and chicks of ground-nesting birds, including CMS Appendix II species such as Common Redshank, Lapwing are affected by raccoon dog.	3

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

>>> In late 2023, the Dutch Minister for Nature announced steps to implement the EU IAS Regulation (1143/2014) and to develop a national invasive species legislation focused on prevention, early detection, and rapid eradication in line with the IPBES IAS assessment findings. The LIFE-MICA initiative (2024) brought together the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany to control invasive mammals like coypu (nutria) and muskrat across 28 Natura 2000 sites. The Caribbean Netherlands suffers from a range of invasive species. To control invasive species populations, management strategies focus on effective removal of for example rats, feral cats and dogs which predate on sea bird nests.

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). >>> Asian hornet (*Vespa velutina*) — rapid expansion & policy shift from eradication to control. In 2025 is a record year with already some 2000 nests removed in August. Common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*) — continued northward spread with public-health and agri risks, in particular allergy burden. Veined rapa whelk (*Rapana venosa*) — signs of local reproduction in the North Sea. 2024 findings of multiple egg-case clusters on a wreck off the Dutch coast indicate the species can now likely reproduce here—bad news for native shellfish (mussels, oysters) due to predation. Invasive American crayfish complexes — entrenched high pressure on freshwater ecosystems. NVWA’s 2024 chain-analysis highlights an active live trade/consumption chain and tens of thousands of kilos of red swamp crayfish removed annually, reflecting persistent, widespread populations that degrade macrophytes, turbidity, and amphibians.

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	marine mammals, seabirds/waterbirds, and bats	2

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

>>> Wageningen Marine Research released a new method (January 2025) to accurately map how seabirds such as razorbills and guillemots avoid wind farms. Additionally, a comprehensive ‘background document’ (2025) for seabird protection plans under the North Sea Agreement identifies high-action-value interventions, e.g. disturbance-free zones, or avoiding construction in

critical offshore zones.

Noise Mitigation for Marine Mammals — Innovations with Bubble Curtains.

Starting November 2024, under a €14 million “hostmanship programme,” the Netherlands began implementing visitor management strategies across key nature zones like the Wadden Sea.

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 Ares under Decision **14.61**.

>>> No specific significant negative trends have occurred during past reporting period.

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)	Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas) App.1, seabirds, waterbirds (app 2), Harbour seal, Grey seal	2
Light pollution	Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas) App.1, in Carribean, bats (app. II), AEWA birds (app.2)	2/3
Underwater noise	Harbour porpoise (app.1), grey seal, harbour seal (app.2), diving birds	2/3
Other pollution	Sea turtles	2/3
Fish aggregating devices (FADs)		

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

>>> In January 2023, the Netherlands, together with Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, formally submitted a restriction proposal to the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) aiming to ban PFAS—“forever chemicals” harmful to both people and wildlife. If enacted, this would be the most extensive substances ban in European history.

In mid-2023, the Dutch government decided to hold the chemical company 3M legally responsible for PFAS pollution detected in the Westerschelde region. This precedent may spur cleanup efforts and tighter accountability, potentially restoring healthier waterways used by migrating birds and aquatic animals.

In November 2023, the Netherlands, Germany, and Denmark secured EU support via the Technical Support Instrument (TSI) for enhanced monitoring of migratory birds in the Wadden Sea region. This involves using drones, acoustic monitoring, radars, and DNA-based techniques to assess habitat quality and pollution exposure.

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).

>>> Widespread and rising PFAS contamination (forever chemicals).

Agricultural chemical use (pesticides/neonicotinoids) linked to insect declines and indirect bird declines.

Multiple, interacting stressors. PFAS, plastics, pesticides and collision risk do not act alone: combined sub-lethal impacts (reduced reproduction, immune stress, prey loss) can amplify population declines for migrants that already face habitat loss and climate stress.

Many CMS species (migratory insectivorous birds) depend on abundant insect prey at breeding grounds and stopovers. Large-scale pesticide use reduces prey availability and contaminates wetlands and field margins.

