



# 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:

Germany

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

None

---

### Report Compiler

\* Name and title:

Dr. Jasmina Stahmer

\* Full name of institution:

Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN - Bundesamt für Naturschutz)

\* Telephone:

+49 228 84911437

\* Email:

jasmina.stahmer@bfn.de

---

### Designated Contact Point for the MOU

(if different from Report Compiler)

Name and title of designated Contact Point:

Dr. Berit Gewert

Full name of institution:

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN – Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Klimaschutz, Naturschutz und nukleare Sicherheit)

Mailing address:

Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, 53175 Bonn, Germany

Telephone:

+49 228 99305 2632

Email:

berit.gewert@bmukn.bund.de

---

## 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 generally stable to increasing population trends of the species listed in the MoU, as well as the fact that the areas listed in the Annex are mostly protected for the benefit of the species in question, indicate the effectiveness of the conservation regime and the action plans.

\* The successful reintroduction of bearded vultures in the Alpine region to date—which is also taking place in Germany—gives reason to hope for a permanent reestablishment.

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

The list of sites in Annex 3 of the MoU includes, for EU member states, not only the SPAs designated for raptors, among other species, but also all IBAs where raptors are qualifying species. The list of sites for Germany thus comprises over 900 sites, with many of them being both SPAs and IBAs—though not identical. This makes the list very confusing and prevents a quick overview.

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

\* Effective protection of listed areas and ensure that these lists are up to date.

\* Harmonization of monitoring programmes.

### **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 title and scope of the strategy or equivalent document, and summarise the current status of its implementation or preparation (as appropriate):

The Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) already gives a substantial and widespread frame for Bird Protection in Germany, including protection of raptors and owls. This directive gives the scope for the essential activities of the action plan as far as species protection and as far as habitat conservation is concerned. Since the end of the last century, the implementation of the Birds Directive has considerably improved in Germany. So e.g. a “Natura2000” barometer of the European Commission shows since approximately two decennia, that Germany has designated sufficiently the appropriate bird sites as Special Protected Areas (SPAs) under the Birds Directive, these SPAs are part of the EU Network of protected sites called “Natura 2000”.

Provide a copy of the document(s) concerned:

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

The Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30th November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds” is published in the official EU languages: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2009/147/oj/eng>  
The following webpage contains an overview of the Natura 2000 sites of the EU:  
<https://natura2000.eea.europa.eu/#>

\* 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:

Most of the listed activities are addressed.  
In general, area related nature conservation measures are in the responsibility of the 16 German federal states (called the “Länder”). However, an involvement of the German Länder to ask for existing measures was not possible for this report, because the deadline was too short to allow a sufficient coordination with the 16 German Länder.

## **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
- Parly
- No
- Not known

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

Legal statutes concerned are the Federal Nature Conservation Act (BNatSchG), the Regulation on Species Conservation (BArtSchV), the EU Birds Directive, and the EU Council Regulation No 338/97. The Federal Nature Conservation Act covers all European Bird Species under a special protection (see EU Bird List [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/eu\\_species/index\\_en.htm](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/eu_species/index_en.htm)) under a special protection. After § 44 (1) no 1 BNatSchG it is prohibited to "pursue, capture, injure or kill wild animals of specially protected species, or to take from the wild, damage or destroy their developmental stages." Nearly all domestic bird of prey species and a considerable number of other raptors too are additionally covered by a stricter protection. This includes all species of Annex A and B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 as well as a few raptor/vulture species strictly protected by the BArtSchV.

- \* 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:

§ 4 of the Regulation on Species Conservation (BArtSchV) lists all methods, which are prohibited. This includes the use of poison (§ 4 (3) No 6 BArtSchV)

## 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:

- *Milvus milvus*, national plan currently under development
- *Falco subbuteo*, national plan currently under development

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

- \* Since 2021 the Bavarian Association for Bird and Nature Conservation LBV released annually two Bearded Vultures into the wild in Berchtesgaden National Park in southwestern Bavaria. The species had been eradicated in Germany over 140 years ago. The released birds originate from breeding centers as Richard-Faust-Zentrum (Austria), Zoo Ostrava (Czech Republic), Helsinki Zoo (Finland), Alpenzoo Innsbruck (Austria) and the Bearded Vulture Captive Breeding Centre of Guadalentin (Spain). The reintroductions in Germany are part of the international cooperation for the reintroduction of the Bearded Vulture in the Alps with first releases in 1986.
- \* Since 2017 106 young Ural Owls have been released in north-eastern Bavaria (Naturpark Steinwald, Hessenreuther Wald and southern Fichtelgebirge). The birds originate from zoos in Europe.

