

National Report Form

Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MOU)

Republic of Moldova | Contribution ID: f1929a21-b055-4206-b207-e57b78215f19 | 21 September 2026

Drafted on September 23, 2026

Introduction

Introductory remarks

This is the National Report form for the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MOU).

The purpose of the National Report is to provide information on your country's implementation of the Raptors MOU including the Action Plan (Annex 3). The format provided here has been designed to generate information that can be synthesised in a comparable way for each future Meeting of Signatories, to give a meaningful picture of progress and reflect the achievements of Signatories and other stakeholders, but also to be as streamlined as possible to keep the work involved in reporting to a necessary minimum.

The format was tested ahead of the third Meeting of Signatories (MOS3) and formally was approved by MOS3 in 2023. The Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU will compile and analyze the National Reports and present a summary on the implementation of the Raptors MOU Action Plan to MOS4.

Reporting period

To enable proper analysis, it is important that all respondents relate their answers (throughout this form) to the same reporting period. On this occasion we are asking you to report on the period between November 2021 and April 2026.

The previous implementation survey covered the period July 2019 - October 2021, the results of which can be found in the Synthesis of national reports submitted by Signatories and Cooperating Partners on their implementation of the MOU.

Instructions

Please answer all questions as fully and as accurately as you can. Wherever possible, please indicate the source of information used to answer the question, particularly if a published reference or report is available. For each relevant question there are icons that can be used to attach a document and/or provide a web link.

When working on the online version of the report, save your information by clicking on the “Save all” button inside each section. An auto-save feature also saves any changed responses every 30 seconds, and whenever you move between sections.

Guidance notes are provided throughout the format to assist you in answering the questions.

Deadline for submission: 30 June 2026

I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Name of Signatory State:

Republic of Moldova is a Range State (for Raptors MOU)

Any territories which are excluded from the application of the MOU:

None

Report Compiler

Name and title:

Elisaveta Alexandrov, Principal Consultant, Nature Conservation and Biosafety Policy Directorate, Dr. Vitalie Ajder, Senior Scientific Researcher / President, SPPN

Full name of institution:

Ministry of Environment, Institute of Ecology and Geography of USM / Society for the Protection of Birds and Nature

Telephone:

+373 22 204 574, +37379662976

Email:

elisaveta.alexandrov@mediu.gov.md, ajder.vitalie@gmail.com

Designated Contact Point for the MOU

(if different from Report Compiler)

Name and title of designated Contact Point:

Full name of institution:

Mailing address:

Telephone:

Email:

II. HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF KEY MESSAGES

GUIDANCE:

This section invites you to summarise briefly the most important positive aspects of Raptors MOU/Action Plan implementation in your country and the areas of greatest concern. Your answers should be based on the information contained in the body of the report: the intention is for this section to distil the technical information in the report into some very brief and simple "high-level" messages for decision-makers and for wider audiences. Although keeping it brief, please try also to be specific where you can, e.g. "New wildlife legislation enacted in 2020 doubled penalties for poisoning birds of prey" is more informative than "stronger laws"; "50% shortfall in match-funding for GEF project on vultures" is more informative than "lack of funding".

GUIDANCE:

Please limit this specifically to the current reporting period only. For this present round of reporting, the period is from 1 November 2021 to the present.

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

The most successful aspects of implementation of the MOU and/or Action Plan? (List up to five items)

1. The national legal framework provides broad legal protection for birds of prey. Hunting of all birds of prey is prohibited under the national hunting and wildlife protection framework, providing an important basis for reducing deliberate killing and unsustainable taking.
2. Wetland and floodplain habitat conservation has been strengthened. During the reporting period, Moldova implemented the GEF/UNDP project "Conservation and sustainable management of wetlands with focus on high-nature value areas in the Prut River basin" (2022–2027), supporting wetland restoration, protected-area management, biodiversity monitoring and restoration of riparian forest strips. (UNDP)
3. Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment provide mechanisms for considering biodiversity in development and planning decisions. The national EIA/SEA framework is applicable to sectors including agriculture, forestry, energy, transport, water management and land-use planning. (Ministerul Mediului)
4. Protected-area management and biodiversity monitoring capacities have been strengthened through international cooperation. The Prut River basin project supports biodiversity monitoring, species-focused conservation activities, protected-area patrolling and management effectiveness. (UNDP)
5. International cooperation in biodiversity and migratory-species conservation has continued through CMS, AEWA and other international and transboundary initiatives. Moldova remains a Party to CMS and AEWA. (Raptors)
6. Substantially increased capacity for opportunistic and casual data collection through platforms like Ornitodata and eBird. Under the coordination of the Society for the Protection of Birds and Nature (SPPN), a standardized methodology was established to survey wintering raptors across the country.
7. In collaboration with Czech University of Veterinary Sciences Brno, satellite telemetry tracking was initiated for 7 Black Kites (*Milvus migrans*), generating key movement and migration data for the species in the region.
8. Continuous long-term monitoring (maintained since 2013 by SPPN) of the breeding population and nest site dynamics of the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*) across the national territory.

