



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

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

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:

Denmark

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

Greenland and the Faroe Islands

Report Compiler

* Name and title:

Peter Kyvsgaard - Head of Section

* Full name of institution:

The Danish Agency for Green Land Use and Aquatic Environment

* Telephone:

+45 51 19 28 90

* Email:

Pekyv@sgav.dk

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)

The most successful aspects of the danish raptor managment is the monitoring systems, achieving positive trends where most populations are now stable or increasing, and ensuring the species are well protected through strengthened conservation measures and effective habitat management.

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

Limited administrative and financial resources, requiring prioritization of efforts towards statutory obligations and other legally mandated conservation and environmental tasks.

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

At present, specific priorities for future implementation have not yet been formally established. Following the recent formation of a new government, policy priorities and resource allocations are currently under review. Future implementation of the MOU and Action Plan is expected to be considered within the broader framework of national biodiversity, nature conservation, and international environmental commitments.

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?

- Yes
 In preparation
 No

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

Due to limited resources and competing conservation priorities, it has not been possible to allocate the necessary capacity to develop a dedicated Raptor Conservation Strategy at this time.

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

- Yes

- Partly
 No

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

Please refer to the section above

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
 Partly
 No
 Not known

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

BEK nr 521 af 25/03/2021 (Bekendtgørelse om fredning af visse dyre- og plantearter og pleje af tilskadekommet vildt)
LBK nr 639 af 26/05/2023 (Bekendtgørelse af lov om jagt og vildtforvaltning)

* 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
 No

Not known

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

BEK nr 521 af 25/03/2021 (Bekendtgørelse om fredning af visse dyre- og plantearter og pleje af tilskadekommet vildt)
LBK nr 639 af 26/05/2023 (Bekendtgørelse af lov om jagt og vildtforvaltning)

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?

- Yes
 No
 In preparation

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

In 2005, a national Action Plan for the Red Kite (*Milvus milvus*) was published by the Danish Ministry of the Environment in collaboration with DOF BirdLife Denmark. This Single-Species Action Plan remains the only current dedicated strategy officially published for a migratory bird of prey in the country.

Provide a copy of the document(s) concerned:

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

<https://sgavmst.dk/media/rtkiu4ga/handlingsplan-for-roed-glente-2005.pdf>

* 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](#)".

- Yes
 No
 Not known

* Please state why not:

Active reintroduction or restocking projects are generally not part of standard conservation practice for migratory birds of prey in Denmark, and there has been no assessed need for such interventions.

However, Denmark has benefited from initiatives in neighboring Sweden and Germany.

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

- Yes
 No
 Not known

* Please state why not:

No permanent supplementary feeding initiatives are currently maintained for birds of prey. Previous experiences were unfavorable as the birds did not generally utilize the food, and with current populations mostly being stable or increasing, there is no biological need. Additionally, establishing such initiatives presents legal and veterinary challenges regarding carcass disposal.

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
 No
 Not known

* 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.

Yes, various measures have been implemented, ranging from smaller interventions to improve nesting sites for species like osprey, to localized habitat improvement trials for little owl. Additionally, the Danish Nature Agency (Naturstyrelsen) has carried out large-scale, comprehensive habitat restoration projects across many of the state's natural areas to support birds of prey and broader biodiversity.

* 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.

- 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?

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
- No
- Not known

- * Please give a brief summary:

Assessments of the threats facing birds of prey are conducted regularly to identify conservation needs. A key baseline is the 2019 Danish Red List, which evaluates specific extinction risks, with an upcoming updated Red List assessment currently in preparation. Additionally, Denmark continuously monitors and tracks these threats through statutory Article 12 reporting under the EU Birds Directive, with the most recent comprehensive status report submitted in 2025 to evaluate population trends and pressures.

- * 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)

- Direct killing and taking
- Collisions and electrocution

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

* 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](#).

Direct killing and taking: Enhanced collaboration between the police and environmental authorities, specifically through a dedicated Raptor Task Force.

Collisions and electrocution: Mitigating infrastructure risks is integrated directly into general environmental planning, ensuring safer placement of installations and the implementation of protective measures along critical flight paths.

Habitat destruction/degradation: Long-term habitat protection is secured through comprehensive environmental planning and systematic nature monitoring to track ecosystem health, detect degradation early, and guide restoration efforts.

* 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
- 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:

Denmark imposes strict environmental assessment requirements on plans and projects that may significantly affect birds of prey or their habitats. Depending on the nature of the proposal, this may involve a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and/or a Natura 2000 appropriate assessment under the Habitats and Birds Directives. Where a project may affect a Natura 2000 site or protected bird species, Danish authorities must apply the precautionary approach embedded in EU nature conservation law. Authorisation may only be granted where it can be established, on the basis of the best available scientific evidence, that the project will not adversely affect the integrity of the protected site, a standard that is regularly applied in Danish administrative and appeals practice.

