



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme



## THIRD MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES OF THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE MIDDLE-EUROPEAN POPULATION OF THE GREAT BUSTARD (*Otis tarda*)

8-12 April 2013, Szarvas, Hungary

CMS/GB/MoS3/Doc.5.2  
Agenda Item 5.0

### OVERVIEW REPORT

(Prepared by the Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary)

#### 1.0 Introduction

1. Pursuant to paragraph 9 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the Conservation and Management of the Middle-European Population of the Great Bustard, the Secretariat shall prepare an overview report compiled on the basis of all information at its disposal pertaining to the Great Bustard. It shall communicate this report to all Signatories, signing Organisations and to all other Range States.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 6 of the MoU, Signatories of the MoU that are also Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) should in their national report to the CMS Conference of the Parties make specific reference to activities undertaken in relation to this Agreement. At the same time, MoU signatories not Parties to the Convention shall be invited to prepare, after the adoption of their national work programme, a report on the implementation of the MoU both of which they should then communicate to the Secretariat.

3. By letters dated 20 February and 10 September 2008, the Secretariat provided to all MoU signatory Range States, non-signatory Range States and signing organisations the reporting guidance for Parts I and II of the Great Bustard Action Plan adopted at the First Meeting of the Signatories. As of 2 April 2013, the following Signatories had submitted their national reports to the Secretariat: **Austria, Germany, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, the Moldova, Romania, Slovak Republic** and the **Ukraine**. Finally, information available to the Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary through bilateral communication or on the Internet was also used.

4. The structure of this report follows that of the reporting guidelines. Corresponding action points from the Action Plan are indicated in square brackets. This report does not repeat the information provided in the national reports. It only summarizes the main issues.

#### 2.0 Status of Great Bustard in the Agreement Area and beyond

5. At the time of writing this report six breeding (**Austria, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovak Republic** and the **Ukraine**) and four non-breeding range states have submitted their reports.

6. A summary of available population estimates are presented in **Error! Reference source not found.** Within the agreement area, trends vary: some recovery can be observed, **Germany**, and in some parts of **Austria** and **Hungary** as a result of intensive conservation measures affecting the core populations. Some of these populations are transboundary and have a positive influence on the situation in **Slovakia** and **Romania**, where conservation efforts are also taking place to maintain or even improve habitat for the Great Bustard. The wintering population is increasing in **Slovakia** (breeding in **Austria** and **Hungary**), and in **Romania** (breeding mainly in **Hungary**), and some breeding birds have also appeared in the latter two countries. However, numbers of resident birds are declining in **Serbia**. The species is not regularly observed in **Croatia**, the **Czech Republic**, **Greece** and the **Republic of Moldova**, with casual (not even annual) observations referring to single individuals or small flocks mainly in the migration season or in winter. This is probably partly due to conservation efforts in **Austria** and **Hungary** to keep the populations in place even in harsh winters. The **Ukrainian** breeding population has been stable over the last 10 years. However, the wintering population in the **Ukraine** originating from **Russia** has declined by 30-40% over the last 10 years.

7. Within Europe, but outside of the agreement area, there are possible increases in **Spain** and **Portugal**, but the previous fluctuating trend has changed to a rapid decrease in **Russia** during recent years.

### 3.0 Implementation of the Action Plan

8. *Protected Areas [AP 1.1]*: The Action Plan requires responsible authorities to designate key breeding sites and key migration and wintering sites throughout the range of the species as protected areas and manage them according to the species' requirements. This includes also areas that are essential for the re-establishment of the species. In the breeding range, **Austria**, **Germany**, **Hungary** and **Slovakia** have reported that the leks and the overall majority of the breeding and wintering areas are already protected as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under the Birds Directive. Coverage by SPAs is reported as low in **Romania**. However, a relatively smaller part of the Great Bustard habitats are protected under national law in **Germany** and **Hungary**. In **Ukraine**, less than 10% of the display, breeding, stop-over and wintering sites are covered by protected areas, but two protected areas were established during the last 4 years in the western part of Autonomous Republic Crimea and one protected area of local importance was established in 2011 in the eastern part of AR Crimea. There are plans to eliminate gaps in protected area coverage in the Karalar area, too.

