

Raptors MOU National Report Form

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 MOU's Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was tasked with developing a suitable format for reports, covering implementation of the MOU and its Action Plan as a whole. The proposed 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.

A formal proposal to adopt the format will be considered by the third Meeting of Signatories (MOS3) in 2022. In the meantime we are taking the opportunity to launch it in its provisional form, so that up to date information on national implementation can be available for MOS3. The Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU will compile and analyse the reports for this purpose.

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 **July 2019 and the present**. (July 2019 was the date of the previous implementation survey, the results of which can be found in the first Review of the Action Plan). Future reporting cycles are likely to cover periods between one Meeting of Signatories and the next.

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 question there are blue icons that can be used to attach a document and/or provide a weblink.

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.

Please Note: Before clicking on any hyperlink contained within this form, please press and hold the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Deadline for submission: 31 October 2021

I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Name of Signatory State:

> Norway

Date of entry into effect of the MOU in your country (DD/MM/YY):

> 22.10.2008

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

>

Report Compiler

Name and title:

> Anne Martinussen, senior adviser / CMS national focal point

Full name of institution:

> Norwegian Environment Agency (hereafter: NEA)

Telephone:

> +4793946131

Email:

> anne.martinussen@miljodir.no

Designated Contact Point for the MOU

Name and title of designated Contact Point:

> Anne Martinussen, senior adviser

Full name of institution

> Norwegian Environment Agency (hereafter: NEA)

Mailing address:

> Miljødirektoratet, P.B. 5672 Torgarden, NO-7485 Trondheim, Norway

Telephone:

> +4773580500

Email:

> post@miljodir.no

II. HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF KEY MESSAGES

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”. Please limit this specifically to the current reporting period only. For this present round of reporting, the period is from **July 2019 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)

> The report "Conservation of birds of prey in Norway - Guidelines and management priorities" (2020) was commissioned by the Norwegian Environment Agency and produced by BirdLife Norway. It is a thorough and technically robust basis for what may be developed into a national action plan or strategy for birds of prey. The report is a result of Norway being a signatory to the Raptors MoU, and is based on its guidance. The MoU is a useful tool and excellent framework to ensure greater focus and attention to the management of birds of prey in Norway.

The greatest difficulties in implementing the MOU and/or Action Plan?

(List up to five items)

> Ensuring cross-sectoral engagement and collaboration is always challenging; this is also the case when it comes to the management of birds of prey.

The main priorities for future implementation of the MOU and/or Action Plan?

(List up to five items)

> The main priority is to assess BirdLife's report and to proceed with next steps for the development of a national action plan / strategy.

III. RAPTOR CONSERVATION STRATEGIES AND EQUIVALENT DOCUMENTS

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- In preparation
- No

Please state the title and scope of the strategy or equivalent document, and summarise the current status of its implementation:

Please use the icons below to provide a copy of the document(s) concerned, and/or provide a website link that will give access to the relevant text.

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly
- No

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

>

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

>

Please state the title and scope of the strategy or equivalent document, and summarise the current status of its preparation:

> "Conservation of birds of prey in Norway - Guidelines and management priorities". BirdLife Norway, report 5-2020.

The report was commissioned by NEA and is the first step in the process of developing what may become a national strategy or similar document. The next step is for NEA to assess, prioritize action and formalize a plan / strategy.

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly
- No

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

> See answer above re. status of report.

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

>

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

>

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?

Follow this link to see the species listed in Annex 1.

If you are answering "yes, please make sure 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.

Please select only one option

- Yes
 Partly
 No
 Not known

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

> The Norwegian Nature Diversity Act, Act of 19 June 2009 No. 100 Relating to the management of Biological, Geological and Landscape Diversity.