The greatest difficulties in implementing the MOU and/or Action Plan? (List up to five items)

1. Absence of a dedicated national raptor conservation strategy and adopted national action plans for priority raptors.
2. Limited long-term, nationwide and species-specific data, especially on breeding success, mortality and migration bottlenecks.
3. Habitat loss and degradation caused by land-use change, agricultural intensification, drainage, tree removal, disturbance and infrastructure development. Although national legislation mandates Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) for renewable energy projects near protected sites, Emerald Network areas, and IBAs, practical compliance remains weak; for instance, wind turbines are being installed immediately adjacent to or within sensitive forest habitats and migration corridors without thorough collision risk assessments.
4. Collision and electrocution risks associated with electricity and other linear infrastructure, with limited systematic mortality reporting. A critical example during the reporting period was the removal of all active Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*) nests from the Vulcănești–Cuciurgan high-voltage transmission line by the utility operator, without any administrative sanctions or corrective measures applied by competent environmental protection authorities.
5. Insufficient stable financing, specialised staff, equipment and enforcement capacity dedicated specifically to raptor conservation.

The main priorities for future implementation of the MOU and/or Action Plan? (List up to five items)

1. Strengthen the legal and policy framework for the conservation of migratory birds of prey, in line with the EU Birds and Habitats Directives.
2. Identify, map and designate key breeding, feeding, migration and concentration areas for raptors, including future Natura 2000 Special Protection Areas.
3. Establish systematic and coordinated monitoring of raptor populations, habitats, migration routes and threats, using standardised methodologies and centralised data management.
4. Improve the conservation, restoration and effective management of key habitats and protected sites important for migratory birds of prey.
5. Strengthen institutional and enforcement capacity to address habitat degradation, disturbance, illegal killing, poisoning, collision and electrocution risks.

III. RAPTOR CONSERVATION STRATEGIES AND EQUIVALENT

DOCUMENTS

GUIDANCE:

A central provision of the MOU (paragraph 12) is for Signatories to prepare national or regional (e.g. EU) strategies or equivalent documents (e.g. Single Species Action Plans) for category 1 and, where appropriate, category 2 species in Table 1 in the Action Plan. The Action Plan itself foresees its listed actions being addressed by these strategies / equivalent documents.

Does a national and/or regional Raptor Conservation Strategy or equivalent document exist in relation to your country?

No

Please state the reasons why a national and/or regional Raptor Conservation Strategy or equivalent document has not been developed:

Raptor conservation is currently integrated into broader biodiversity, wildlife and protected-area policies. Limited financial and institutional resources have led to prioritisation of integrated biodiversity measures rather than preparation of a separate raptor strategy.

Does the strategy or equivalent document address all of the activities listed in Table 2 of the Action Plan?

Partly

Please state the reasons why all of the Table 2 activities are not addressed:

Relevant activities are covered across several biodiversity, protected-area, environmental-assessment, research and awareness instruments. However, no single adopted document systematically assigns responsibilities, indicators, deadlines and financing for every Table 2 action.

IV. LEGAL PROTECTION OF SPECIES AGAINST KILLING AND

UNSUSTAINABLE EXPLOITATION

Are all species of migratory birds of prey (present in your country) listed in Annex I of the Raptors MOU granted full legal protection from deliberate killing and taking from the wild?

GUIDANCE:

Follow this link to see the species listed in Annex 1. If you are answering "yes", please make sure that the statute(s) concerned is/are clearly identified by giving details of title, date, etc. If you are answering "only partly", please be clear whether this is because legal protection only applies to some aspects, or because only some species are covered (please identify the species) or because only some areas are covered - (or any combination of these types of partial coverage); and give the reasons for this.

Yes

Please indicate the statute(s) concerned and summarise the provision:

Migratory birds of prey occurring in the Republic of Moldova benefit from legal protection under the national wildlife and hunting legislation. Law No. 439/1995 on the Animal Kingdom, together with the applicable hunting regulations, provides the main legal framework for wildlife protection and hunting regulation. Law No. 1538/1998 on the State-Protected Natural Areas Fund and the Red Book framework provide additional protection. Contravention and criminal provisions apply to unlawful taking or destruction of wildlife. The applicable hunting framework prohibits hunting of all birds of prey. Additional legal protection applies to species under special state protection, including Red Book species. These provisions provide a legal basis for preventing deliberate killing and unsustainable taking of raptors.

