

Strasbourg, 27 August 2002
[Inf26e_2002.doc]

T-PVS/Inf (2002) 26

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

22nd meeting
Strasbourg, 2-5 December 2002

Large Carnivore Action Plans for Dinara - Pindus range



**Risnjak National Park (Bijela vodica 48, 51317 Crni lug, Croatia)
12 to 15 May 2002**

*Document prepared by
Prof. Djuro Huber, Biology Department, Veterinary Faculty, Zagreb, Republic of Croatia*

Large Carnivore Action Plans for Dinara - Pindus range

Which was held in:

Risnjak National Park

(Bijela vodica 48, 51317 Crni lug, Croatia)

(tel.: 385-51-836133, or 836246; fax.: 385-51-836116)

from 12 to 15 May 2002

The meeting has been attended by 22 participants representing 9 countries. List of participants with their addresses is enclosed.

Seven of states represent the large carnivore (LC) populations (brown bear, Eurasian lynx, grey wolf) in the Dinara-Pindus Range: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Greece, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Slovenia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Additionally Bulgaria has been included to the list. It should be noted that all this countries do hold the populations (or at least some remains of them) of all three LC species in region. None of the countries is big enough to have its own viable population of any LC species and trans-boundary management of all populations is unavoidable. Also the management and conservation strategies for the LC species has not been well advanced in all of the states, including that the Bern Convention was not signed in all states too. Representatives from Switzerland and Italy helped to compare with experiences with LC Action plans in their countries.

The invited participants have been instructed how to prepare ahead of the meeting. At the Risnjak meeting each Action point for brown bear, lynx and wolf from European LC Action plans has been discussed and brief comments are included in the document below. Additional Action points have been added when appropriate, as well as some were classified as "not relevant". The original Action plans did not include brown bear for FYR Macedonia, and wolf for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Both are incorporated in the revised document now.

The major gains of the meeting and the report are:

- The achieved awareness of the Bern Convention importance and the role of LCs in it.
- The awareness about the need to prepare LC management plans and about the main approaches in that process.
- The thought through and revised Action points for each country in the region and for each of three LC species.
- The first time ever occasion that the leading regional LC experts from the whole region meet, get to know each other, and develop future collaboration. The entire meeting went in a very positive mood and a very friendly atmosphere, thus increasing hopes into implementation of results.

Comments to each action point are marked in blue, and added action points are in green letters. Status summary for each LC species and country are in front of the list of Action points.



Djuro Huber

Action Plan for the conservation of the Brown Bear (*Ursus arctos*) in Europe

5. Required actions by country

Population: Alps-Dinaric-Pindus

Albania

Status: Population is stable and slightly increasing. Strictly protected by law.

- *Action 4.1.1: Adoption of Action Plan by Bern Convention.*

Not in the country domain.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

Not established. Group for large carnivores will be formed.

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law and game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

There is no legal hunting.

- *Action 4.1.5: Intensification of law enforcement and appropriate penalties in populations where poaching is a limiting factor.*

Law is not enforced.

- *Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.*

In progress.

- *Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.*

Linkage zones exist.

- *Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.*

Not relevant. Planned roads will go along the coast.

- *Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental in bear core areas and linkage zones.*

Small scale illegal logging activities, people are abandoning rural areas, people that remain in the area live mostly on livestock but livestock conflict is not significant.

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems*

None at present, but planned.

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures*

Not applicable.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

Not problem at present.

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

No feeding.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

Few problem bears.

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Local authority applies for special licence to remove the bear.

- *Action 4.5.3: Evaluation of costs and benefits before removing problem bears in threatened populations.*

Yes.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

Few so far, but NGOs are becoming more active.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

To be done.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

To be done.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

Yes, in cooperation with Greece.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

Not complete.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

Status: Protected by limited hunting seasons. Local management plans determine hunting quotas.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

Possible after the ratification of the Bern Convention.

- *Action 4.1.5: Intensification of law enforcement and appropriate penalties in populations where poaching is a limiting factor.*

Hunting law. Poaching is not a limiting factor, excluding in the areas affected by war.