Chapter III Species management, Section 15 (principle for species management): Harvesting and other removal of animals that occur naturally in the wild shall be authorised by statute or a decision pursuant to statute. Unnecessary harm and suffering caused to animals occurring in the wild and their nests, lairs and burrows shall be avoided. Harvesting and other removal of plants and fungi occurring in the wild are permitted to the extent that they do not jeopardise the survival of the population concerned or are not limited by statute or by a decision pursuant to statute. The provisions of the first and second paragraphs do not preclude lawful access and passage, agricultural activities or other activities that take place in accordance with the duty of care laid down in section 6.

See full document at: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/nature-diversity-act/id570549/>

According to the Nature Diversity Act all Norwegian bird species are protected, including birds of prey (Ministry of the Environment 2009). Except for the Snowy Owl and Eurasian Eagle Owl, all Norwegian owls have been protected nationwide since 1930. In 1951, some species of raptors achieved legal protection in the breeding period, although several were still hunted throughout the year. The Osprey was protected by law in 1962, and the Snowy Owl was protected by law in 1965.

The Golden Eagle and the White-tailed Eagle received protection in 1968, and in 1971 the Eurasian Eagle Owl finally received legal protection.

Note that the Wildlife Act (Viltloven) sets some regulations regarding hunting, killing, keeping, introduction and handling of dead animals (incl. taxidermy). According to the Regulation relating to killing of wildlife that cause damage or reduce the reproduction of other species, the County Governor may give landowners or users permission to kill Golden Eagle, Northern Goshawk and Eurasian Sparrowhawk. The Regulation requires alternative measures to be implemented before killing as a derogation takes place, and then only as a last resort. Nationally such derogations are guided by the Bern Convention.

<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1981-05-29-38>

Please state why all species are not (yet) fully covered:

>

Please state why all species are not (yet) fully covered:

>

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

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.

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

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

> See references in the Nature Diversity Act of 2009 and paragraph 15 as specified above.

Please state why not:

>

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 In preparation
 No
 Not known

Please list the species involved and the status of each Plan:

Please use the icons below to provide a copy of the document(s) concerned, and/or provide a website link that will give access to the relevant text.

>

Please list the species involved and the status of each Plan:

Please use the icons below to provide a copy of the document(s) concerned, and/or provide a website link that will give access to the relevant text.

>

Please state why not:

> A Single Species Action Plan was prepared for the Eurasian eagle-owl (*Bubo bubo*) in 2009; which is an active plan being implemented. However, Eurasian eagle-owls in Norway are resident, not migratory.

No other S/MSAPs are published.

Document available only in Norwegian:

https://www.miljodirektoratet.no/globalassets/publikasjoner/dirnat2/attachment/17/rapport_2009-1.pdf

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary, and indicate whether or not captive breeding is involved:

>

Please state why not:

> There are currently no reintroduction programs for birds of prey in Norway. Previously, reintroduction projects on Peregrine Falcon and Eurasian Eagle Owl have been carried out. White-tailed Eagles from Norway have been used in reintroduction programs in Scotland and Ireland.

In general, most birds of prey populations in Norway are stable. Some are still recovering after heavy persecution during the early 20th century, as well as from environmental pollutants causing eggshell thinning during the 1960s and 1970s.

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary:

>

Please state why not:

> There have been some small-scale sporadic private initiatives, but nothing publicly.

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary:

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

> Most public measures have been directed at *Bubo bubo* as follow up of the management plan, such as facilitating nesting through clearing vegetation, leaving old forest and tall trees, and protecting sites. New regulations were implemented in the PEFC Norwegian Forest Standard in 2019, stating that logging should be avoided in forests of particular importance for birds in May - July. How this will influence birds of prey is at present unknown.

The habitats used by breeding raptors in Norway are many and varied, including habitats as diverse as woodland (boreal forest, subarctic forest, temperate forest), subarctic shrubland, plantations, open land (tundra, subarctic grassland, arable land, pastureland), mountains (alpine cliffs and rocky areas), marine coastal habitats, wetlands and urban areas. The dominance of different habitats is an important determinative factor in the distribution and abundance of breeding birds of prey across Norway.