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	Fish (app.2)	2
Habitat degradation	Birds (app.2)	2
Mineral exploration/extraction	Fish, amfibians (app.2)	3
Unsustainable land/resource use	Birds (app.2)	2
Urbanization	Birds (app.2)	3
Mineral exploration/extraction, incl. deep-seabed mineral exploitation	Fish (app.2)	
Fire		
Physical barriers		

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

>>> Implementation momentum for the EU Nature Restoration Regulation and national restoration planning, which has resulted in a more active approach to address habitat degradation.

Increased funding and project delivery through national programmes (Deltaplan Biodiversiteitsherstel & innovation funds). The Deltaplan Biodiversiteitsherstel and related innovation funds have continued to finance and scale on-the-ground restoration projects (peatland rewetting, wetland creation, riverine and meadow restoration) since 2023, supporting dozens of local initiatives.

These projects restore and reconnect stopover and breeding habitats (wetlands, floodplain meadows, peatlands) that migratory birds, fish and mammals need. Funding also helps pilot nature-friendly agriculture and landscape measures along flyway.

Protection of the Wadden Sea & limits on extractive activities in sensitive marine habitats. The Dutch government (2024) moved to prohibit gas drilling in the Dutch Wadden Sea and continues trilateral Wadden Sea protection and management efforts; UNESCO status and trilateral plans reinforce conservation measures.

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).

>>> The current minister has halted previous plans for tackling nitrogen deposition and is developing new nitrogen policies that are yet to be completed and implemented. High nitrogen deposition levels, and the damage to sensitive habitats, persist.

Even though some emission reductions occurred, large parts of Dutch natural land still receive nitrogen above critical loads, driving scrub encroachment, eutrophication and loss of typical heathland, dune and bog plant communities that many migrants depend on. Resulting in loss/quality decline of breeding and stop-over habitats (heath, peatland, coastal grasslands) — fewer foraging resources and reduced breeding success for many migrant birds.

The low-lying Peatlands—key for many wetland species—have been degraded historically and although restoration projects exist, the scale of past drainage and continuing agricultural pressures mean peatland condition and associated habitats remain under pressure. Past warm and dry years have accelerated habitat

deterioration.

The Wadden Sea remains under pressure from coastal defence works, shipping incidents, disturbance and other human uses; State-of-Conservation reporting and trilateral assessments point to ongoing habitat loss and management tensions (space for flood protection vs. space for nature).

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	2	many species

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

>>> The Netherlands' Delta Programme (2023–2024 cycle) has moved from short-term projects to more structural, financed planning for spatial climate adaptation (coastal defence, flood risk, room for rivers, and sediment strategies). This programme explicitly integrates nature-based approaches (sand nourishment, salt-marsh development) into coastal resilience planning.

Since 2023 there has been stronger policy and project momentum (national programmes and EU support) to rewet drained peatlands, trial paludiculture (wet agriculture) and reduce peat oxidation (which also lowers CO₂ emissions and subsidence). Research and pilots have expanded and monitoring of greenhouse gas benefits continued through 2023–2024.

EU / national projects (e.g., REWET, Interreg and Horizon-funded actions) and Dutch restoration schemes accelerated delivery of wetland restoration, river restoration and habitat creation since 2023. These projects explicitly tie biodiversity goals to climate adaptation and GHG mitigation. It helps CMS species through new and reconnected wetlands increase area and quality of staging and breeding habitat, buffering against climate impacts (drought, extreme floods) and improving year-round resilience of flyway networks.

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

GUIDANCE TIP:

Significant advances may include efforts, actions, steps, programmes, initiatives and/or activities described in CMS documentation, such as Decision **14.211** (Climate change and Migratory Species).

>>> Impact of drought. Hot summers, more water is drawn from groundwater resources for irrigation, resulting in peat oxidation and subsidence.

National meteorological data show continued warming trends, with record-breaking temperatures in multiple seasons since 2023, plus more frequent heatwaves, droughts, and short-duration heavy rain events.

Recently the national targets for carbon emissions are under discussion, and likely to be lowered.

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	3	
Inadequate legislation	3	
Lack of knowledge	3	
Inadequate enforcement of legislation	3	

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

>>> No particular significant advances, although it should be emphasized that the knowledge about biodiversity in the Caribbean Netherlands (Bonaire, St. Eustatius, Saba) significantly increased since these island became special municipalities of The Netherlands on 10-10-2010.