The CMS Raptors country profile identifies the following relevant Raptors MOU species occurring in or associated with the Republic of Moldova: Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), Booted Eagle (*Hieraaetus pennatus*), Rough-legged Buzzard (*Buteo lagopus*), , Short-toed Snake-Eagle (*Circaetus gallicus*), Pallid Harrier (*Circus macrourus*), Western Marsh-Harrier (*Circus aeruginosus*), White-tailed Sea-eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*), Greater Spotted Eagle (*Clanga clanga*), Montagu's Harrier (*Circus pygargus*), Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), European Honey-Buzzard (*Pernis apivorus*), Lesser Spotted Eagle (*Clanga pomarina*), Black Kite (*Milvus migrans*), Levant Sparrowhawk (*Accipiter brevipes*), Common Buzzard (*Buteo buteo*), Long-legged Buzzard (*Buteo rufinus*), Eurasian Sparrowhawk (*Accipiter nisus*), Northern Goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*), Common Kestrel (*Falco tinnunculus*), Red-footed Falcon (*Falco vespertinus*), Merlin (*Falco columbarius*), Eurasian Hobby (*Falco subbuteo*), Northern Long-eared Owl (*Asio otus*), Short-eared Owl (*Asio flammeus*), Ural Owl (*Strix uralensis*), Osprey (*Pandion halietus*) and other species listed on the CMS country profile, including Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*) (Raptors)

Is there legislation in place which bans the use of exposed poison baits and other toxic chemical methods of predator or pest control?

GUIDANCE:

The CMS Guidelines to prevent the risk of poisoning to migratory birds provide further background on legislative (and other) means of reducing harm to migratory birds (including raptors) from toxic chemicals.

Yes

Please indicate the statute(s) concerned, and summarise the provision:

Article 12(9) paragraph (5)(b), of Law No. 94/2007 on the ecological network prohibits the use of poison and

Article 12(9) paragraph (5)(b), of Law No. 94/2007 on the ecological network prohibits the use of poison and poisoned or tranquillising baits as methods of capturing or killing bird species listed in Annexes No. 3 and No. 4 to the Law. This prohibition contributes to preventing intentional poisoning and reducing the risk of secondary or accidental poisoning of non-target migratory birds, including raptors.

V. SPECIES POPULATION MANAGEMENT AND RECOVERY

PROGRAMMES

Have any Single or Multi-species Action Plans been published for any species of migratory bird of prey in your country?

No

Please state why not:

No formally adopted national single- or multi-species action plan dedicated to migratory raptors was identified for the reporting period. Species conservation is addressed through general biodiversity measures, protected-area management and research and monitoring initiatives.

Have any reintroduction or restocking projects been implemented involving migratory birds of prey in accordance with prevailing international guidelines?

GUIDANCE:

One of the most relevant international guidelines documents for this question is the IUCN publication “Guidelines for reintroductions and other conservation translocations”.

No

Please state why not:

No national raptor-specific reintroduction or repopulation programme has been identified in the Republic of Moldova during the reporting period. No national programme involving the release of captive-bred migratory raptors for reintroduction or reinforcement of wild populations has been identified.

However, natural population recovery and expansion have been documented for key species. For instance, the White-tailed Sea-eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*) has experienced a significant natural recovery: after being considered virtually absent as a breeding species prior to 2010 (0 breeding pairs), the population increased to 4 breeding pairs in 2014, and currently reaches an estimated 8 identified breeding pairs across the country.

Have any supplementary feeding initiatives been established and maintained for necrophagous birds of prey?

No

Please state why not:

No regular breeding populations of vultures requiring supplementary feeding were recorded in the Republic of Moldova during the reporting period. Therefore, supplementary feeding stations were not considered a priority conservation measure.

VI. CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF HABITATS AND SITES

Have any measures been implemented to improve or restore the habitats of species of birds of prey?

Yes

Please give a brief summary:

GUIDANCE:

Please indicate what habitat type, where, and (broadly) what type of measures were involved. Comments on success (or otherwise) would also be valuable.

Measures benefiting birds of prey habitats have been implemented through protected-area and Emerald Network management, wetland and forest conservation, ecosystem restoration, afforestation and improved management planning. The Biological Diversity Programme for 2026–2030 provides for further ecosystem restoration, strengthening of protected areas and the Emerald/Natura 2000 networks, and improved conservation of species and habitats. Projects during 2023-2026 supported institutional development, management effectiveness and habitat restoration in areas including Lower Dniester National Park, Orhei National Park and Codrii Scientific Reserve. Wetland conservation in the Lower Prut and Lower Dniester landscapes also benefits raptor feeding and nesting habitats. An important example is the GEF/UNDP project “Conservation and sustainable management of wetlands with focus on high-nature value areas in the Prut River basin”, implemented from 2022 to 2027. The project supports the ecological integrity and restoration of key floodplain wetlands, strengthening protected-area management, biodiversity monitoring, protected-area patrolling and species-focused conservation activities. It also includes restoration of riparian forest strips in the Lower Prut area and measures to improve wetland hydrology.