Please state why not:

>

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 excel 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.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that Table 3 is currently incomplete. A revised Table 3, following the inputs received at the 2nd Meeting of Signatories, is being finalised, and following comments by the Technical Advisory Group it will be circulated alongside the 'Form to propose internationally important sites for addition to Table 3 of the Raptors MoU'. Signatories will be asked to comment on the list and invited to propose new sites of international importance. The list, including any comments received as per the Rules of Procedure, will be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Group and circulated for the 3rd Meeting of Signatories to consider.

In the meantime, if your country is covered in the current Table, please answer this question in relation to the sites that are listed there. Please provide your answers in the excel file on google drive by following the link above. The file will automatically save your answers.

Please select only one option

- I have added the relevant information for my country's sites

>

- 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?

“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).

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Please give a brief summary:

> Birdlife Norway's report 2020-5 "Conservation of birds of prey in Norway - Guidelines and management priorities" includes a fairly in-depth assessment of threats facing birds of prey and measures to be taken.

Please state why not:

>

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:

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.

- Direct killing and taking
- Collisions and electrocution
- Other mortality
- Alien and/or invasive species
- Disturbance and disruption
- Habitat destruction/degradation
- Climate change
- Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.
- Other (please specify)

>

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

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), the CMS Energy Task Force, and the adopted Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds.

> Despite large areas of relatively unspoiled nature, birds of prey in Norway face a number of threats, most of which are related to human pressure on their habitats. The Norwegian legal framework provides reasonably good protection for birds of prey. However, enforcement of the relevant legislation could be improved and actions to address threats prioritized.

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)?

Helpful pointers on this subject (and reference to sources of further guidance) are given in CMS Resolution 7.2 (Rev.COP12) 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.

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

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 Planning and Building Act (Plan- og bygningsloven) regulates land planning in Norway and is thus a central Act in environmental management. The purpose of the Act is to promote sustainable development for the good of the individual, society in general and future generations. The connection and interaction between

the Planning and Building Act and the Nature Diversity Act is important to protect nature, and especially protection and management of priority biotopes. The principal rule concerning environmental impact assessment is that all regional plans and all municipal plans with guidelines or framework for future development shall be risk-assessed to evaluate potential influences on the environment and the community. In addition, all development plans that may have potential influence on the environment or to society shall be risk assessed. There is also a general prohibition of measures close to the sea or along watercourses (< 100 m), according to the Act (Section 1-8), with some exceptions.

Chapter 5 of the act regulates public participation in planning. Anyone who presents a planning proposal shall facilitate public participation, and the municipality shall make sure that this requirement is met in planning processes carried out by other public bodies or private bodies (Section 5-1). Where the act provides that a planning proposal shall be circulated for public scrutiny, the proposal shall be sent to all central government, regional and municipal authorities and other public bodies, private organisations and institutions that are affected by the proposal for comment within a stipulated time limit (Section 5-2). This enables the participation of NGOs and other conservation bodies in the planning process.

Furthermore, the Forestry Act (Skogbruksloven), whose purpose is to “promote sustainable management of forest resources in Norway”, is central. Section 4 makes the forest owner responsible for having adequate knowledge about environmental values in his own forest and observe them when carrying out activities. This Section confers to the Regulation concerning sustainable forest management, which shall promote sustainable forest management to secure environmental values, active reforestation and good health of the forest. Forest owners shall make sure that necessary consideration is taken regarding biodiversity (Section 3). Forestry is only to occur where environmental values have been catalogued, and if such registration is not carried out the logging shall be based on the precautionary measures stated in the “Living Forest” (PEFC) standards (Levende Skog 2008, Ministry of Agriculture and Food 2006). If the logging is in conflict with the Act (i. e. has negative consequences for environmental values), the local municipality has the authority to refuse logging or set terms for how it should be carried out.