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

>>> Nothing particular.

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?

>>> Most significant advance concerns scientific studies into the (cumulative) impacts of these pressures. E.g. as mentioned above, the Multiple, interacting stressors. PFAS, plastics, pesticides and collision risk do not act alone: combined sub-lethal impacts (reduced reproduction, immune stress, prey loss) can amplify population declines for migrants that already face habitat loss and climate stress.

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

>>> None in particular

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)
	No status change, but reproducing again since 2017.	This species has been reproducing in the Netherlands since 2017 (with an estimated 25 reproducing animals in 2 atlas blocks), but because this is less than ten consecutive years, the species is not yet assessed as reproducing regularly.	Basic report red list mammals	Myotis myotis

Birds

	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Comments	Source reference	Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)
	Extinct	Was last seen in 1995, Moroc, was suspected extinct, now declared extinct.	https://www.naturalis.nl/over-ons/media/persberichten/dunbekwulp-is-nu-officieel-uitgestorven ; https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.wur.nl/10.1111/ibi.13368	slenderbilled curlew (Numenius tenuirostris) App.I
	new breeding bird in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020.	Not breeding in 2021, 2022	SOVON	Circus macrourus (App. II)

Fish

	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:

>>> In the EU LIFE CIBBRiNA project, initiated by The Netherlands, fishers, scientists, policymakers and NGO's from 13 European countries work together on minimising the bycatch of several migratory species. This project runs from 2023 from 2029 and focuses on the implementation of practical solutions and fostering a 'Safe Working Environment' for all parties involved. Part of CIBBRiNA is an Action Plan and Roadmap for the Long-term implementation, including governance issues.

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?

Yes

Please describe the results of these actions achieved so far:

GUIDANCE TIP:

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

>>> - The legal obligations of the EU Bird and Habitat Directives and the management of EU Natura 2000 sites, specifically designated for migratory (water)birds, bats, fish and other migratory species can be considered a concerted action between (EU) range states, and has generally benefited the conservation status of the species concerned.

- Wilhelmshaven Declaration (2023): Dutch, German and Danish environment ministers signed a new four-year mandate for the Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation, explicitly steering joint action and networks (education, youth, site managers) that support flyway-scale conservation.(TWSC).

- Under the Wadden Sea Flyway Initiative (WSFI)—a DK-DE-NL programme co-led from the Netherlands—partners have strengthened international monitoring and collaboration along the East Atlantic Flyway (birds), including a 2024-25 EU DG-REFORM assessment to modernise flyway monitoring and a 2025 climate-resilience project for critical sites along the flyway.

- The Black-tailed Godwit action plan, driven by Dutch NGOs with government backing—targets core breeding areas in NL and cooperation along staging/wintering routes in Europe and West Africa, i.e., a holistic flyway plan.

- In June 2023, Dutch conservation groups—including ARK Rewilding Netherlands, WWF-NL, Sportvisserij Nederland, WUR, and Rijkswaterstaat—released 29 young European sturgeons (*Acipenser sturio*) into the Biesbosch. On 16 August 2024, a significant release of around 250 juvenile sturgeons occurred in the Millingerwaard region near the Dutch-German border, under the Interreg project "The Rhine Connects". All these fish were tagged with transmitters and predator tags to help track survival, migration routes, and potential return to spawn

- The Netherlands highlights support for wetlands abroad within the AEWA flyway (including the Dutch Caribbean), reflecting a beyond-borders approach consistent with migration systems thinking.

- Yarari Sanctuary given full legal "nature park" status (2023): The Netherlands (Ministry of LNV) formally established the Yarari Marine Mammal & Shark Sanctuary as a protected nature park for the territorial waters of Bonaire, Saba and St. Eustatius—a concrete step that strengthens protection for CMS-listed cetaceans frequenting these waters.

- Basin-wide cetacean surveys expanded (2023-2024):** The Caribbean Cetacean Society (CCS) ran multi-island expeditions across the ABC islands with Dutch-Caribbean partners (DCNA, WWF-NL), documenting 8+ cetacean species and demonstrating cross-island connectivity (e.g., photo-ID matches). These efforts support CMS objectives on data and transboundary cooperation.