9. In **Austria**, a LIFE project ran from 2005-2010 and two cross-border projects were also implemented in this period. Since 2010, a LIFE+ project focuses on the main threats to the Great Bustard, in particular the burial of power lines. A Rural Development and a Leader project are also running.

10. The **Austrian** agri-environmental scheme has also contributed significantly to the increasing trend. In **Germany**, extensive farming is promoted, windbreaks have been removed and predators are managed in order to enhance the habitat for Great Bustards. In **Hungary**, most of the nationally protected Great Bustard habitat is owned by the state and managed by the national park directorates or contracted out to farmers for management compatible with Great Bustard conservation. This area was increased by 855 ha in the reporting period, but there would be need for more. Natura 2000 payments continue on

grasslands, but still do not exist for arable land, however, agri-environmental payments cover some ploughlands, too, since 2009. An agri-environmental programme for the protection of Great Bustard is also implemented in one of the two areas in **Slovakia**, and agreements have been made with hunters and farmers. Although there has been significant progress in relation to the habitat of extant populations, the conservation of currently unoccupied but suitable habitats appear to be more problematic, but some progress also can be reported here. In **Germany** and **Hungary**, agricultural extensification schemes exist outside presently occupied Great Bustard habitats. The **Czech Republic** reported that a former military airport is managed every year to ensure adequate habitat for Great Bustards, and the future (2014-2020) agri-environmental scheme is also discussed in light of the requirements of Great Bustard. The **Republic of Moldova** expanded the steppe vegetation in Bugeac steppe, founded the Orhei National Park, and created its ecological network. **Romania** took measures to reduce infrastructure development in the area where Great Bustards are re-establishing themselves. **Slovakia** manages (agri-environmental scheme, crop composition, planting of windbreaks, exclusion of visitors) around 2000 ha for the Great Bustard, and the species re-appeared as a breeder during the reporting period, which led to strict protection of the nesting site. In the **Ukraine**, presently unoccupied habitats are mapped but not protected or managed.

11. In the *non-breeding period* the Middle-European population migrates only occasionally and often only short distances, and conservation efforts focus on preventing such migration. This makes the designation of protected areas for migration stopover sites and wintering grounds difficult, and in some cases it may be more practical to devise more flexible, ad hoc conservation measures than site designation. On the other hand, the majority of the population from Saratov, **Russia** migrates regularly to Crimea, **Ukraine**. The coverage of Great Bustard habitats is still rather small and there are large gaps in Kerch and Tarkhankut peninsulas (AR Crimea), Kherson'ska district and southwest Zaporizhzhia district..However, restoration of degraded steppe areas has taken place. A guideline has been developed for infrastructure development and afforestation projects in Great Bustard sites.

12. *Habitat quality outside of protected areas [AP 1.2]:* The Action Plan calls for maintenance or improvement of habitat quality outside of protected areas. It calls for extensification, introduction of appropriate crop rotation, including alfalfa and oilseed rape, and set-aside schemes supported by incentives provided under agri-environmental schemes. In **Austria, Germany, Hungary** and **Slovakia** only a small part of the suitable habitats are left unprotected (16.4% in **Hungary**). Agricultural extensification schemes, not specific to, but supportive of Great Bustard conservation are in place in some Great Bustard inhabited areas outside protected areas in **Austria, Germany** and **Hungary**. In **Hungary**, on lands which are not involved in the agri-environmental scheme and the breeding of Great Bustard (or other strictly protected bird) is detected, a local and temporary restriction of the land use can be implemented (or as compensation for damage caused by Great Bustards in winter crops). Winter rape cultivation was also supported by Germany in a few cases in wintering areas. The 2007 abolition of set-asides on the EU level is still a problem. In the **Ukraine**, an NGO rented two sites on a long term in AR Crimea to manage them for the Great Bustard.