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems.*

Yes, government pays 45%, municipality 25%, the rest by bear managers.

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures.*

Hunting law proposes the measures. If the measures are not used, there is no right for compensation.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

Recently it became the problem.

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

Feeding is practiced, but no problems were identified. Damage on trees at one location was mitigated by additional feeding.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

Problem bears are common (bee hives, pigs).

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Practiced.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

There is understanding for local needs.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

There is understanding for local needs.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

None so far.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

None. Some individual cases.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

None, but should be priority.

Bulgaria

Population: Stara Planina Mountains; Rila-Rhodope Mountains

Status: Officially protected, but also listed as a game species.

- *Action 4.1.1: Adoption of Action Plan by Bern Convention.*

Not in the country domain.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

No official management group formed and no management plans created and adopted. Management incorporated in the activities of the game breeding areas according to the newly proposed changes of the hunting law.

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law and game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

As no management plans exist and no exact data for the bear population exist, the listing of the bear as a game species in the new changes of the hunting law is in contradiction to this Action plan's recommendations

Action 4.1.5: Intensification of law enforcement and appropriate penalties in populations where poaching is a limiting factor.

New changes in the laws, pending enforcement of biodiversity law. Not enforced. Poaching is a limiting factor.

- *Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.*

There is no proper classification of the areas with bear distribution, neither assessment of possible bear range.

- *Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.*

Partially studied but not maintained. There are 2 isolated populations.

- *Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.*

No evaluation. There is impact (highways).

- *Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental in bear core areas and linkage zones.*

Control exists only within the protected areas / national parks. Conflict with livestock people outside the national parks

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems.*

Compensation system included for the first time within the frame of the new changes of the Hunting Law (pending approval by the National Assembly). The compensation of the damages is full responsibility of the organizations (national or private), which are managing and using the game areas. "If there is no bear, there is no problem"

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures.*

Compensation system linked to hunting clubs, gamebreeding farms or national forestry doing the management of the game areas, which are obliged to take preventive measures.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

No actions taken because it is not a problem.

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

Feeding of the bears is also practiced to prevent poisoning.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

Action 4.7.1. Only Action 4.7.1 followed. There are dancing bears. Captive bears are microchipped.

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Killing is used. Ministry has to approve the removal.

- *Action 4.5.3: Evaluation of costs and benefits before removing problem bears in threatened populations.*

Done by game managers.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

NGOs are trying to get more involved, but they work separately.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

Not done.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

Partial education activities done by several NGOs. Aimed to local people, but do not reach hunters and foresters.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

No coordinated research. NGOs do some research but do not share all the information.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

To be done.

Additionally proposed actions:

- Co-ordinate public awareness, education and information campaigns at the regional and European level, and co-ordinate exchange of ideas and materials.

Underway in the frame of Balkan Net.

- Solve the problem with captive-bred bears.

Underway with international involvement.

Croatia

Population: Alps-Dinaric-Pindos

Status: Population stable and gradually increasing range. Game species.

- *Action 4.1.1: Adoption of Action Plan by Bern Convention.*

Not in the country domain.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

Established. Work started this year.

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law and game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

Reserve on Bern Convention – managed as game species.

- *Action 4.1.5: Intensification of law enforcement and appropriate penalties in populations where poaching is a limiting factor.*

Poaching exists but is not a limiting factor. Special penalties are being prepared by the Ministry of agriculture and forestry.

- *Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.*

Separate management plan for the coastal areas is prepared.

- *Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.*

Not relevant for Croatia.

- *Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.*

Highways Zagreb – Rijeka (enough tunnels, viaducts and one green bridge) and Zagreb – Split (in construction, 7 green bridges proposed).

- *Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental in bear core areas and linkage zones.*

Disturbance of dens during winter. Nothing was done about it. There is the potential that the conflict will increase (sheep raising).

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems.*

Exists. Locally problematic.

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures.*

Not done yet.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

Some attempts done (electric fencing at a garbage dump). Needs more attention.

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

Feeding is done for the purposes to bring the bears away from the humans.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

Problem bears exist. Guidelines to prevent this should be done.