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

- Yes  
 No  
 Not known

\* Please state why not:

---

The focus is on a self-sustaining population with a natural food supply.

## 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.*

Article 6(1) of the EU Habitats Directive requires Member States to establish the necessary conservation measures and, where appropriate, to draw up management plans. Article 3 and 4 (1) and (2) of the Birds Directive corresponds to the provisions of Article 6(1) of the Habitats Directive with similar provisions which apply to Special Protection Areas (SPAs). This stipulates that Member States shall take the necessary measures to “maintain or restore a sufficient diversity and area of habitats” for all wild bird species native to the European territory of the Member States. Depending on the species the measures aim to reduce disturbance, avoid degradation or regulate harmful development.

The German national report under Art. 12 of the EU Birds Directive identifies 77 threats to the species regularly occurring in Germany listed in the annex to the MoU. Necessary measures were specified for each species, for the honey buzzard alone, for example, there are 32 measures listed. The measures range from adapting land management practices (agriculture and forestry) and reducing disturbances to supporting initiatives outside Germany. The most important measures aim to preserve breeding habitats with sufficient food availability and to reduce mortality (for example, by adapting or regulating renewable energy facilities or by controlling invasive alien species).

The National Species Recovery Programme (nAHP) is intended to support projects that implement measures to permanently protect species and their habitats and improve their conservation status. The funding programme focuses on the protection of species that are affected by the expansion of renewable energies. For example there are currently running projects for *Clanga pomarina* (<https://www.bfn.de/projektsteckbriefe/gemeinsam-fuer-den-schreiadler-ein-umfassendes-artenhilfsprogramm-fuer>), *Milvus milvus* (<https://www.bfn.de/projektsteckbriefe/erberos-erfassung-und-bewertung-des-erhaltungszustandes-von-rotmilan>) and *Circus aeruginosus* (<https://www.bfn.de/projektsteckbriefe/artenhilfsprogramm-kulturlandschaft-fuer-die-rohrweihe-im-kreis-warendorf-klaro>).

\* 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](mailto: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:

On national level, threats and measures for raptor bird species (Annex I, Annex II or trigger species) are listed in the report under Art .12 of the EU Birds Directive or in the national red lists of endangered species of flora and fauna (see <https://www.bfn.de/rote-listen-tiere-pflanzen-und-pilze>).

For EU Natura 2000 sites, in addition to the obligation to implement conservation measures in the special protected areas (s. Art. 6(1) of the EU Habitats Directive), the second key obligation under the Habitats Directive for member states is to take measures to avoid significant disturbance or damage to the habitats and species for which the sites were designated (see Art. 6(2) of the Habitats Directive). Threats and pressures have been identified for relevant species occurring in SPA's including raptor species. Management planning for these sites aims to preserve or restore a favorable conservation status of the species.

\* 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](#).*

The most important measures for the benefit of most of the raptor species under the MoU's Annex occurring in Germany addressing these three pressures include:

- Refraining from mowing, grazing, and other similar agricultural activities, such as burning (including habitat restoration or enhancement)
- Regulation of the use of natural and synthetic fertilizers and chemicals in agricultural production (crop farming and livestock production)
- Adjustment/Change in Forest Management and Utilization Practices
- Regulation of the construction and operation of renewable energy facilities (excluding hydropower and water withdrawal activities)
- Reducing the impact of access roads and distribution networks
- Management, control, or eradication of established invasive alien species of EU-wide significance [listed in EU Regulation 1143/2014]

Other important and effective measures include:

- Reducing the negative impact of outdoor sports, recreational, and leisure activities (including habitat

restoration)

- Reducing lead poisoning (e.g., the ban on lead ammunition in wetlands)

- \* 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:

The respective EU SEA / EIA legislation is implemented through the German Environmental Impact Assessment Act. Furthermore, the EU Habitats Directive requires in Art. 6 a specific assessment procedure in case of plans or projects concerning Natura 2000 sites, which include Special Protected Areas for Birds.