Please state why not:

>

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- Partly
- No
- Not known

Please give a brief summary:

>

Please state why not:

>

Please give a brief summary:

> According to the Nature Diversity Act all Norwegian bird species are protected, including birds of prey (Ministry of the Environment 2009), and their protection and requirements must be taken more into consideration in management and planning processes. The Planning and Building Act (Plan- og bygningsloven) regulates land planning in Norway and is thus a central Act in environmental management. However, social economics also play a part in sectoral decisions.

An important tool is a database of selected species of birds, mammals and lichen, called the Sensitive species database. Localized information for the species in it is shielded because open access could lead to exposure to unfortunate negative influence. For example disturbances, pursuit or destruction. Although access to sensitive species data is restricted, it is possible for public administration, contractors / developers and others with legitimate needs to gain access to data relevant for a project or an area they are responsible for.

Furthermore, all sectors / private land owners / businesses are obliged to check this database before starting any activity (logging, construction etc.) to see if there are any sensitive animal sites in the relevant area before proceeding. If there are, they are required to take the necessary actions to avoid harm, do an EIA, protect sites etc. This has proved to be a useful tool for natural resource management in Norway.

<https://sensitive-artsdata.miljodirektoratet.no/Contentpages/Om.aspx>

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Please give a brief summary:

> Regular dialogue and annual reporting is mandatory

Please state why not:

>

IX. RESEARCH, MONITORING AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Please use the icons below each question to provide a copy of any relevant documents, and/or provide a website link that will give access to relevant material.

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary, and highlight any particularly significant declines or increases that have been revealed for relevant species:

> Referring to the findings of the previously mentioned BirdLife 2020 report, commissioned by the Norwegian Environment Agency.

Please state why no such assessments have been made:

>

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary:

> National and regional monitoring of raptors and owls in Norway are chiefly focusing on a few selected species. For some the knowledge about population trends is limited. Most monitoring of birds of prey in Norway is in the form of breeding bird surveys. The Golden Eagle and Eurasian Eagle Owl are surveyed under annual single species national monitoring programs at selected sites, coordinated by the Norwegian Environment Agency.

Breeding bird surveys are carried out annually through the Program for terrestrial monitoring (TOV), accomplished through a network of bird observers.

Counts during migration are not standardized, although systematic counts are carried out at a few sites, such as government-funded programs at bird observatories. Significant amounts of observation data from volunteers and professionals are reported via the online Species Observation System (www.artsobservasjoner.no).

Please state why not:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

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

> Detailed guidelines exist for Golden Eagle, under the national monitoring programme for wildlife.

Please state why not:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary:

> This is the case for the Eurasian Eagle Owl, where a multi-stakeholder advisory group identifies knowledge gaps, needs and suggests priorities for research.

Please state why not:

>

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Not known

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

> Formal platforms are in place in relation to conservation of the Eurasian Eagle Owl and the Golden Eagle.

Please state why not:

>

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

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

>

Please state why not:

>

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Please give a brief summary:

>

Please state why not:

> No formal public awareness program as such has been implemented by the NEA. However, regular communication to the public is done on a case-by-case basis, in the form of news, research findings, and general information. In addition, NGOs and interest groups play an important role in communication, often with financial support from the government.

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary:

>

Please state why not:

> The legal framework and the competence of the agencies responsible for the application of relevant laws and regulations are in place.

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?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please give a brief summary:

>

Please state why not:

> Nothing has been organized by the authorities, but there are many ornithologists and interest groups which undertake training and activities at national and local levels - often with financial support from the government.

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

“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).

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

Please state the beneficiary/ies concerned and the activities supported:

> The beneficiaries are mainly Norwegian scientists and NGOs, who have received support for knowledge acquisition, research, buying radio equipment etc.

Please state why not:

>

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

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No
 Not known

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

>

Please state why not:

>

XII. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Please give a brief summary:

> Participated in international working groups for Golden Eagle and Snowy Owl.

Please state why not:

>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Please identify the Range State(s) concerned, and the nature of the support or encouragement given:

>

Please state why not:

>