- Management within Yarari aligned to the CMS Sharks MOU (2023-2025): The Netherlands is a Signatory to the CMS Sharks MOU; the MoU's 2023-2025 Programme of Work has been underway (AC4 met in 2024). Yarari's shark protections contribute to the MOU's goals (research, bycatch mitigation, awareness) in the Dutch Caribbean EEZ.

- Monitoring & conservation upswing (2023-2025): Sea Turtle Conservation Bonaire (STCB) published its 2023

research & monitoring report (foraging growth, in-water and nesting monitoring). The new State of Nature Caribbean Netherlands assessment (2025) reports visible recovery but persisting threats—evidence that long-running actions for CMS-listed turtles (hawksbill, green, loggerhead) are yielding results yet need reinforcement.

- Dutch-Caribbean Bird Monitoring (2023–2027): DCNA launched a region-wide standardized bird monitoring programme (shorebirds, seabirds and other migrants) with island park authorities; first baseline dataset for Fall 2023 was released in 2024. This supports CMS/Americas flyway work by improving status and trend data.

- “Turning the Tide” is a marine ecosystem restoration pilot project launched in early 2023, funded by the EU’s RESEMBID Programme, and led locally by the Aruba Conservation Foundation (ACF) in collaboration with: University of Aruba, ScubbleBubbles Foundation, Wageningen University & Research (WUR). This resulted in a Mangrove Channel Restoration, and improved tidal flow to reestablish nursery functions essential for fish populations. Two artificial coral reef structures were deployed forming 13 reef structures, and MARRS Reefs were installed across marine protected areas. The Documentary: “Turning the Tide”, demonstrated the ecological restoration work and community involvement. It was screened at the United Nations Ocean Conference in Nice, June 2025.

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:

>>> - The Wadden Sea is of crucial importance for migratory (birds species) in the African-Eurasian Flyway. Since 1978, the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark have cooperated to protect the Wadden Sea as an ecological entity in the so-called Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation.

- The Netherlands - Society for the protection of birds cooperates with birdlife partners in countries along the African-Eurasian Flyway, as well as with birdlife partners in other flyways, like the Caribbean.

- The German-Dutch governments are cooperating on connecting the Rhine region.

- Sea Turtle Conservation Bonaire cooperates with international partners, like within the Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network (WIDECAST)

- The Dutch Caribbean Nature Alliance (DCNA) works closely with partner organisations inside and outside of the Dutch Caribbean.

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/>.

Partially - to a large extent

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

>>> - These habitats have been identified under the Birds and Habitats Directives. Natura 2000 sites have been designated and management plans implemented for the species concerned, among these are many migratory species.

- Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) covering the Netherlands (including overseas territories) are recorded in the World Database of KBAs; a 2021 dossier reports 104 KBAs for the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

- The Netherlands lists 58 Ramsar Sites (e.g., Waddenzee, IJsselmeer, Biesbosch), many of which are also Natura 2000 and key for migratory waterbirds

- Aruba has increased in 2023 its wetland areas protected under the Ramsar Convention with four new Ramsar sites. With the extension of Spaans Lagoen, the only existing Ramsar site since 1980, the total area protected under the Convention on the island has increased from 70 to no 14,408 ha.

- Main gaps and priorities are situated in the Dutch Caribbean where there is still a substantial knowledge gap in the inventory and monitoring of species and the assessment of relevant critical habitats. Projects are implemented to fill this gap.

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

Partly / for some areas

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 the use 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).

>>> - EU member states are obliged to periodically report about the conservation status of Birds and Habitats Directive species for which Natura 2000 sites have been designated. This kind of knowledge is still limited for the Dutch Caribbean.

- The Dutch government participated in a networking event: Atlantic and Continental N2000 Sites as Migration Hotspots, Dublin, Republic of Ireland on 4 - 5th October 2021, to identify crucial staging areas for migratory waterfowl (western Flyway)

The Netherlands participated in an ISRA data workshop for the NE Atlantic spring 2025. In this workshop expert from the region discussed data for potentially important Shark and Rays areas. The Dutch Elasmobranch Society (NEV) atteded to ensure that data of Dutch waters were being covered. The ISRA team will analyse the collected data and evaluate if identified areas do qualify for ISRA nomination according to de IUCN-guidelines. The final report for the NE-Atlantic will be published later this year.