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Done.

- *Action 4.5.3: Evaluation of costs and benefits before removing problem bears in threatened populations.*

Done.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

Initiated.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

Initiated.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

None.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

Yes, since 1981.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

Not sufficient.

FRY Macedonia

NEW country in ACTION PLAN

Status: Population is stable, protected by law.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

Not established but planned. Management plan only partially and locally.

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law and game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

No legal hunting, but there is poaching and shooting of problem bears.

- *Action 4.1.5: Intensification of law enforcement and appropriate penalties in populations where poaching is a limiting factor.*

Poaching is not sanctioned.

- *Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.*

No areas classified.

- *Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.*

Linkage zones exist and those are mostly in protected areas.

- *Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.*

Impacts of infrastructures: problems exist, especially during war activities.

- *Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental in bear core areas and linkage zones.*

Conflicts with agricultural issues.

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems*

Compensation presently does not work.

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures*

Not applicable at present.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

Garbage dumps: no information

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

No feeding sites for bears and feeding sites for vultures will be fenced.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

Problem bears exist and are removed by hunters and park managers (self-defence cases).

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Yes.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

Public involvement: does not exist. Locals are used to bears.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

To be done.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

To be done.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

Scientific research: None.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

Monitoring: mortality data are collected.

Greece

Population: Alps-Dinaric-Pindus; Rila-Rhodope Mountains

Status: Bear fully protected under Greek law.

List of Action points to be added in addition to published ones (Arctouros NGO recommended):

- *Action 4.1.1: Adoption of Action Plan by Bern Convention.*

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law; game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

Bear is protected by law.

- **Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.**

In process through LIFE projects.

- **Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.**

In process through LIFE projects.

- **Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.**

In process through LIFE projects.

- **Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental in bear core areas and linkage zones.**

In process through LIFE projects.

- **Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems.**

Amendments to existing system proposed by Arctouros through LIFE project.

- **Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures.**

Proposed by Arctouros through LIFE project.

- **Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.**

Already in application – closing down of diffuse garbage dumps.

- **Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.**

In application by authorities (4.4.1) and 4.7.1 by Arctouros through LIFE project.

- **Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.**

Not feasible by national authorities due to lack of know how.

New Action points to be added (Arctouros NGO recommended):

- **Action 4.5.3: Evaluation of costs and benefits before removing problem bears in threatened populations.**

Not feasible by national authorities due to lack of know how.

- **Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.**

- **Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.**

- **Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.**

Continued by Arctouros through ongoing LIFE projects.

- **Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.**

Continued by Arctouros through ongoing LIFE and Balkan cooperation projects (BALKANET-LCIE project)

- **Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.**

Continued by Arctouros through ongoing LIFE and Balkan cooperation projects (BALKANET-LCIE project)

Slovenia

Status: Population increasing in numbers and range. Protected with regulated quota hunting.

- *Action 4.1.1: Adoption of Action Plan by Bern Convention.*

Not in the country domain.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

Done.

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law; game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

Done.

- *Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.*

Done.

- *Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.*

Done.

- *Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.*

Problems are the already existing highways (Ljubljana to coastal area). Parliament has decided to build at least one green bridge (2 places are proposed) on that section + use of electric fences to channel the bears to the bridges.

- *Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental in bear core areas and linkage zones.*

Not done.

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems.*

Established.

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures.*

Not established, but proposed.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

Not done.

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

Artificial feeding is used, but controlled. Guidelines will be produced. Wild boar feeding sites are the problem.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

At least one case of problem bear was proved. Relocation of the bear is proposed. Public education.

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Done.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

Included in the game committee.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

Done through the intervention group. There is the special phone number for general alert.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

None.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

Exists.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

Data are gathered.

Yugoslav Federation

Status: Number of bears is decreasing. Legal status: game species with closed season (since April 2002). Bern Convention not signed yet.

- *Action 4.1.2: Establishment of national brown bear management groups and management plans (countries sharing populations produce management plans co-operatively).*

Planned.

