



**First Meeting of the Signatory States of the Memorandum of
Understanding on the Conservation and Management of the Middle-
European Population of the Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*)**

*National Park Neusiedler See-Seewinkel, Burgenland, Illmitz, Austria
17-18 September 2004*

CMS/GB.1/6
Agenda item 8.0

DRAFT MEDIUM TERM INTERNATIONAL WORK PROGRAMME

(Prepared by the Secretariat)

1. By signing the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the Conservation and Management of the Middle-European Population of the Great Bustard, Signatories endeavour to work closely together to improve the conservation status of Great Bustard throughout its breeding, migratory and wintering range. The MoU emphasises the need for exchanging scientific, technical and legal information to co-ordinate conservation measures and for co-operation with other Range States, appropriate international organizations and recognized scientists.
2. According to paragraph 7 of the MoU the Signatories shall endeavour to adopt a Medium Term International Work Programme for the Great Bustard. This should include (1) subjects for co-operative research and monitoring, (2) measures to implement the MoU and its Action Plan, as well as (3) items for which guidelines are needed to further develop and improve the measures listed in the MoU as well as in international and national work programmes.
3. The attached draft Medium Term International Work Programme is organised around these three main headings. It lists objectives related to the MoU and Action Plan, and suggests a set of activities to achieve those objectives.
4. Funding will be needed to support the activities listed in the Work Programme. Multilateral, bilateral and other sources of funding will need to be secured through funding applications prepared by lead countries and collaborators.
5. A column on financial considerations is provided, but figures have not been actually indicated. The meeting may wish to consider whether an estimate of an activity's costs may be more appropriately made after the projects are conceptualised by the lead countries and their collaborators. The information could be then subsequently provided to the Secretariat.
6. Signatory States are invited to consider which activities they wish to lead in collaboration with other Range States. Relevant intergovernmental, international and national organisations are invited to consider collaborating on the Work Programme's implementation.

Action requested:

The meeting is invited to:

- Provide specific comments on the draft work programme.
- Consider the desirability of creating a working group to consider the draft work programme in detail and revise as needed for the meeting's review and subsequent adoption.

**Draft Medium Term International Work Programme
on the Conservation and Management of the Middle-
European Population of the Great Bustard**

2005 – 2010

Introduction

By signing the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the Conservation and Management of the Middle-European Population of the Great Bustard, Signatories endeavour to work closely together to improve the conservation status of Great Bustard throughout its breeding, migratory and wintering range. The MoU emphasises the need for exchanging scientific, technical and legal information to co-ordinate conservation measures and for co-operation with other Range States, appropriate international organizations and recognized scientists.

According to MoU paragraph 8 the Signatory States shall endeavour to adopt a Medium Term International Work Programme for the Great Bustard. This should include (1) subjects for co-operative research and monitoring, (2) measures to implement the MoU and its Action Plan, as well as (3) items for which guidelines are needed to further develop and improve the measures listed in the MoU as well as in international and national work programmes.

The Medium Term International Work Programme is organised around these three main headings. It lists objectives related to the MoU and Action Plan, and suggests a set of activities to achieve those objectives.

Lead countries for the particular activities are indicated along with relevant intergovernmental, international and national organisations that would collaborate on the Work Programme's implementation.

Funding will be needed to support the activities listed in the Work Programme. Multilateral, bilateral and other sources of funding will need to be secured through funding applications prepared by lead countries and collaborators.

It is proposed that the Work Programme be kept under review by the regular meetings of the Signatories.

1. Cooperative research and monitoring

Objective	Priority	Measures to be taken	Time-table ¹	Financial considerations	Lead ²	Collaborators ²
1.1. Synchronised counts are co-ordinated across the borders [Action 6.1.1]	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical experts appointed by the Range States agree on the dates of synchronised counts annually by 1 April. 	2005-ong	n/a		All Range States
1.2. Comparative studies on habitat requirements, effects of habitat changes and causes of decline in different range states are available [Action 6.2.1]	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical experts appointed by the Range States to agree and elaborate on a joint research programme. 	2005	€€€,€€€		All Range States
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement joint research programme. 	2006-ong			Scientific institutes, NGOs, protected area authorities
1.3. Experience in habitat management shared between Range States and results used when revising agro-environmental schemes for the new EU rural development programme period (2007-13) [Actions 6.1.2 and 6.2.3]	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceedings of the 2004 Expert Meeting published. 	2005	€,€€€		
1.4. Effectiveness of different predator control strategies compared and shared amongst experts [Actions 6.2.2 and 6.2.3]	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceedings of the 2004 Expert Meeting published. 	2005	Same as above		
1.5. Effectiveness of captive management programmes in different countries assessed and lessons are shared	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceedings of the 2004 Expert Meeting published. 	2005	Same as above		
1.6. Key personnel and staff have opportunity to exchange	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2nd Expert Meeting organised. 	2006	€€,€€€		Scientific institutions, NGOs,

¹ Dates represent the year the action is to be implemented. On-going actions are indicated by the starting year followed by “-ong”. Actions expected to take several years are indicated by the starting and end year.