## **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:

Implemented measures in these sections are for example: habitat improvements, breeding area/nest protection, species adaptive cultivation, water renaturation, headway control for wind turbines, power line marking, prohibition of lead ammunition.

\* 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

## 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:

Of the MoU's 82 species of birds of prey 18 are regularly breeding in Germany. 7 of these show a significant increase over the last 12 years (Osprey, Lesser Spotted Eagle, White-tailed Sea-eagle, Red Kite, Black Kite, Common Kestrel and Peregrine Falcon). 3 species are subject to a moderate to significant negative trend (Western Marsh-harrier, Hen Harrier and Northern Goshawk). Of the 12 species of Owls 5 are regular breeding in Germany. Boreal Owl and Northern Long-eared Owl show a moderate negative trend, Ural Owls numbers are increasing. Declining populations of five of the species listed in Annex 1 of the MoU that are regularly occurring in Germany indicate that conservation efforts for some species need to be stepped up.

Please provide a copy of any relevant documents:

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

Gerlach et al. (2025): Vögel in Deutschland – Bestandssituation 2025. DDA, BfN, LAG VSW, Münster.  
[https://www.dda-web.de/downloads/publications/statusreports/vid\\_bestandssituation\\_2025.pdf](https://www.dda-web.de/downloads/publications/statusreports/vid_bestandssituation_2025.pdf) (German with English summary)

\* 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:

\* Breeding Populations: the nationwide bird monitoring consists of several programs such as i.a. the Common Breeding Bird Monitoring, Rare Breeding Bird Monitoring, High Mountain Bird Monitoring and

### Protected Areas Bird Monitoring.

In 2024 the Association of German Avifaunists (DDA) initiated and started a monitoring protocol dedicated to birds of prey covering all breeding species in Germany under the umbrella of the rare breeding bird scheme. The development of the rare breeding bird scheme (MsB) module on birds of prey was financially supported by the project "Evaluation and Consolidation of the New Monitoring Program for Rare Breeding Birds," funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) with funds from the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN).

\* Methodological guidelines in terms of minimum effort and criteria for assessing the breeding status, based on the observations reported, were developed together with species specialists. The guidelines were deliberately worded in quite broad terms to allow the integration of the various already ongoing monitoring activities into the new protocol. A tool for mobile digital data collection was developed and implemented within the app NaturaList, allowing participating surveyors to map the exact location of nesting sites (nests, nesting platforms etc.) in defined survey areas and attaching observations made to these nesting sites. Data on breeding success (number, age, status of juveniles) can be reported too but are an optional addition. Since the start of the protocol about 200 survey units have been established so far across 12 of the 16 German federal states, often quadrants of approx. 6 x 6 km. About 100 survey units are awarded to specific surveyors, but data return so far is much lower. In 2025 data for about 40 survey units were transmitted. DDA aims to continuously increase the participation in the protocol, but it will require time and effort before site-level data will be comprehensive enough for the calculation of population trends. In the meantime, DDA continues to collect population estimates at federal state level for several rare raptor species, covered by specialist groups, on an annual basis allowing statements on population size and trend of Osprey, Lesser-spotted eagle, Hen harrier, Montagu's harrier, White-tailed eagle and Peregrine falcon.

\* Additionally, breeding bird surveys repeated every six years for reporting on EU Special Protected Areas lie within the responsibility of the Bundesländer.

\* Reproductive success: several projects are concerned with monitoring of reproductive success, most of them on local scale. The German bird ringing centers contribute to the knowledge on reproductive success and mortality. Monitoring is also carried out by the Monitoring European Raptors and Owls (MEROS), founded in 1988 and running until today. It provides valuable long-term data series on various species, and it is regularly consulted e.g. in frame of article 12 reported under the EU Birds Directive.

\* Migration counts: no coordinated migration count program exists in Germany.