13. *Preventing habitat fragmentation [AP 1.3]:* The Action Plan calls for prevention of afforestation and making infrastructure development, in particular construction of new roads, highways, railways and irrigation, subject of environmental impact assessment (EIA). In general, larger projects and projects within protected areas are subject of EIA, but smaller projects on unprotected areas are not. Moreover, there are very limited chances to consider flyways between protected areas or habitat loss due to the fact that Great Bustards shun

infrastructure sites (such as wind farms). Transboundary effects are also difficult to take into consideration in its entirety (e.g. wind farms in **Austria** may affect the transboundary population with **Hungary**). In addition, EIAs only inform, but do not bind the competent authorities in their decision whether they approve or reject a proposal. Some countries (**Germany**, **Hungary** and the **Ukraine**) have reported on infrastructure developments that took place in Great Bustard habitats during the reporting period. These include: wind farms on flyways (**Germany**), gravel pit, wind farms, dirt roads, irrigation infrastructure and afforestation (**Hungary**), gas pipeline and power line (**Ukraine**).

14. *Protection from hunting [AP 2.1]:* The Action Plan calls for prohibiting any hunting where it is considered necessary at the time Great Bustards are expected to occur in the area. These restrictions should be then strictly enforced. Already the first overview report noted that the species is officially protected in all countries either as a (strictly) protected species or as a game bird with a year-round closed season. In **Austria**, most hunting activities are suspended voluntarily at the breeding sites. In **Germany**, some restrictions are in force in nationally protected areas to prevent disturbance of Great Bustards. In **Hungary**, the national park directorates hold the hunting right and organise hunting in the most important Great Bustard sites, but in all Great Bustard sites measures have been taken to reduce disturbance from hunting during the display season and the wintering season of Great Bustards (e.g. restriction of Roe Deer hunting in May). **Slovakia** also introduced restrictions on hunting for the first half of the year in the SPAs holding Great Bustards. Illegal killing is still considered critical in the **Ukraine**.

15. *Preventing disturbance [AP 2.2]:* The Action Plan calls for preventing disturbance of display and breeding sites through restricting or controlling access and adoption of the timing and techniques of land management. The **Austrian** agri-environmental scheme (ÖPUL) helps to reduce disturbance from farming **Germany** and **Hungary** reported visitor management as well as restrictions on air traffic, farming and hunting in protected areas. Surveillance officers and awareness activities also play a role in enforcing legal restrictions and agreements in these countries as well as in **Romania**. In **Slovakia**, access is restricted to SPAs and Memoranda of Understanding have been concluded with hunting societies. Protection of breeding and wintering sites from disturbance is carried out in protected areas in the Ukraine, and in the two sites rented by an NGO.

16. *Preventing predation [AP 2.3.1]:* The Action Plan provides for the control of foxes and feral dogs in areas where Great Bustard occurs regularly. However, other predators have been also mentioned such as Badger, Stone Marten (and possibly other mustelids), Raccoon-dog, Raccoon, Wild Boar, White-tailed Eagle, Imperial Eagle, Marsh Harrier, Goshawk, Hooded Crow and Raven. Control measures are taken in Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia, but predator control is at best only partially effective in these countries. In Germany enclosures of 10-20 hectares are applied to exclude foxes and give higher chance for successful breeding. The 400 ha enclosure at Dévaványa, Hungary is still very important for the local population, but the electric fences used experimentally in Hungary did not prove very efficient. In addition to intensified hunting, other control measures include trapping and transporting away of Goshawks, trapping and killing of corvids (Hungary) as well as better preparation of juvenile Great Bustards before releasing (Germany). Diversionary feeding of raptors (Germany, Hungary) also provides better opportunities for shooting of huntable species. Habitat management can also be an important factor in reducing Wild Boar populations. No measures against predators other than reporting on predation have been taken in the Ukraine.