Which sites in your country listed in Table 3 of the Action Plan are designated as protected areas, or are otherwise appropriately managed taking into account the conservation requirements of migratory birds of prey?

Please indicate in this online file (link) for each of the relevant sites listed in Table 3 of Annex 3 of the MOU whether the site is (a) fully designated as a protected area or covered by an instrument ensuring proper management, (b) partially so designated/covered, or (c) not so designated/covered. If you experience any issues accessing the online file, please contact the Raptors MOU Coordinating Unit at umberto.galloorsi@un.org to request a copy as an email attachment.

GUIDANCE:

The list is extracted from the List of internationally important sites for migratory birds of prey in Africa and Eurasia (Table 3 of Annex 3 of the Raptors MOU) as approved by the Third Meeting of Signatories. Please answer this question in relation to the sites that are listed there. Please provide your answers in the online file by following the link above. The file will automatically save your answers.

My country does not have sites listed

VII. ASSESSING AND RESPONDING TO THREATS AND PRESSURES

Have any assessments been made of the nature, likelihood, severity or potential consequences of threats facing birds of prey, and measures identified to maintain their Favourable Conservation Status?

GUIDANCE:

“Favourable Conservation Status” should be interpreted for this question in accordance with the definition provided in Article I (1) (c) of the Convention on Migratory Species. ([Link to text here](#)).

Yes

Please give a brief summary:

Yes, but mainly through broader biodiversity, protected-area and environmental assessment processes rather than through a single comprehensive national assessment dedicated exclusively to Raptors MOU species. Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment procedures in the Republic of Moldova provide mechanisms for identifying potential effects on biodiversity, habitats and protected areas. The national framework also provides for biodiversity assessment of planned activities that may have significant effects on Emerald sites. Project-based biodiversity assessments and monitoring have also been undertaken in wetlands and protected areas, including the Lower Prut River basin. Threats to birds of prey are considered within the wider national environmental assessment and biodiversity conservation framework. Environmental assessments address potential effects associated with habitat loss and degradation, infrastructure development and other pressures. Biodiversity assessment is required for planned activities that may have significant effects on Emerald sites, and EIA/SEA procedures allow mitigation measures and environmental conditions to be incorporated into decision-making. However, Moldova does not yet have a single comprehensive nationwide raptor-specific threat assessment integrating all major pressures, mortality causes and species-level population responses. (cdn.climatepolicyradar.org)

Specific species-level threat evaluations have also been conducted through long-term field monitoring by civil society (SPPN since 2013). For the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), targeted monitoring identified critical anthropogenic pressures, notably the removal and destruction of all active breeding nests on high-voltage transmission lines along the Vulcănești–Cuciurgan corridor by the power grid operator without administrative enforcement or sanctions applied by environmental authorities.

Furthermore, site-based assessments highlight significant protection gaps: the Important Bird Area (IBA) Vulcănești–Purcari, which holds the entire national breeding population of the Saker Falcon, currently lacks national statutory protected area status and overlaps only minimally with existing national protected sites (Emerald sites), leaving core breeding habitats vulnerable.

Based on the assessment referred to above (or if none, on your own knowledge and judgement) please identify (tick) the three most important categories of threat affecting birds of prey in your country:

GUIDANCE:

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

Exactly 3 selection(s) Collisions and electrocution; Disturbance and disruption Habitat destruction/degradation; Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.

+ Disturbance and disruption

Add comments here on any particular actions in response to these threats:*GUIDANCE:*

You may find it helpful here to refer to actions assisted by relevant existing response tools and initiatives in the framework of mechanisms such as the CMS. Examples could include the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT), Intergovernmental Task Force to Address Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (ITTEA), South-West Asia Illegal Taking of Migratory Birds Intergovernmental Task Force (SWA ITB TF), the CMS Energy Task Force, and the adopted Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds.

1 Disturbance and disruption:

Human disturbance during the breeding season represents a critical pressure on raptors in Moldova. Major issues include active forestry logging operations conducted during the sensitive nesting window (spring–early summer), directly disrupting tree-nesting species, including breeding pairs of the White-tailed Eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*). Additionally, localized human disturbance and unregulated infrastructure maintenance continue to impact vulnerable raptors, as seen in the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), where nesting activities along high-voltage utility corridors were severely disrupted by unauthorized nest removals. Advocacy and field monitoring by civil society (SPPN) aim to enforce seasonal logging bans near active nests and promote spatial buffer zones around key breeding territories.

2 Collisions and electrocution:

Risks associated with power lines and energy infrastructure are screened through EIA and SEA procedures. However, systematic mitigation (such as grid retrofitting or installation of bird-safe nesting platforms) remains limited. Actions are being aligned with recommendations from the **CMS Energy Task Force**, particularly regarding power line risk assessments for nesting raptors such as the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*).