Please provide a copy of any relevant documents:

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

Common Breeding Bird Monitoring: <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/mhb/programm>

Rare Breeding Bird Monitoring: <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/msb/programm>

Birds of Prey Monitoring: <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/msb/module/greifv%C3%B6gel>

<https://austausch.dda-web.de/s/MsB-Merkblatt-Greifvoegel> (Methods)

[https://austausch.dda-web.de/s/Anleitung\\_Greifvoegel\\_NaturaList](https://austausch.dda-web.de/s/Anleitung_Greifvoegel_NaturaList) (Data collection and submission)

[www.dda-web.de/downloads/msb/feedback/2025/MsB\\_Feedback\\_Greifvoegel\\_2025.pdf](http://www.dda-web.de/downloads/msb/feedback/2025/MsB_Feedback_Greifvoegel_2025.pdf) (Feedback note season 2025)

High Mountain Bird Monitoring: <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/alpenvogelmonitoring/programm>

Protected Areas Bird Monitoring: <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/vm-s/programm>

MEROS: <https://www.greifvogelmonitoring.de/>

\* 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:

\* Migratory birds of prey are covered by the national breeding bird monitoring programs which have standard protocols (s. links above). Protocols for common and rare breeding birds are published on [www.dda-web.de](http://www.dda-web.de) and [www.ornitho.de](http://www.ornitho.de). There is currently one protocol focusing on wintering Red Kites in Germany carrying out dedicated roost counts for this species. Since the winter 2015/2016 DDA is advertising to search for and document roosting sites via [ornitho.de](http://ornitho.de).

\* In frame of the monitoring of migratory and wintering waterbirds there is an option to survey an “extended species list” which also comprises the following birds of prey species: White-tailed Eagle, Montagu’s Harrier, Hen Harrier, Rough-legged Buzzard, Osprey, Merlin and Peregrine Falcon. Accordingly, at least sub-record for surveyed wetlands is available.

\* Species-specific protocols have been reviewed and published in a new edition by Südbeck et al. (2025): Methodenstandards zur Erfassung der Brutvögel Deutschlands. DDA, Münster, 722 p.

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

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

Protocol website (Red kite roost count): <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/rotmilan-spz/programm>  
 Method: <https://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/rotmilan-spz/hinweise>  
 Feedback note season 2026: [https://www.dda-web.de/downloads/publications/rotmilan\\_spz\\_ergebnisse\\_2026.pdf](https://www.dda-web.de/downloads/publications/rotmilan_spz_ergebnisse_2026.pdf)  
 Protocol website (migratory and wintering waterbirds): [www.dda-web.de/monitoring/mrw/wasservogelzaehlung/mitmachen](http://www.dda-web.de/monitoring/mrw/wasservogelzaehlung/mitmachen)

\* 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 give a brief summary:

The funding under the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN) is coordinated with the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), further external experts and stakeholders are consulted if needed. The priorities are determined each year taking due account of the existing project proposals. Furthermore, in a long process based on the best available knowledge the list of species of national responsibility was built, to prioritize projects and actions.

The nationwide bird monitoring program is supported by a broad collaboration between professional associations and government agencies, as well as between the federal government and the states. The framework for this program was established by the Federal-State Administrative Agreement on Bird Monitoring, commonly referred to as the Administrative Agreement on Bird Monitoring. This volunteer-based bird monitoring program consists of three core components: monitoring of common breeding birds, monitoring of rare breeding

birds, and monitoring of migratory waterfowl. The Administrative Agreement on Bird Monitoring governs the financial support provided to the Association of German Avifaunists for the nationwide coordination of volunteer-based bird monitoring. The federal and state governments provide the necessary funding for this purpose. The Administrative Agreement on Bird Monitoring entered into force in 2008. It stipulates that the Association of German Avifaunists (DDA) is responsible for the nationwide coordination of volunteer-based bird monitoring programs, as well as for data consolidation and analysis. The goal is to ensure the long-term sustainability of bird monitoring so that the data can be continuously used for nature conservation purposes and to strengthen volunteer participation. The collaboration between the Working Group of the Vogelschutzwarten (LAG-VSW), the DDA, and the BfN has proven effective for conducting bird monitoring in Germany.

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

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

see above

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

- \* Working Group Bird Conservation of the German Länder/Vogelschutzwarten (LAG VSW): Exchanging information and research results, discussion of all relevant bird conservation issues, publication of strategy /position papers and guidelines.
- \* Committee Against Bird Slauhter (CABS): Activist association working to protect migratory birds from poaching and over exploitation with taking direct and quick actions.
- \* Website [www.ornitho.de](http://www.ornitho.de) of the Federation of German Avifaunists (DDA): Exchange knowledge, observations and information about birds and bird monitoring.
- \* Within projects funded by the National Species Recovery Programme (nAHP) there are species-specific exchange platforms, e. g. for *Clanga pomarina* (s. project weblink above).