17. *Adopting measures for power lines [AP 2.3.2]:* According to the Action Plan, existing lines which cross Great Bustard areas should be buried or marked prominently. New lines should not be built across Great Bustard areas. The national reports did not mention the construction of new power lines. During this reporting period Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia carried out some major projects to reduce collision of birds with power lines. In Austria, 47 km of medium-voltage power lines have been buried and 157 km marked from 2005-2012. Several medium-voltage power lines were buried and 6 km were marked with bird diverters in Germany, nearly 100 km have been buried and additional power lines marked with diverters in Hungary. However, monitoring of marked power lines in Hungary raised serious doubts as to the efficiency of this measure. A total of 30 km of power lines have been marked to enhance visibility in Slovakia. In Croatia, the distribution company monitors and reports on bird casualties and the problematic sections will be converted in a bird-friendly way. Targeted research has just recently begun in the Ukraine to identify the most dangerous sections of power lines.

18. *Compensatory measures [AP 2.3.3]:* According to the Action Plan any activities which will create new loss or degradation of Great Bustard habitat or longer term disturbance of the species should be compensated by appropriate measures. No loss to infrastructure was reported from Austria, only to intensified cultivation. Germany reported on the loss of 450 ha in an SPA and on 15 thousand hectares of flyways and former habitat all lost due to wind farms. Compensations included habitat improvement on 112 ha and the building of two fox-free enclosures. However, large areas are also lost to maize production, for which there is no compensation as it is an agricultural activity. No significant habitat loss was reported in Hungary, only the degradation of smaller areas due to natural succession. About 20 thousand hectares of Great Bustard habitat were lost in Slovakia, mostly before EU accession. Converting grassland into arable land was compensated for by applying agri-environmental measures (changing for crops more favourable for Great Bustard).

19. *Possession and trade [AP 3.0]:* The Action Plan requires that the collection of eggs or chicks, the possession of and trade in the birds and their eggs should be strictly prohibited and the restrictions controlled. The general species conservation measures are in place in all countries that have sent a report to the Secretariat as this requirement is also covered by CITES, the Bern and Bonn Conventions and the EU Birds Directive. Exceptions are only possible for conservation purposes. Germany reported on an unsolved case where a male bustard is suspected to have been killed as an injured bird. In the Ukraine, enforcement is reported as weak, and there is information on illegal collection and trade of eggs and chicks for keeping in private zoos.

20. *Captive breeding in emergency situations [AP 4.1]:* The Action Plan provides for the possibility of taking eggs into artificial incubation from threatened nests if it is not possible to guarantee their survival on the field. Captive management of threatened nests continues to form part of the conservation measures of Great Bustard only in Germany, Hungary and Russia. Chicks from the egg rescue project in Russia are provided for the UK reintroduction programme.

21. *Reintroduction [AP 4.2]:* The Action Plan requires that reintroduction actions should be undertaken only at those sites where feasibility studies (following the IUCN guidelines for re-introductions) have been carried out with success.

22. There were no attempts reported to reintroduce the species within the MoU area, even though at the First Meeting of the Signatories, Bulgaria, Romania, Republic of Moldova and the Ukraine have announced their intention of starting a reintroduction programme. **Romania** reported that they have discussed the possibility of a reintroduction project with **Russia** and **Moldova**. A guidelines has been developed for reintroduction and release programmes.

23. *Monitoring of the success of release programmes [AP 4.3]:* The Action Plan requires that the survival of chicks bred in captivity and of chicks hatched from artificially bred clutches should be closely monitored, as well as the survival and breeding performance of adults released into the wild. Release programmes should be permanently reassessed and discontinued if birds are failing to survive under natural conditions. Release programmes form integral part of the conservation of Great Bustard in Germany and Hungary. In Germany, annual survival rates until the next spring varied between 7.1 and 59.1 % in the reporting period with an average of 29.8% and an increasing tendency. The success rate was 25-37% in Hungary till the stage of repatriation. A guidelines has been developed for reintroduction and release programmes.