- *Action 4.1.4: Protection of brown bear by law; game species only where viability is proven and hunting is used to reach population goals identified by management plans.*

Applied.

- *Action 4.1.5: Intensification of law enforcement and appropriate penalties in populations where poaching is a limiting factor.*

Exist, but is not easy to apply because of the current economical situation in the country due to the war.

- *Action 4.3.1: Classification of areas within present and possible bear range according to their suitability and importance as habitat for bear management.*

Areas with present and possible range are identified.

- *Action 4.3.2: Identification and maintenance or recreation of linkage zones in fragmented populations.*

Areas are fragmented by deforestation. Linkage zone should be established. Core areas are in national parks.

- *Action 4.3.3: Evaluation of impact of existing and planned infrastructure on bear habitat and mitigation of negative impact.*

Planned to be applied. Proposed "spatial plan" is not adequate. (highways, power plants)

- *Action 4.3.4: Control or prohibition of human activities detrimental to bear core areas and linkage zones.*

Forestry activities are a problem. Conflicts with livestock husbandry.

- *Action 4.4.1: Establishment of compensation systems*

Exists, but does not work. Ministry of Agriculture is going to make a more efficient system.

- *Action 4.4.2: Link of compensation system to individual farmer's use of preventive measures*

No link. Planned.

- *Action 4.4.3: Inaccessibility of garbage dumps and human waste for brown bears.*

Not a problem. Garbage dumps are not in bear areas.

- *Action 4.4.4: Abandon artificial feeding that may create food- or human-habituated bears.*

There are feeding sites for hunting purposes and feeding sites for raptors in remote areas.

- *Action 4.5.1: Minimise the creation of problem bears through actions Action 4.4.1-Action 4.4.5 and Action 4.7.1.*

There are problem bears, dancing bears (some actions to create sanctuary – NGOs, but the sanctuary was not adequate).

- *Action 4.5.2: Removal of problem bears in viable populations if preventive efforts have failed.*

Done.

- *Action 4.5.3: Evaluation of costs and benefits before removing problem bears in threatened populations.*

Done.

- *Action 4.6.1: Identification and involvement of public opinion leaders and stakeholders in brown bear management.*

In progress. There are attempts to involve stakeholders.

- *Action 4.6.2: Establishment of permanent consultation protocol with locals about their needs and necessary management actions.*

None.

- *Action 4.7.1: Initiate information campaigns designed for different target groups.*

In progress.

- *Action 4.8.1: Co-ordinated scientific research on brown bears in Europe.*

None.

- *Action 4.8.2: Co-ordination of gathering necessary data to monitor management and biological conditions of brown bears in European countries.*

Exists, but incomplete and unorganised.

Action Plan for the conservation of the Eurasian Lynx (*Lynx lynx*) in Europe

5. Required actions by countries

Albania AL

Albania shares the Balkan population with its neighbouring countries. This is the most threatened autochthonous lynx population in Europe and should be given high priority in conservation. Albania first should gather basic data about the status and the threats to the population and secure the species legal protection.

Recent status:

Least researched population, very endangered and protected by law. During 80s estimated were around 60, today around 25 animals. Until 1985 furs were exported. Local forest offices collect only some rough data. There is initiative to obtain some funds to start a survey of status of the species. A project was initiated in areas with certain lynx presence. There is an idea about the distribution. During project they had some public relation actions: public hearings and publications. Lynx area is estimated to 3000 km². Permanent presence of the species is correlated with the old forests and remote areas. Some of the existing protected areas within the lynx area are enlarged. Attitudes are not perceived as bad. Damages to livestock are very rare. Wild prey is not viable. Areas without grazing activities are inhabited by lynx.

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Not in the country domain.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plan according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

None.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Protected , there is some poaching. Population is still declining.

4.1.4. *Law enforcement is intensified in areas where poaching is an important threat for the population.*

To be done.

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

Protected , there is some poaching.

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the population and establish a monitoring programme.*

To be done.

4.2.3. *The historical decline of the lynx should be analysed, threats to the population identified, and measures to remove the limiting factors (see below) taken.*

To be done.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

To be done.