3 Habitat destruction and degradation:

Addressed through protected-area management, Emerald Network site monitoring, and targeted wetland restoration. Notable ongoing actions include floodplain and riparian forest restoration in the Lower Prut River basin (GEF/UNDP project, 2022–2027), alongside efforts by civil society (SPPN) to evaluate and expand the network of Important Bird Areas (IBAs).

4 Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, and management:

National monitoring capacity and public awareness have been substantially increased through citizen science platforms (Ornithodata, eBird), nationwide wintering raptor counts, and satellite telemetry tracking (e.g., *Milvus migrans* in collaboration with Czech partners).

However, enforcement and legislative frameworks face significant risks. Annually, the Society for the Protection of Birds and Nature (SPPN) reports cases to the Environmental Protection Inspectorate (IPM) regarding wild chicks of various raptor species poached from nests and illegally advertised or sold online.

Furthermore, despite Moldova lacking a historical tradition of falconry, the national Hunting Law adopted in 2024 (HG 27-11-2024 Hunting Law nr. 55/2024) formally legalizes hunting with birds of prey. This legal mechanism creates serious vulnerabilities, as it potentially opens doors for the illegal taking and collection of wild raptors, chicks, or eggs directly from active nests to supply falconry activities. These developments underscore the urgent need to establish a dedicated, specialized legal framework and enforcement protocols strictly regulating raptor protection, nest safeguards, and anti-poaching controls in Moldova.

Are requirements in place to ensure that proposals for activities that may have significant effects on birds of prey or their habitats are subject to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) or Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA)?

GUIDANCE:

Helpful pointers on this subject (and reference to sources of further guidance) are given in CMS Resolution 7.2 (Rev.COP14) on "Impact assessment and migratory species". Comments on the general standard and quality of EIAs/SEAs that are undertaken would be valuable. Any use that has been made of "sensitivity mapping" techniques in this context should be mentioned here.

Yes

Please give a brief summary of the requirements and their implementation, including the extent to which the results of these assessments are used to inform relevant consent decisions and associated mitigation

measures:

The national EIA and SEA framework requires environmental effects to be assessed before relevant decisions are taken. SEA is applied to plans and programmes that may have significant environmental effects. EIA is applied to categories of proposed activities defined by national legislation. Where relevant, biodiversity assessment addresses potential effects on Emerald sites. Environmental assessment outcomes can inform approval decisions and can result in environmental conditions, mitigation measures or modifications to proposed activities. Biodiversity and protected-area considerations therefore form part of the environmental decision-making process, although a nationwide raptor-specific sensitivity mapping system has not been identified as a standard mandatory component of the national EIA/SEA procedure.

VIII. ACTION / INTEGRATION ACROSS SECTORS

Is the conservation of migratory birds of prey integrated within the policies of sectors such as agriculture, forestry, energy, transport, waste, tourism and others?

Partly

Please give a brief summary:

Biodiversity requirements are integrated mainly through environmental assessment, protected-area rules,

Biodiversity requirements are integrated mainly through environmental assessment, protected-area rules, forestry and wildlife legislation, Emerald Network development and the national environmental strategy. Law No. 439/1995 on the animal kingdom includes provisions concerning wind farms and electricity networks in protected areas and intensive bird migration routes and provides for visual marking and technical safeguards in relevant circumstances. Raptor-specific standards are not yet consistently embedded across all sector policies.

However, comprehensive, raptor-specific conservation standards (e.g., systematic insulation of power poles, targeted anti-poisoning protocols, or specific wind farm exclusion zones) are not yet consistently embedded across all sector-specific policies.

Have any programmes been implemented during the reporting period among government departments (other than the department that has lead responsibility for the Raptors MOU) to inform decision makers of the conservation needs of migratory birds of prey?

No

Please state why not:

No comprehensive national assessment covering the status and long-term population trends of migratory birds of prey has been identified for the reporting period. Relevant observations and project-based biodiversity monitoring are available, including monitoring associated with protected areas and wetland conservation projects, but these do not constitute a single coordinated national assessment of all relevant migratory raptor populations.

IX. RESEARCH, MONITORING AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Have any overall assessments been made of the status and trends of any populations of migratory birds of prey in your country, during the reporting period?

Yes

Please give a brief summary, and highlight any particularly significant declines or increases that have been

During the reporting period, assessments of the population status, distribution, and trends of migratory birds of prey in the Republic of Moldova were carried out by academic researchers and civil society organizations (such as the Society for Protection of Birds and Nature – SPPN).