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?

- Yes
 Partly
 No
 Not known

- * Please give a brief summary:

The conservation of migratory birds of prey is generally integrated into sectoral policies such as agriculture, forestry, energy, transport, tourism, and spatial planning through environmental legislation, impact assessments, and nature conservation requirements. Many industries actively consider potential impacts on protected species and habitats. However, challenges remain, and conflicts can still arise where economic development, infrastructure projects, or land-use changes affect migratory birds of prey and their habitats.

- * 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?

- Yes
 No
 Not knowm

- * Please give a brief summary:

During the reporting period, efforts have been made across government departments and agencies to raise awareness of the conservation needs of migratory birds of prey. This includes the ongoing national raptor task force involving relevant authorities and the police, which facilitates cooperation on combating wildlife crime and improving the protection of birds of prey. In addition, the Danish Nature Agency (Naturstyrelsen) holds regular meetings with the Danish Ornithological Society (DOF/BirdLife Denmark), where issues concerning birds of prey, monitoring, conservation measures, and emerging threats are discussed and communicated to relevant decision-makers and authorities.

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
 No
 Not known

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

Assessments of the status and trends of migratory birds of prey are conducted regularly in Denmark. A key baseline is the 2019 Danish Red List, which evaluates the conservation status and extinction risk of species, with an updated assessment currently in preparation. In addition, Denmark reports regularly under Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive, providing comprehensive assessments of population status, trends, distribution, and pressures affecting bird species, including migratory raptors. The most recent reporting cycle was completed in 2025 and serves as an important source of information for conservation planning and management.

Several notable population trends have been identified during recent assessments. Among the most significant increases are those of the White-tailed Eagle, which has continued its successful recovery and expansion following recolonisation of Denmark, and the Peregrine Falcon, which has increased as a breeding species after a long period of absence. Positive trends have also been recorded for species such as the Red Kite, whose breeding population has grown substantially over recent decades.

In contrast, some migratory raptors continue to face challenges. The Hen Harrier remains scarce as a breeding species in Denmark, while species associated with open farmland habitats, including the Montagu's Harrier, have experienced long-term pressures

Please provide a copy of any relevant documents:

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

https://dce.au.dk/fileadmin/dce.au.dk/Udgivelser/Videnskabelige_rapporter_600-699/SR672.pdf

* 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
- No
- Not known

* Please give a brief summary:

Denmark operates several systematic and coordinated monitoring programmes relevant to birds of prey. These include standardized bird ringing activities, migration counts at key migration sites, species-specific monitoring and conservation projects (including for eagles and Montagu's Harrier), as well as government-funded monitoring programmes that contribute to reporting under EU nature directives

Please provide a copy of any relevant documents:

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

<https://novana.au.dk/fugle>
<https://dk.birdmigrationatlas.dk/arter>

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

- Yes
- No
- Not known

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

Systematic raptor migration monitoring in Denmark is mainly implemented through NOVANA (national framework) and standardized station-level protocols rather than one unified national raptor-specific protocol document.

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

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

<https://novana.au.dk/fugle>

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

- Yes
- No
- Not known

* Please state why not:

While coordination and consultation exist, there is no formalised, multi-stakeholder governance process that explicitly sets shared research priorities for birds of prey conservation.

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

- Yes
- No
- Not known

* Please state why not:

It is assessed that establishing dedicated, species-specific platforms exclusively for birds of prey is unnecessary and would not represent an optimal allocation of resources. Knowledge, data, and experience regarding raptor conservation are already effectively exchanged through existing, broader environmental fora and established networks within general biodiversity and nature management.

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
- No
- Not known

* 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
- No
- Not known

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
- No
- Not known

* 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
- No
- Not known

* 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).

- Yes
- No
- Not known

* Please state why not:

Denmark has not provided new resources specifically earmarked for migratory birds of prey during the reporting period. However, broader biodiversity, habitat, and ecosystem conservation measures have been implemented that also benefit migratory birds of prey alongside other species.

* 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.

- Yes
- No
- Not known

* Please state why not:

Denmark has not received new resources specifically targeted at migratory birds of prey during the reporting period. As a high-income country, conservation measures are primarily financed internally or by the EU-budget, and funding is generally directed towards broader biodiversity and ecosystem conservation objectives.

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
- No
- Not known

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

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Contact

alexandra.caron-strehlow@un.org