4.2.5. *The viability of the population should be increased through measures that allow the establishment of a viable meta-population (reducing threatening and limiting factors, expand the area or the density of the population, re-introductions, etc.).*

To be done.

4.2.6. *The genetic status of the population (degree of inbreeding, heterozygosity, relationship to other European populations) should be analysed in order to determine the necessity and strategy of re-stockings.*

To be done.

4.3.1. *The forest and landscape in lynx areas or potential lynx areas should be managed according to the requirement of the species. Deforestation is halted wherever it is a problem for the survival of the lynx, and forests are managed in a way to provide good habitat for the lynx and for its most important local prey species.*

To be done.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

Not relevant.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

To be done. Prey base is limiting for lynx.

4.4.1. *Livestock husbandry procedures and protective devices apt to prevent depredation of lynx on sheep, goats, or semi-domestic reindeer in the lynx area should be tested and implemented.*

To be done. Not a big problem.

4.4.2. *The economic loss of livestock owners due to lynx depredation should be compensated for. Compensation systems should aim to promote the co-existence of livestock breeders with lynx rather than to let the owners simply profit from losses.*

To be done.

4.4.3. *Rules should be fixed saying under what conditions and how lynx causing intolerable losses in livestock herds can be removed.*

Not relevant at present.

4.4.4. *The impact of lynx on its wild prey populations should be recognised and taken into consideration when defining the hunting management of the local (ungulate) populations.*

To be done. Similar to 4.3.3.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

Some public relation actions have been held: public hearings and publications. Attitudes are not perceived as bad.

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

To be done.

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

To be done.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

To be done.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

In the process of starting.

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

In the process of starting.

4.6.3. *Human dimension research projects should be launched in order to understand the conflicts between humans and lynx.*

To be done. *Attitudes are not perceived as bad.*

4.6.4. *Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.*

In the process of starting.

4.6.6. *Applied and co-ordinated projects should test methods to protect livestock from lynx depredation.*

To be done.

Bosnia-Herzegovina BIH

Bosnia-Herzegovina's original lynx population went extinct. The country is now the southern edge of the expansion of the lynx population re-introduced to Slovenia. However, no data on the present status of the population are available.

Recent status:

From 1911 to 1980 there was no lynx in BiH. Since 1980 reintroduced population expanded to Bosnia from Croatia. During last year (2002) there are some data about significant further expansion to east (to Sarajevo). Lynx is not protected. BiH has two hunting laws (Republika Srpska and the rest of the BiH federation). New (present) Serbian Republic hunting law does not mention lynx at all. In the previous law (since 1994) it was protected. Law in preparation will include lynx as completely protected game species. Hunting association is pushing to include lynx as protected species.

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Not in country domain. Preparations were done and Convention is expected to be signed before the end of the year.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

Hunting associations should cooperate as NGOs.

To be done.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Expected to be protected soon.

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

Expected to be protected soon.

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the population and establish a monitoring programme.*

Not done. There are only local and individual surveys. It should be done on a national level and is condition for many other points.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

No activities yet.

4.2.5. *The viability of the population should be increased through measures that allow the establishment of a viable meta-population (reducing threatening and limiting factors, expand the area or the density of the population, re-introductions, etc.).*

The beginners meat-population is expanding.

4.2.6. *The genetic status of the population (degree of inbreeding, heterozygosity, relationship to other European populations) should be analysed in order to determine the necessity and strategy of re-stockings.*

Very important and planned.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

It is a question if the corridor to autochthonous remaining lynx in Balkan is desirable at the moment.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

Natural prey is poor.

4.4.1. *Livestock husbandry procedures and protective devices apt to prevent depredation of lynx on sheep, goats, or semi-domestic reindeer in the lynx area should be tested and implemented.*

There are signs of damages to livestock. Guarding dogs are used.

4.4.2. *The economic loss of livestock owners due to lynx depredation should be compensated for. Compensation systems should aim to promote the co-existence of livestock breeders with lynx rather than to let the owners simply profit from losses.*

To be done.