24. *Cross-border conservation measures [AP 5.0]:* The Action Plan requires that Signatories harmonize their legal instruments in order to conserve and manage Great Bustards more efficiently. Populations which are shared by two or more countries should be the subject of bi- or multilateral programmes to ensure that there is appropriate coordination of national surveys, research, monitoring and conservation activities. The **Czech Republic** cooperates especially with **Austria** in exchanging information of movements of birds and experience on habitat management. **Germany** participates in international projects (e.g. the **British** reintroduction project), but their population is isolated from other countries.

25. The West Pannonian population is located on the area of 4 countries (**Austria, Hungary, Slovakia** and **Czech Republic**), however most of the birds are resident in **Austria** and **Hungary**. The protection of the West Pannonian GB population is implemented by the 4 countries, with the co-ordination of **Austria**. Within this framework the co-operation is very tight, an INTERREG project has also been completed in the region. A project also has been completed successfully within the framework of the **Hungary-Romania** Cross-Border Co-operation Programme 2007-2013, with synchronized censuses, study visits and monitoring organized regularly. Several visits were organized to the Mokrin region (SRB) from **Hungary** and to the neighbouring Hungarian sites from **Serbia**. A Rafford Grant project is going on, which aims at creating archive and online database, doing more intensive monitoring in **Serbia**, but also informing the main stakeholders (farmers and hunters) in and around the Mokrin region.

26. *Monitoring of population size and population trends [AP 6.1.1]:* According to the Action Plan, efforts should be made to monitor the basic parameters of all Great Bustard populations, such as size and trends, by applying methods which lead to comparable results, at all breeding and wintering sites. Monitoring of the breeding populations can be considered complete in Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia, but less comprehensive in the Ukraine. The current status of the species is much better known in Romania than previously, at least along the border to Hungary, but uncertainties as to Great Bustards survive remain in the southern part of the country. The few observation data that exist are collected precisely in Croatia, the Czech Republic and Greece. A guideline has been developed for monitoring of Great Bustard.

27. *Monitoring of the effects of habitat management [AP 6.1.2], comparative ecological studies [AP 6.2.1] and investigation of factors limiting breeding success [AP 6.2.3]:* The Action Plan requires that studies should be carried out on the effects of habitat protection measures, implementation of agro-environmental regulations, etc. These studies should preferably be done at sites where the population has been well monitored for a number of years. The **Czech Republic** monitored the former military airport managed as permanent grassland. In **Germany**, habitat monitoring includes studies on plant communities, invertebrates, small mammals and breeding birds. Abundance and availability of invertebrates is also studied from stomachs of dead birds. The studies indicate that extensification and habitat management has positive influence on biodiversity, but also increase the number of small mammals which may attract predators. Comparative ecological studies in **Germany** pointed out the importance of extensive agriculture (even more attractive than natural steppe) and the importance of predator management. The main limiting factor of breeding success is predation. In **Hungary**, studies focused on the efficiency of the agri-environmental programme, the influence of human disturbance and conspecifics on display site selection, and effects of fragmentation at the Mosoni-sík. In **Slovakia**, a publication summarised the effects of grassland conversion on the Great Bustard population. The **Ukraine** reported on a study on the interrelation of wintering birds and the amount of snow and ice cover. Other studies pointed out the main factors limiting breeding and wintering success, which are insufficient habitat management, taking of eggs and chicks, poaching, disturbance and poor coverage of wintering sites with protected areas.

28. *Promotion of studies on mortality factors [AP 6.2.2]:* According to the Action Plan all individuals found dead should be examined for the causes of mortality. This, together with field studies and monitoring of marked individuals, should help to identify the direct or indirect impact of land use on Great Bustard mortality. Mortality factors of casualties during the 20<sup>th</sup> century have been analysed in **Croatia**. There is detailed mortality monitoring in **Austria, Germany, Hungary** and **Slovakia**, but monitoring of marked and radio-tracked individuals is only implemented in **Germany** (apart from some ad hoc tracking in Hungary), where conclusions have been drawn and action taken to reduce the major mortality factors (conservation and awareness campaigns on power lines and baler twines). Studies from all countries indicate the importance of collision with power lines, predation and agricultural works.