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”)?

Yes

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

>>> The EU has adopted the EU Nature Restoration Regulation. Consequently, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Nature is preparing a national Nature Restoration Plan in line with the regulation. The plan will address in a concerted way issues which are threatening flora and fauna and a healthy environment, and the plan should lead on the path to recovery. This will be of major importance for CMS species too.

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?

Partly / for some areas

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:

>>> officially: no (reported) OECMs for the Netherlands.

However, many area-based measures in the Netherlands function like OECMs and do deliver real benefits to migratory species even if they haven't been formally recognised and reported as OECMs yet.

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):

>>> There is no assessment explicitly about “ecosystem services associated with migratory species.” What does exist since 2023 are adjacent efforts—natural-capital/eCOSYSTEM-services accounts and status reports on migratory taxa—none of which centre the ES of migratory species as a unit of assessment.

However, there was a National natural-capital / ES accounts (broad, not migratory-specific), the National Statistics office CBS updated technical guidance and accounts for ecosystem extent, condition and ecosystem service flows in the Netherlands (incl. amenity, recreation, etc.). Useful framework, but not broken out by “migratory species.”

Also, there was a SEEA Ocean ecosystem accounting for the Dutch North Sea (marine ES). These were experimental accounts for the North Sea covering marine ecosystem condition and multiple services; again, not tied specifically to migratory species.

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.

Yes

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

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

>>> Policy ensuring conservation of genetic resources

Please describe the captive breeding & release strategy:

>>> On 16 August 2024, around 250 juvenile European sturgeons—descendants of the last wild individuals from France and Germany—were released into the Rhine near Millingen aan de Rijn. These fish were bred in captivity and equipped with identification chips, telemetry trackers, and predator tags to monitor survival and migration

Please describe the gene typing research strategy:

>>> The Netherlands' National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan 2025–2030 names genetic diversity and actions to safeguard genetic resources (including agreements with the Centre for Genetic Resources Netherlands — CGN).

Please describe the reproductive material archives/repositories strategy:

>>> Wageningen UR and other Dutch research bodies explicitly work on genetic-diversity innovation for restoration and management; competitive research calls (e.g., 2024 thematic PVG calls / research agendas) fund projects that include genetic-diversity topics.

A national seed collection for native plants (Nationale Zadencollectie or “Noah’s Ark for plant seeds”) has been set up. It is chaired by Prof. Joop H.J. Schaminée, the initiative has established a National Seed Collection, where seeds are collected from in-situ populations across the country and stored as a genetic backup for endangered wild plant species.

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

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

[National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans \(NBSAPs\) Dutch Language version of the fifth National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of The Netherlands](#) - The NBSAP, as published on 25 March 2025

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.

>>> NBSAP:

- Agreements around the protection of the North Sea, such as OSPAR, ASCOBANS, CMS MoU Sharks etc: p. 33.
- The Nationale Visroutekaart, action plan/map to improve the situation of Migratory fish species: p. 33. and measures for eel p. 64.

CMS is mentioned in relation to the international illegal trade in protected species: page 36

- CITES and the CITES Strategic Vision 2030 are mentioned in relation to illegal trade, and the EU action plan against wildlife trafficking, the EU Wildlife Trade Regulation (WTR), European legislation around protected species and the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement are mentioned which are all demonstrating commitment to protect migratory species: page 37.

- Green-blue veining, a spatial strategy to allow for the migration of biodiversity: page 52, 60, 66.

Other documents:

- Nature and environment policy plan Caribbean Netherlands 2020-2030: page 40, point 2.1a and 2.1b.
- Nature ambition Large Waters 2050 and beyond: whole document like page 67, fish migration across the Afsluitdijk, and the Programmatic Approach Large Waters.
- National Ecological Network: this includes all Natura 2000-sites specifically designated for migratory species.