4.4.3. *Rules should be fixed saying under what conditions and how lynx causing intolerable losses in livestock herds can be removed.*

To be done.

4.4.4. *The impact of lynx on its wild prey populations should be recognised and taken into consideration when defining the hunting management of the local (ungulate) populations.*

It is done. Losses are calculated.

4.4.5. *Harvest of viable lynx populations through hunting should be allowed when the population can tolerate it.*

Yes.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

To be done.

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

To be done.

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

To be done.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

To be done.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

To be done.

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

To be done.

4.6.3. *Human dimension research projects should be launched in order to understand the conflicts between humans and lynx.*

To be done.

4.6.4. *Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.*

To be done.

4.6.5. *Long-term research projects should investigate the impact of lynx on its prey population in relation to human influences of the same populations.*

To be done.

4.6.6. *Applied and co-ordinated projects should test methods to protect livestock from lynx depredation.*

To be done.

Bulgaria BG

Bulgaria's lynx population(s) are virtually extinct. It is, however, possible that isolated individual(s) live at the western border. Plans for re-introducing the species were discussed, but not realised.

Recent status:

Bulgaria's lynx population(s) are virtually extinct. It is, however, possible that isolated individual(s) live at the western border. There are signs of lynx presence, but is not studied. Plans for re-introducing the species were discussed, but not realised Status is not clear.

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Not in the country domain.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

Not done. Initial steps.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Protected but due to its official extinction status individuals migrating from Yugoslavia are freely poached.

New to add:

4.2.2. Identify the status of small and isolated populations and establish a monitoring programme.

4.2.3. *The historical decline of the lynx should be analysed, threats to the population identified, and measures to remove the limiting factors (see below) taken.*

Threats and limiting factors partially identified, measures not taken.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

No public campaign done yet.

4.2.7. *Carefully designed re-introduction programmes should be carried out in areas that can potentially host viable populations.*

Some areas studied for further re-introduction but not proceeded further. More work should be done on the topic.

New to add:

4.3.1. *The forest and landscape in lynx areas or potential lynx areas should be managed according to the requirement of the species. Deforestation is halted wherever it is a problem for the survival of the lynx, and forests are managed in a way to provide good habitat for the lynx and for its most important local prey species.*

To be added.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

The cases of lynx presence not fully evaluated yet, although current data show probable expansion of Carpathian population. This expansion is not studied.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

The main prey base of the lynx – the roe deer is decreasing of. No effective management.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

Limited education activities only.

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

Limited education activities only.

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

To be done.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

To be done.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

To be done.

Action points to add and act upon:

4.6.2. National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.

4.6.4. Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.

4.6.5. Long-term research projects should investigate the impact of lynx on its prey population in relation to human influences of the same populations.

Croatia CR

Croatia's original lynx population went extinct. The country is now re-colonised through lynx expanding from the population re-introduced to Slovenia.

Recent status:

Lynx is protected, there are no hunting quotas at the moment. Trend of the population: stable or decreasing. In the last 5 years there is a decrease in numbers.

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Not in the country domain.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

Done. Cooperation with Slovenia.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Strictly protected for now.

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

Not enforced.

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the population and establish a monitoring programme.*

Not functioning because of the total protection.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

None.

4.2.5. *The viability of the population should be increased through measures that allow the establishment of a viable meta-population (reducing threatening and limiting factors, expand the area or the density of the population, re-introductions, etc.).*

Not relevant.

4.2.6. *The genetic status of the population (degree of inbreeding, heterozygosity, relationship to other European populations) should be analysed in order to determine the necessity and strategy of re-stockings.*

In progress.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

Potential meta-population in eastern Croatia. Better to keep it isolated until the source determined.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

Not enough prey. Prey management should be improved.

4.4.1. *Livestock husbandry procedures and protective devices apt to prevent depredation of lynx on sheep, goats, or semi-domestic reindeer in the lynx area should be tested and implemented.*

Currently not a problem.

4.4.2. *The economic loss of livestock owners due to lynx depredation should be compensated for. Compensation systems should aim to promote the co-existence of livestock breeders with lynx rather than to let the owners simply profit from losses.*

Done.