29. *Studies on migration [AP 6.2.4]:* According to the Action Plan studies should be made to identify the migration routes and resting habitats of the Great Bustard and especially of key sites along such routes and in wintering areas. Ringing and studies involving satellite telemetry should be planned and implemented for those purposes. Local or short distance movements of birds are well understood in all countries. However, long distance movements and migration between populations are poorly known in the absence of marking and radiotelemetry studies with the exception of Germany, where long distance migration to Western Europe was detected on two consecutive winters after a lack of this phenomenon for more than twenty years. German experts also carried out satellite tracking of birds in Russia, which migrated to the Ukraine. The satellite-tracked female marked in May 2006 is still alive and the transmitter is still working. One harsh winter she moved further east from the Kiskunság to the Dévaványa area where conditions were less harsh. The relative lack of telemetry reflects the sensitivity of the species to capturing (especially of adults) and the lack of experience and relatively limited financial means. An observation reporting site has been created and hosted by MME/Birdlife Hungary (<http://www.tuzok.mme.hu/>) but is not used by sufficient observers.

30. *Training of staff working in conservation bodies [AP 7.0]:* The Action Plan recommends that personnel working regularly in Great Bustard areas (agronomists, biologists, wardens, etc.) should receive specific training on Great Bustard matters, especially their biological characteristics and living requirements, legal matters, census techniques and management practices. Also, communication and cooperation between the various sectors involved (e.g., farmer, hunter and nature conservation organisations, tourist companies and state authorities) should be intensified. Staff working for the conservation bodies is fairly stable. Hence formal training plays relatively minor role, but informal and formal interactions of staff (e.g. under the various projects, including crossborder projects and the British reintroduction project, as well as in national working groups) played an important training function.

31. *Increasing awareness of the need to protect Great Bustards and their habitat [AP 8.0]:* The Action Plan recommends using Great Bustard as a flagship species to protect steppes, dry grasslands and suitable agricultural landscapes. Furthermore, farmers, shepherds, the general public and decision-makers should be subject of targeted information campaigns to secure their collaboration and adopt their management practices to the species' requirements. Agri-environmental programmes are also very important in raising awareness among farmers. The species maintains a high profile in the countries where it breeds. The LIFE and cross border projects implemented in Austria, Hungary and Slovakia have contributed significantly to raising awareness and numerous activities were carried out in Germany, too.

32. *Economic measures [AP 9.0]:* The Action Plan recommends developing economic activities which are not harmful to the Great Bustard to compensate land users for any damage they may experience as a result of conservation activities. Agri-environmental measures are the main mechanism to compensate farmers in the EU Member States. The 2004 and 2007 EU enlargement has significantly expanded the number of range states where these measures are applicable. No economic incentives were reported from other range states. In the Czech Republic, the management of permanent grassland was paid by the Ministry of the Environment, but an agri-environmental scheme is also planned.

#### **4.0 Evaluation**

33. Based on the synthesis of the national reports and other available information the following achievements can be recognized:

- (a) Most of the achievements recognized in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> overview reports were sustained.
- (b) Transboundary collaboration between Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Serbia and Romania has intensified thanks to several projects.

34. During this reporting period, also welcome development can be recognized in relation to reducing the mortality caused by power lines in the EU Member States thanks to several EU funded projects and in relation to applying compensatory measures for habitat loss as a result of the Natura 2000 regulations.