² To be filled in according to the offers made and agreed during the First Meeting of Signatories and kept under review.

Objective	Priority	Measures to be taken	Time-table ¹	Financial considerations	Lead ²	Collaborators ²
opportunity to exchange experience [Action 7]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3rd Expert Meeting organised. 	2009			institutions, NGOs, protected area management authorities
1.7. Information on the ecology and conservation of Great Bustard effectively managed and shared within the conservation and research communities [MoU Para. 7]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a Web-based information management system for the MoU with inter alia a register of on-going and completed projects and their outcomes, research reports and other relevant information (see also 2.5 below) 		€€,€€€		All Range States

2. Measures to implement the MoU and Action Plan

Objective	Priority	Measures to be taken	Time-table	Financial considerations	Lead	Collaborators
2.1. All Range States provide the same level of strict legal protection of Great Bustard and its habitat [MoU Para. 4(1) and Actions 1.1.1 and 2]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the status of Great Bustard Range States and identify existing gaps at future Meetings of the Parties. 	2007&2010	€€,€€€		All Range States
2.2. Connectivity of the Pannonic subpopulation increased and the breeding population in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic recovered [Action 5 and MoU Para. 4]	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify recently unoccupied areas to be protected from adverse development in order to increase connectivity. 	2007	€,€€€,€€€		CZ, HU, SK
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reach multilateral agreement on the site network. 	2008			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop plans to improve habitat quality at occupied and recently. 	2009			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop funding applications. 	2009			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce appropriate legal measures and financial incentives to protect these habitats and improve habitat quality there. 	2010			

Objective	Priority	Measures to be taken	Time-table	Financial considerations	Lead	Collaborators
2.3. Status and feasibility of restoring the transboundary populations between Hungary, Romania and Serbia-Montenegro is determined [Action 5 and MoU Para. 4]	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out co-ordinated Great Bustard surveys in the border zone between the three countries and along the border in the vicinity of Salonta, especially in the post-breeding and wintering period. 	2006–2007	€,,€€€		HU, RO, SM
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare a feasibility study on expanding the habitat in these transboundary regions. 	2008	€€,€€€		
2.4. Status of Great Bustard along the border between Bulgaria and Romania is clarified [Action 5 and MoU Para. 4]	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out survey in both countries along the lower section of the Danube River in particular in Dobrudja during the display season. 	2006–2008	€€,€€€		BG, RO
2.5. Wintering Great Bustard populations are adequately protected	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set up an Internet-based reporting system on sightings of Great Bustard in winter to facilitate collection and sharing of information. 	2005	€,,€€€		All Range States
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify other countries about use of colour ring or wing tags and make information about these marking schemes available on the Internet. [Action 6.2.4] 	2005	n/a		AT, (BG), CZ, DE, HU, SK, (RO),
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand radio tracking of Great Bustard, building on existing Spanish and German experience. [Action 6.2.4] 	2006-ong	€€,€€€		DE, AT, HU
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that wintering Great Bustards are protected from any disturbance. [MoU Para. 4(6) and Action 2.2] 	2005	n/a		All Range States
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set up an international inventory of key sites for Great Bustard during migration and winter. [Action 1.1] 	2008	n/a		All Range States
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess potential causes of mortality (e.g. power lines, wind farms, hunting) at sites where Great Bustard occur regularly on migration or in winter and take appropriate measures to remove these threats. [Action 2.3.2] 	2010	€,,€€€		All Range States

3. Issues for which guidelines should be developed

Objective	Priority	Measures to be taken	Timetable	Financial considerations	Lead	Collaborators
3.1. Monitoring results from different countries are comparable [Action 6.1.1]	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop guidelines for monitoring Great Bustard populations. 	2005	€,,€€€ consultancy		All, mainly breeding countries
3.2. Restoration of Great Bustard populations is based on best practices [MoU Para. 4 and Action 4]	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop guidelines on restoration of Great Bustard populations covering the issues of habitat management and restoration, as well as, predator control, captive breeding and release. 	2009	€€,€€€ consultancy		All Range States
3.3. All Range States can apply appropriate strategies to secure successful wintering of Great Bustard [MoU Para. 4(6)]	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop guidelines on species and habitat conservation measures to be implemented at places where wintering of Great Bustards occur based on recommendations of the 1st and 2nd Expert Meetings. 	2008	€,€€€		All Range States
3.4. Risk of collision with power lines and loss of habitat due to infrastructure development and forestry measures is reduced [Actions 1.3, 2.3.2 and 2.3.3]	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing experience in mitigating the impact of infrastructure development and afforestation and publish a best practice guide. 	2007	€,€€€		All Range States