4.4.3. *Rules should be fixed saying under what conditions and how lynx causing intolerable losses in livestock herds can be removed.*

No such cases.

4.4.4. *The impact of lynx on its wild prey populations should be recognised and taken into consideration when defining the hunting management of the local (ungulate) populations.*

Not enough included.

4.4.5. *Harvest of viable lynx populations through hunting should be allowed when the population can tolerate it.*

Will be regulated through management plan.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

To be done.

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

To be done. Not important for livestock owners.

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

Done.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

Done.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

Started.

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

To be done.

4.6.3. *Human dimension research projects should be launched in order to understand the conflicts between humans and lynx.*

To be done.

4.6.4. *Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.*

In progress.

4.6.5. *Long-term research projects should investigate the impact of lynx on its prey population in relation to human influences of the same populations.*

In progress.

4.6.6. *Applied and co-ordinated projects should test methods to protect livestock from lynx depredation.*

Not relevant.

FR Yugoslavia YU

In the south-west, Yugoslavia shares the highly threatened Balkan population, which needs urgent conservation measures. In the east, the country has a lynx occurrence that seems to be an expansion from the Carpathian population, though separated by the Danube.

Recent status:

Three sub-populations. Balkan lynx is critical (15 – 30 individuals). Assumption is that due to the war the situation is worse than 10 years-ago.

It is completely protected by 2 laws (hunting and environment)

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Expected to be signed by the end of the year.

Not in the country domain.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

Potentially there is a group of experts.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Not relevant at present.

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

Done.

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the populations and establish a monitoring programme.*

Partially. Monitoring program proposed.

4.2.3. *The historical decline of the lynx should be analysed, threats to the population identified, and measures to remove the limiting factors (see below) taken.*

Done in general.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

Occasional articles in hunting journals and some publications.

4.2.5. *The viability of the small and isolated populations should be increased through measures that allow the establishment of a viable meta-population (reducing threatening and limiting factors, expand the area or the density of the population, re-introductions, etc.).*

Measures should be intensified. Game management is expected to be changed to increase prey availability, including poaching control of both lynx and prey.

4.2.6. *The genetic status of threatened populations (degree of inbreeding, heterozygosity, relationship to other European populations) should be analysed in order to determine the necessity and strategy of re-stockings.*

There is interest and will to cooperate.

4.3.1. *The forest and landscape in lynx areas or potential lynx areas should be managed according to the requirement of the species. Deforestation is halted wherever it is a problem for the survival of the lynx, and forests are managed in a way to provide good habitat for the lynx and for its most important local prey species.*

Deforestation is present, but not so detrimental as sometimes perceived. Habitat fragmentation is more important. New highways are planned.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

Expansion of the populations is faster than expected.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

Natural prey in protected areas, and livestock in other areas. Poaching decreases number of prey.

4.4.1. *Livestock husbandry procedures and protective devices apt to prevent depredation of lynx on sheep, goats, or semi-domestic reindeer in the lynx area should be tested and implemented.*

To be done.

4.4.2. *The economic loss of livestock owners due to lynx depredation should be compensated for. Compensation systems should aim to promote the co-existence of livestock breeders with lynx rather than to let the owners simply profit from losses.*

No compensation. Should be implemented.

4.4.3. *Rules should be fixed saying under what conditions and how lynx causing intolerable losses in livestock herds can be removed.*

Not identified as a problem animal. People are not aware of lynx presence.

4.4.4. *The impact of lynx on its wild prey populations should be recognised and taken into consideration when defining the hunting management of the local (ungulate) populations.*

Theoretically exists.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

None, only sporadically.

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

To be done.

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

To be done.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

To be done.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

To be done.

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

To be done.

4.6.3. *Human dimension research projects should be launched in order to understand the conflicts between humans and lynx.*

Not relevant so far.

4.6.4. *Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.*

To be done.

4.6.6. *Applied and co-ordinated projects should test methods to protect livestock from lynx depredation.*

To be done.