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

>>> Many actions have been completed or are ongoing, like:

- Management plans for Natura 2000-sites have been drafted and (partially) implemented.
- The National Ecological Network (NEN) is due to be completed in 2027. Already some 50.000 ha has been achieved, still some 30.000 ha is to be acquired but there are significant delays, due to lack of funding from the government and political will in some provinces;
- The innovative fish migration river through the IJsselmeerdijk is under construction and due to delays likely to be completed by 2027.

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.

>>> The Netherlands maintains the Updated Conservation Plan for Harbour Porpoise and produced 2024 evaluations/national reports under ASCOBANS; work includes understanding habitat use (tagging), fisheries bycatch risk and broader ecosystem pressures to keep favourable conservation status.

- The 2025 ecological vision for the Wadden Sea (incl. Eems-Dollard) sets targets and measures that support migratory fish and bird habitat quality (sediment flats, channels, estuarine dynamics), reinforcing delivery pathways for PAGW projects.

- The Legal consolidation continued with Yarari Marine Mammal and Shark Sanctuary, with park designation confirmed (Sept 2023); Yarari (covering the Caribbean Netherlands EEZ) underpins NL delivery under CMS Sharks MOU and regional marine-mammal/shark measures.

- In the EU LIFE CIBBRiNA project, initiated by The Netherlands, fishers, scientists, policymakers and NGO's from 13 European countries work together on minimising the bycatch of several migratory species. This project runs from 2023 from 2029 and focuses on the implementation of practical solutions and fostering a 'Safe Working Environment' for all parties involved. Part of CIBBRiNA is an Action Plan and Roadmap for the Long-term implementation, including governance issues.

- A Single Species Action Plan for the tope shark was prepared. This is not a Concerted Action, but still an

appendix II species for which a SSAP was prepared for adoption at the COP.

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.

>>> - The Netherlands took part in East Atlantic Flyway / Wadden Sea Flyway Initiative (WSFI) with the simultaneous January 2023 flyway census (13,000+ counters at 7,000+ sites across 36 countries) and supported analysis published in May 2025 on trends along the flyway—important for adaptive management of migrants using the Wadden Sea.

- Ongoing trilateral reporting on 34 key waterbird species and implementation of the Wadden Sea Seal Management Plan 2023-2027 continue.

- Since 2023, the Caribbean Netherlands has increased efforts to conserve migratory species—especially shorebirds and migratory seabirds—through standardized monitoring, targeted habitat management, EU-funded projects, and ecosystem-level research. These actions span multiple islands and ecosystems, combining science, funding, and on-ground implementation to strengthen long-term conservation.

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

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).

>>> The Netherlands has no indigenous peoples or local communities within its borders. It can, however, substantially affect indigenous and local communities beyond its borders through international cooperation, foreign policy and policies on sustainable trade. Specific policy on indigenous peoples however dates back to 1993 and has not been reviewed since. The Netherlands ratified the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (ILO Convention 169) in 1998 and voted in favour of the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007, but no specific policies have been developed to support its implementation. The Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV) was an NGO that supported the promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples worldwide since 1969, but is no longer active. Other Dutch NGOs, such as Both ENDS, take action for people elsewhere in the world.

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)

- Capacity building
- Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives
- Capacity assessments/gap analyses
- Agreements at policy level on research priorities
- Research by academia, research organizations and other relevant stakeholders

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 (AEM LAP), 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).

Capacity building

>>> Among others:

- Private data-collecting organizations (PGOs) carry out the monitoring of migratory species with thousands of volunteers, who are trained by the PGOs. Thousands of trained volunteers in the Netherlands conduct bird counts and marine mammal surveys, supported by training workshops from Sovon, Vogelbescherming Nederland, and NGOs.

- Ongoing support to Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland and provincial partners for International Waterbird Census (IWC), goose counts, and breeding bird schemes. These feed directly into AEWA, WSFI, and flyway-level assessments.

In the Caribbean Netherlands, the Dutch Caribbean Nature Alliance (DCNA) launched the Bird Monitoring Programme (2023-2028) to standardize landbird surveys across Bonaire, Saba, St. Eustatius, and neighboring islands.

- Dutch Caribbean: capacity building for sea turtle conservation (ongoing).

- DCNA ran capacity building workshops for rangers and local conservation NGOs on standardized bird monitoring, GIS tools, and data entry.

Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives

>>> The Netherlands has a long history in environmental research and biodiversity monitoring. Many have been mentioned in the questions above. We present some important platforms for sharing knowledge and information below (no new but ongoing initiatives):

The Knowledge Network for Restoration and Management of Nature in the Netherlands (OBN) is an independent and innovative platform in which management, policy and science work together on nature restoration and conservation management. OBN develops and disseminates knowledge on the restoration and management of nature and is an important partner for everyone involved in forest, nature and landscape management. This knowledge is made publicly available on a website.

The Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL), in cooperation with scientific institutes and NGOs, periodically reports on the status and trends in nature, biodiversity and other environmental issues in the Netherlands. This is a statutory requirement under the Nature Conservation Act. Dutch nature policy is significantly influenced by the content of these reports and the information is widely available. The Dutch language website includes hundreds of indicators on nature and the environment.

The Atlas of Natural Capital (ANK) is an initiative which supports the development of information tools for policy and society to treat our natural capital sustainably and to find appropriate solutions, especially for the long term. It provides information about natural capital and ecosystem services, related concepts and inspirational examples. Maps contain information that can be used when taking decisions that affect the human environment at site level. <http://www.atlasnatuurlijkkapitaal.nl/home>

Capacity assessments/gap analyses

>>> This is an ongoing process.

- A major capacity and gap analysis was delivered as a Technical Support Instrument (TSI) project finalized in September 2024. Conducted by Sovon and NIOZ, this report evaluates the state of waterbird and habitat monitoring along the East Atlantic Flyway. It identifies methodological shortfalls and proposes innovations and

improvements in areas like abundance, vital rate, and environmental monitoring across the flyway. Highlights monitoring system weaknesses and outlines practical upgrades—enhancing future data reliability and informing capacity building.

Agreements at policy level on research priorities

>>> Among others:

In mid-March 2025, the Netherlands finalized and presented its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) to Parliament, as part of its delivery under the Convention on Biological Diversity COP 16. While this plan broadly outlines biodiversity goals—including nature restoration and alignment with global biodiversity frameworks—it does not specifically single out migratory species or set dedicated research priorities targeting them.

- The research programme “North Sea Monitoring, Research, Nature Enhancement and Species Protection” has been commissioned under the North Sea Agreement. It aims to answer the central question of whether and, if so, how the changing use of the North Sea can adapt to its ecological capacity, and advises the parties of the North Sea Agreement. Research priorities include, but are not limited to, food availability studies, bycatch monitoring and mitigation and effects of closed areas for fisheries etc.

- Although not a formal policy agreement, a Technical Support Instrument (TSI) Project was started – East Atlantic Flyway Monitoring (September 2024). The resulting “Assessment of innovations to improve the monitoring of waterbirds and their habitat along the East Atlantic Flyway” (finalized Sept 2024)

The Technical Support Instrument (TSI) Project – East Atlantic Flyway Monitoring (September 2024)“ is not a formal policy agreement, but results in the assessment of innovations to improve the monitoring of waterbirds and their habitat along the East Atlantic Flyway” (finalized Sept 2024) includes specific research-related recommendations.

The Network Ecological Monitoring (NEM) is a partnership of governments for the collection of nature data for policy. Partners in the NEM are the Ministries of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV) and Infrastructure and Water Management (IenW), the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL), Statistics Netherlands (CBS) and the provinces.

Research by academia, research organizations and other relevant stakeholders

>>> Many organisations in the Netherlands and the Dutch Caribbean are involved in research on migratory species, like species organisations, universities and research institutes.

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)

No assistance required

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?

No

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.

>>> - Implementing the Dutch National Fund for Green Investments (Nationaal Groenfonds), a key domestic financial instrument. It offers financial facilities to public entities, private organizations, and individuals.

- Through the NBSAP CMS-relevant projects can be embedded into broader biodiversity and habitat conservation funding priorities.

- Finalize the National Ecological Network (NEN). There's not enough progress due to funding, time-consuming procedures to acquire land and priority setting. The NEN is due for completion in 2027;

- Implementation of the nature policy plan Caribbean Netherlands 2020-2030.