- **Falco cherrug (Saker Falcon):** Remains extremely rare and critically endangered as a breeding species in Moldova. Monitoring and field assessments indicate sporadic observations along the Dniester and Prut river valleys, with no stable breeding population confirmed in recent years, highlighting an urgent need for targeted conservation actions and nest-site protection.
- **Haliaeetus albicilla (White-tailed Eagle):** Shows a slight positive trend/recolonization along major river basins (Prut and Dniester wetlands, including Lower Prut and Lower Dniester Ramsar sites). Breeding pairs and wintering individuals are regularly monitored, though nesting success remains vulnerable to habitat disturbance and tree logging.
- **Wintering Birds of Prey Monitoring:** Regular systematic monitoring of wintering raptor populations (such as *Buteo lagopus*, *Buteo buteo*, *Circus cyaneus*, *Accipiter* species, and wintering *Haliaeetus albicilla*) is conducted annually using standardized transect methodologies across key agricultural landscapes, river valleys, and open habitats to evaluate population fluctuations, overwintering density, and winter distribution trends. Additionally, annual census counts are carried out to monitor communal winter roosts of Long-eared Owls (*Asio otus*) in urban and rural settlements across the country to assess population fluctuations, overwintering density, and winter distribution trends.

revealed for relevant species:

Please provide a copy of any relevant documents:

- DOI: [10.2478/orhu-2025-0010](https://doi.org/10.2478/orhu-2025-0010)
- DOI: [10.3390/su18062722](https://doi.org/10.3390/su18062722)
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/402239011_WINTERING_RAPTORS_IN_EASTERN_EUROPE_INSIGHTS_FROM_A_LARGE_SCALE_MONITORING_PROGRAM_ON_POPULATION_TRENDS_AND_CLIMATE

And/or provide a website link that will give access to relevant material:

[SPPN anunță monitorizarea ciufilelor de pădure în locurile de iernare. Cum te poți implica și tu - Ecopresa](#)

Are any systematic and coordinated monitoring programmes operated in your country in relation to breeding populations, reproductive success or migration counts of birds of prey?

Yes

Please give a brief summary:

Systematic and coordinated monitoring is conducted primarily through NGO initiative—specifically the Society for Protection of Birds and Nature (SPPN)—in collaboration with academic partners (Institute of Ecology and Geography):

- A targeted monitoring program led by SPPN to assess the breeding status and occupancy of the Saker Falcon in Moldova. This includes field surveys of nest sites, systematic monitoring of potential breeding territories along major open steppe habitats, checking "natural" nests on high-voltage electricity pylons, and tracking potential breeding pairs or solitary individuals.
- Annual systematic monitoring of wintering birds of prey (such as *Buteo lagopus*, *Buteo buteo*, *Circus cyaneus*, *Accipiter* species, and wintering *Haliaeetus albicilla*) conducted by SPPN using standardized car transects counts across agricultural landscapes, river valleys, and open habitats (all type of habitats) to evaluate population trends, overwintering densities, and distribution dynamics during winter period.
- Conducted annually in January across key wetlands (including Ramsar sites, IBAs, KBAs), providing coordinated counts of wintering wetland-associated raptors such as White-tailed Sea-eagle *Haliaeetus albicilla*, Eurasian Marsh Harrier *Circus aeruginosus*, Short-eared Owl *Asio flammeus*.
- Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (CBM): Standardized breeding bird monitoring scheme operating across representative national Point Counts during the breeding season (April–June). While primarily designed to track common farmland and forest bird indices, the scheme systematically records territorial breeding raptors and owls associated with open agricultural landscapes and forest habitats (e.g., *Falco tinnunculus*, *Buteo buteo*, *Accipiter nisus*), contributing long-term population trend data.
- Citizen Science Data Aggregation: Systematic collection and national validation of raptor observations via national biodiversity databases (Ornithodata) and eBird, coordinated at the national level.

Please provide a copy of any relevant documents:

And/or provide a website link that will give access to relevant material:

- <https://pecbms.info/country/moldova/>
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/402239011_WINTERING_RAPTORS_IN_EASTERN_EUROPE_INSIGHTS_FROM_A_LARGE_SCALE_MONITORING_PROGRAM_ON_POPULATION_TRENDS_AND_CLIMATE
- DOI: [10.2478/orhu-2025-0010](https://doi.org/10.2478/orhu-2025-0010)
- DOI: [10.3390/su18062722](https://doi.org/10.3390/su18062722)
- <https://sppn.md>

Have any guidelines or protocols been published concerning systematic or coordinated monitoring programmes for migratory birds of prey?