## 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

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

A couple of awareness programs have been implemented during the reporting period, even though most of them are not aimed exclusively at raptors.

Since 1998, numerous training courses leading to qualification as “certified nature and landscape guides” are offered annually by state-run environmental education centers. These trainings are based on the uniform standards of the “nationwide working group of state-run environmental education centers (banu - <https://banu-akademien.de/>)”. As part of their environmental education programs, mainly in large protected areas such as national parks and biosphere reserves, as well as large NSGs and nature parks, these persons implement measures to inform visitors and sensitize them to the natural environment and to promote public awareness. Germany’s national parks, biosphere reserves and nature parks additionally operate hundreds of nature and information centers, offering nature walks and tours.

Other programs which are not part of a national program to raise awareness and understanding are e.g. the Federation of German Avifaunists Birdrace as an example of how awareness raising and fundraising can be successfully combined.

The migratory bird days in the Wadden Sea National Park of Lower Saxony (celebrated annually in autumn) are an excellent example of raising awareness for the conservation of migratory bird species.

Many organizations took World Migratory Bird Day as an opportunity to publish press releases or information to draw attention to and raise awareness of the phenomenon of bird migration and the problems for migratory birds. Examples:

<https://www.kraniche.de/en/news/world-migratory-bird-day-2022.html>

[https://www.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/startseite/aktuelles/presse\\_und\\_offentlichkeitsarbeit/pressemitteilungen/weltzugvogelzug-2024-in-sudwest-niedersachsen-wie-schutzen-wir-zugvogel-bei-uns-in-der-region-232004.html](https://www.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/startseite/aktuelles/presse_und_offentlichkeitsarbeit/pressemitteilungen/weltzugvogelzug-2024-in-sudwest-niedersachsen-wie-schutzen-wir-zugvogel-bei-uns-in-der-region-232004.html)

<https://www.nationalpark-wattenmeer.de/news/licht-aus-zum-weltzugvogelzug/>

<https://image-witten.de/n/vhs-vogelkunde-noch-plaetze-frei-beim-hellip:5597>

<https://www.wald-und-holz.nrw.de/aktuelle-meldungen/schutz-des-wespenbussards-im-nrw-wald>

<https://rieselfelder-muenster.de/weltzugvogelzug-14-15-oktober/>

<https://unric.org/de/weltzugvogelzug-2024-unterstreicht-die-bedeutung-von-insekten/>

<https://niedersachsen.nabu.de/tiere-und-pflanzen/voegel/vogelzug/35486.html>

Within projects funded by the National Species Recovery Programme (nAHP) public awareness programs are included, e. g. for *Clanga pomarina*, *Milvus milvus* and *Circus aeruginosus*.

\* 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

\* Please give a brief summary:

- \* Various conservation organizations offer training courses concerning identification and conservation, universities and educational institutions of the German states offer Courses on rehabilitation of birds of prey.
- \* On federal level, knowledge and data sharing activities are implemented by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN) as well as by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN).

## 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

\* Please give a brief summary:

The funding under the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN) is coordinated with the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), further external experts and stakeholders are consulted if needed. The funding supports projects by initiatives, associations, research institutions, and other stakeholders that promote nature conservation and landscape management. A funding of projects related to birds of prey is possible under this program. For example, there are currently running projects for *Clanga pomarina*, *Milvus milvus* and *Circus aeruginosus* within the National Species Recovery Programme (nAHP).

The framework for the nationwide bird monitoring program was established by the Federal-State Administrative Agreement on Bird Monitoring, commonly referred to as the Administrative Agreement on Bird Monitoring (s. above). This volunteer-based bird monitoring program receives funding from the federal and state governments and places a strong emphasis on training and qualifying volunteers.

\* 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 the beneficiary/ies concerned and the activities supported:

During the reporting period a new nature conservation funding program was invented in Germany: The National Species Recovery Programme (nAHP), which is intended to support projects that serve to permanently protect

species and their habitats and improve their conservation status. The funding program focuses on the protection of species that are affected by the expansion of renewable energies. The aim of the nAHP is to improve the conservation status, quality and connectivity of the habitats of various species in the long term. This is intended to flank the expansion of renewable energies.

- \* 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:

The existing possibilities are in principle usually sufficient.

## **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

- \* Please state why not:

/

### **Contact**

alexandra.caron-strehlow@un.org