35. On the other hand, the following issues are still of high concern:
- (a) The most important Great Bustard breeding habitats and regular wintering sites should be designated protected throughout the range;
  - (b) Predation seems to be one of the major risks presenting a difficult challenge throughout the range, where international exchange of experience may be important;
  - (c) Observational and modeling data suggest that the effectiveness of habitat conservation measures is scale and location dependent, which has implications for the roll-out and funding of agri-environmental measures. The new Natura 2000 compensatory payments for obligatory restrictions present new, alternative opportunities, but the prescriptions can be more detailed and flexible in voluntary schemes; the 2007 abolition of set-asides on the EU level is still a problem which should be addressed in the CAP-reform (greening).
  - (d) The facultative migratory behaviour of the Central European population remain to pose a challenge in terms of preparedness in potential wintering countries, even though long-distance migrations have been mostly prevented in the last ten years in the Carpathian Basin;
  - (e) The increasing frequency of extreme weather events (e.g. extreme drought, floods) requires developing new strategies for the Middle European population and underlines the importance of international exchange of expertise, as well as of maintaining and possibly improving the existing facilities for captive breeding and release programs, which may also assist to reintroduction programs if they become necessary;
  - (f) Measures to reduce collision with power lines and other harmful infrastructure need to be taken in the most important Great Bustard habitats as a high priority; and
  - (g) The most critical knowledge gaps need to be addressed in the next Medium-Term International Work Program.

**Action requested:**

The Meeting is requested to:

- a. Provide specific comments on the draft overview report. Take note and discuss the findings and proposals of the Scientific Symposium, if any, which are or might be related to the Signatories' implementation and trends in Great Bustard populations in the reporting period, in order to decide on their inclusion.
- b. Revise as needed for the meeting's review, especially Table 1 thereof, for the subsequent adoption.
- c. Adopt the final version of the Overview Report with amendments thereof.

**Table 1. Status of Great Bustard in Europe**

Country	Number of Birds				Trend / Status	Source
	1994	2004	2008	2012		
Albania	-	?	?	?	Irregular winter visitor	
Austria	50-60	107-140	167-183	213-253	Recovering breeding population	<a href="http://www.grosstrappe.at/indexe.html">http://www.grosstrappe.at/indexe.html</a> and National Report 2013
Bulgaria	10-15	0-10	0-10	?	Possibly extinct, with sightings in the early 2000s	<a href="http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760">http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760</a>
Croatia	-	-	-	-	Irregular winter visitor, 3 observations in 2000s	National Report 2013
Czech Republic	10-20	1-6	-	-	Extinct, 4 observations between since September 2008	National Report 2013
Germany	130	85	104	123	Recovering breeding population	National Report 2013
Greece	-	-	-	-	A bit more than 20 observations since 1918, the last in 2004-2006	National Report 2013
Hungary	1,100-1,300	1,3	1397	1555	Recovering but recently declining breeding population	National Report 2013
Macedonia	-	?	?	?		National Report 2008
Moldova	2-3	0	0	0	Possibly extinct, the last observation in 2001	Verbal report from the representative of Moldova at the 1st Meeting of the Signatories; National Report 2013
Portugal	1	1,161	1,355	1893	Possible increase recently	Alonso and Palacín 2010, <a href="http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760">http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760</a> (Figure for 2004 revised based on Pinto and Rocha 2006)
Romania	10-15	?	?	9	Breeding again near Hungarian population, non-breeding population as well	National Report 2013
Russia	8,000-10,000	8,000-10,000	8,000-10,000	8,000-12,000	Population probably rapidly declining	<a href="http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760">http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760</a>
Serbia and Montenegro	8-10	30-36	35-38	?	Declining breeding population	Personal communication
Slovakia	25-30	10	0-3	0-2	Breeding again in one year, increasing wintering population from Austria and Hungary	National Report 2013
Spain	13500-14000	23,3	22,768-24,493	29,400-34,300	Possible increase recently	Alonso and Palacín 2010, <a href="http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760">http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760</a>

Country	Number of Birds				Trend / Status	Source
	1994	2004	2008	2012		
Turkey	800-3,000	700-1,200	764-1,250	400-1000	Decreasing	Özbagdatli & Tavares 2006; <a href="http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760">http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/speciesfactsheet.php?id=2760</a>
U.K.	0	0	10-20	?	Ongoing reintroduction	Goriup pers com 2007
Ukraine	300-400	640-850	260-340	520-680	Stable (possible misunderstanding in numbers in reports?)	National Report 2013
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,945-29,983</b>	<b>35,600-38,500</b>	<b>34,8604-39,183</b>	<b>42,113-51815</b>		