Yes

Please give the source reference(s) and a brief summary:

☐ **Wintering Diurnal Raptors Monitoring Scheme in the Republic of Moldova (SPPN Protocol):** Initiated in 2015, this national monitoring program follows a standardized methodology based on monthly roadside car transects conducted during the winter period (November through February, scheduled strictly after the 15th of each month). The sampling grid covers **9 fixed transects** across the country (3 in the North, 3 in the Center, and 3 in the South). Each transect spans **40 km in length**, maintaining a **minimum inter-transect distance of 40 km**, with survey vehicles driving at a **maximum speed of 40 km/h** to ensure complete visual coverage. (SPPN Reports & Published Paper Data)

* ☐ **Targeted Breeding Survey Protocol for Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*):** A dedicated breeding monitoring protocol focused on high-voltage power lines (LEA) in southern Moldova. Field monitoring is conducted during the early summer breeding window when chicks are fully developed and visible in nests. The protocol mandates complete, continuous physical coverage of high-voltage power line corridors stretching from **Etulia to Purcari**, inspecting electrical pylons for potential occupied nests (specifically Corvidae or Buzzard nests reused by Saker Falcons) and tracking breeding success and chick fledging rates (SPPN Reports (sppn.md) & Published Paper Data)

* ☐ **International Protocol Adaptations:** Standardized field methodology adapted from the **International Waterbird Census (IWC)** protocols (Wetlands International) for raptor counts in wetland habitats, alongside observational guidelines integrated into **ornitodata.sppn** a national biodiversity portal, <https://ornitodata.sppn.md/>

Please provide a copy of any relevant document(s):

And/or provide a website link that will give access to relevant material:

- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/402239011_WINTERING_RAPTORS_IN_EASTERN_EUROPE_INSIGHTS_FROM_A_LARGE_SCALE_MONITORING_PROGRAM_ON_POPULATION_TRENDS_AND_CLIMATE
- DOI: [10.2478/orhu-2025-0010](https://doi.org/10.2478/orhu-2025-0010)
- DOI: [10.3390/su18062722](https://doi.org/10.3390/su18062722)
- <https://ornitodata.sppn.md/>

Does any process exist for establishing multi-stakeholder agreement about priorities for research on issues of relevance to the conservation of birds of prey?

No

Please give a brief summary:

Currently, there is no formal, institutionalized multi-stakeholder process specifically dedicated to establishing agreed national priorities for research on birds of prey. Research priorities are typically defined independently,

mainly by NGOs and less by academic institutions or individual researchers, or guided broadly through international conventions and biodiversity strategies without a centralized coordination platform.

Please provide a copy of any relevant document(s):

N/A

And/or provide a website link that will give access to relevant material:

N/A

*** Please state why not:**

There is no legally established or centralized national framework dedicated specifically to defining raptor research priorities. Research activities are driven on a project-by-project basis by civil society organizations (NGOs) based on immediate conservation threats, available funding, and international reporting commitments, rather than through a coordinated multi-stakeholder strategic process.

Are suitable platforms in place in your country to exchange knowledge, experience and information about the conservation of birds of prey?

Yes

Please identify the relevant platform(s) and summarise its/their scope and function:

Knowledge and information exchange are primarily facilitated through civil society initiatives, particularly by the Society for Protection of Birds and Nature (SPPN). The main platforms include:

- SPPN hosts regular assemblies, publishes annual conservation reports, and maintains communication channels that allow ornithologists, members, and volunteers to present monitoring data, field experience, and threat assessments regarding birds of prey.
- National researchers and NGO experts actively present and exchange knowledge on raptor conservation mainly through international scientific conferences and working groups, which offer greater scope, peer feedback, and impact compared to local events.
- To a lesser extent, information is shared at national academic conferences, though these are used less frequently due to limited visibility, outreach, and engagement regarding applied conservation issues.

X. RAISING AWARENESS

Have any public awareness programmes been implemented during the reporting period to promote the importance of birds of prey, their migrations and their conservation needs?

Yes

Please give a brief summary including comments on the impact and success (or otherwise) of these programmes:

Society for the Protection of Birds and Nature and partner institutions organised public birdwatching, citizen-science counts, communications and outreach concerning wild birds and their habitats. Government and project communications on protected areas and the Emerald Network also promoted biodiversity values. Participation in structured monitoring and growth of national digital bird records indicate increased engagement, although impact has not been evaluated through a dedicated national survey.

Because SPPN is the sole specialized ornithological organization in the country, international conservation teams and foreign research projects routinely contact SPPN whenever satellite/GPS-tagged birds enter Moldovan territory. SPPN acts as the local ground response team to track, monitor, and verify the health and safety of these tagged individuals. A recent notable case involved ground verification for a satellite-tracked Black Vulture (*Aegypius monachus*) originating from a reintroduction project in Bulgaria.

SPPN organizes bi-annual Global Big Day events (May and October), bringing together a significant network of professional ornithologists, birdwatchers, and volunteers. These events generate substantial public outreach and collect critical real-time field data on raptor migration and distribution.

Have any education programmes or teaching resources been provided during the reporting period to inform young people and students about migratory birds of prey and their conservation needs?

Yes

Please give a brief summary:

Environmental education and bird-related outreach were delivered through protected areas, schools, universities, NGOs, public events and citizen-science activities. Field excursions, identification resources and participation in counts enabled students and young people to learn about migration, monitoring and conservation. Verified activity names, dates and participant numbers should be added. Links: <https://pecbms.info/moldova-monitoring-oritodata/> , <https://liferenata.eu/moldova-presents-first-results-on-alignment-of-the-emerald-network-with-natura-2000-a-major-step-toward-eu-biodiversity-integration/>

XI. STRENGTHENING CAPACITY

Have any training or other support programmes been implemented during the reporting period to strengthen the capacity of agencies responsible for the application of relevant laws and regulations?

Yes

*

Please give a brief summary:

Capacity-building activities included training and support for protected-area personnel, local stakeholders and environmental volunteer rangers. The measures strengthened field-level capacities for protected-area management, monitoring, patrolling, biodiversity conservation and enforcement.

During the reporting period, the Society for the Protection of Birds and Nature (SPPN) collaborated with the Environmental Protection Inspectorate (IPM) from the Republic of Moldova within the project "Multi-stakeholder governance for better protection and conservation of wildlife. Capacity-building initiatives included specialized training workshops for environmental inspectors, such as sessions on "Bird species in the Republic of Moldova and their conservation status" and "Species of hunting interest in light of a new hunting season." Additionally, technical support was provided through the donation of optical equipment (binoculars) to enhance the inspectors' monitoring and enforcement capabilities. Joint field trips were also conducted to monitor wild bird species in their natural habitats and combat poaching.

Have any training or other initiatives been implemented during the reporting period to support activities undertaken by local communities or voluntary groups in relation to birds of prey surveys, monitoring, site protection work or related outreach?

Yes

Please give a brief summary:

Citizen-science and volunteer participation were supported through winter counts, Common Bird Monitoring, field excursions and Ornitodata use. Protected-area and Emerald Network initiatives also involved local authorities and stakeholders in management and conservation discussions

During the reporting period, has your country provided any new financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory birds of prey?

GUIDANCE:

"Other resources" in this context could include, for example, "in-kind" forms of support such as staff time or administrative infrastructure, loan of equipment, provision of data processing facilities or technology transfer. (Do not include training or mentoring schemes and other initiatives for capacity building however, as these are covered separately in the preceding two questions).

No

Please state why not:

During the reporting period (1 November 2021 – 30 April 2026), no new financial or other resources specifically dedicated to conservation activities benefiting migratory birds of prey were identified.

During the reporting period, has your country received any new financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory birds of prey?

GUIDANCE:

See guidance on interpretation of “other resources” provided in relation to the preceding question.

No

Please state the source(s) concerned and the activities supported:

During the reporting period, the Republic of Moldova received financial and in-kind support through the EU- funded LIFE EBP reinforcement project. The support included access to and adaptation of the Ornitodata platform, digital tools for field data collection, data storage and processing facilities, and integration of national data into the European Bird Portal. These resources supported bird-monitoring programmes, including Winter Raptor Counts, and therefore directly benefited the monitoring and conservation assessment of migratory birds of prey.

<https://life.eurobirdportal.org/overview> However, Moldova received substantial international support for wider biodiversity and wetland conservation. The GEF/UNDP Prut River basin project, implemented from 2022 to 2027, supports wetland restoration, protected-area management, biodiversity monitoring and species-focused conservation activities. These measures provide indirect benefits for migratory birds through habitat conservation.

XII. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

During the reporting period, has your country participated in any international cooperation activities as provided by paragraph 8 of the MOU?

Yes

Please give a brief summary:

During the reporting period, the Republic of Moldova participated in international cooperation activities through the LIFE EBP reinforcement project, the Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme, the European Bird Portal and cooperation with the Romanian Ornithological Society. These activities supported harmonised monitoring protocols, data exchange and integration of national bird data into European monitoring systems, including data collected through Winter Raptor Counts. Cooperation concerning the Emerald Network and the transition to Natura 2000 also supported the identification and conservation of important species and habitats, including those relevant to migratory birds of prey. <https://life.eurobirdportal.org/overview> <https://pecbms.info/moldova-monitoring-ornitodata/>

During the reporting period, has your country taken any steps to support or encourage any other Range State (s) to sign the Raptors MOU?

No

Please state why not:

No specific steps were taken during the reporting period to encourage other Range States to sign the Raptors

No specific steps were taken during the reporting period to encourage other Range States to sign the Raptors MOU. Available resources were focused on national implementation priorities, while international cooperation activities were not specifically aimed at promoting signature of the MOU.

Contact

alexandra.caron-strehlow@un.org