FYR Macedonia MK

FYR Macedonia shares the Balkan population with its neighbouring countries. This is the most threatened autochthonous lynx population in Europe and should be given high priority in conservation.

Recent status:

Status is not clear. Information about the distribution is probably correct, but the numbers are conflicting. Lynx is completely protected by hunting law. In 1974 there were about 120 lynx. Today the number is uncertain with estimations about 30 lynx. Hunters in last 5 years did not kill any lynx. In last 10 years only 8 lynx were stuffed. At least 4 of the 8 are probably older than 10 years. Even museum would like to have a new one. There were some observations.

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Not in the country domain.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

To be done.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Lynx is completely protected by hunting law.

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

Enforcement should be done

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the population and establish a monitoring programme.*

Not done. Funding necessary.

4.2.3. *The historical decline of the lynx should be analysed, threats to the population identified, and measures to remove the limiting factors (see below) taken.*

To be done.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

To be done.

4.2.5. *The viability of the population should be increased through measures that allow the establishment of a viable meta-population (reducing threatening and limiting factors, expand the area or the density of the population, re-introductions, etc.).*

To be done.

4.2.6. *The genetic status of the population (degree of inbreeding, heterozygosity, relationship to other European populations) should be analysed in order to determine the necessity and strategy of re-stockings.*

To be done. Some steps undertaken.

4.3.1. *The forest and landscape in lynx areas or potential lynx areas should be managed according to the requirement of the species. Deforestation is halted wherever it is a problem for the survival of the lynx, and forests are managed in a way to provide good habitat for the lynx and for its most important local prey species.*

Deforestation is extensive, except in national parks.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

Sub-populations are not isolated, but some doubt it.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

Prey availability is good in protected areas.

4.4.1. *Livestock husbandry procedures and protective devices apt to prevent depredation of lynx on sheep, goats, or semi-domestic reindeer in the lynx area should be tested and implemented.*

No information about domestic animals.

4.4.2. *The economic loss of livestock owners due to lynx depredation should be compensated for. Compensation systems should aim to promote the co-existence of livestock breeders with lynx rather than to let the owners simply profit from losses.*

None.

4.4.3. *Rules should be fixed saying under what conditions and how lynx causing intolerable losses in livestock herds can be removed.*

To be done.

4.4.4. *The impact of lynx on its wild prey populations should be recognised and taken into consideration when defining the hunting management of the local (ungulate) populations.*

To be done.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

To be done.

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

To be done.

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

To be done.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

To be done.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

To be done. Initialised.

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

To be done.

4.6.3. *Human dimension research projects should be launched in order to understand the conflicts between humans and lynx.*

To be done.

4.6.4. *Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.*

To be done.

4.6.6. *Applied and co-ordinated projects should test methods to protect livestock from lynx depredation.*

To be done.

Greece GR

There are probably at present no lynx in Greece, but the country shares the Balkan population with its neighbouring countries. This is the most threatened autochthonous lynx population in Europe and should be given high priority in conservation.

[No comments received to add or revise the published Action points.](#)

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the population and establish a monitoring programme.*

4.2.3. *The historical decline of the lynx should be analysed, threats to the population identified, and measures to remove the limiting factors (see below) taken.*

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

Slovenia SLO

The Slovenian re-introduced lynx population showed an outstanding dynamic at the beginning, but has not further expanded in recent years. The vitality of the Slovenian population could be crucial to save the lynx occurrence in neighbouring Italy and Austria.

Recent status:

Protected in 1993. There are no more than 50 lynx, though hunters believe there are about 100. Trend is stable or decreasing. There is also a change of range. Membership in the SCALP group – daily monitoring within hunting reserves. Yearly quota was 5 lynx, but it was not realized.

Actions recommended:

4.1.1. *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan.*

Not in the country domain.

4.1.2. *Establishment of a national lynx management group that produces a national lynx action plans according to this Action Plan. Cross-border management is secured.*

In progress. Secured through the SCALP and cooperation with Croatia. Participated in development of Croatian lynx management plan.

4.1.3. *The lynx is protected by law. Hunting is only allowed if it does not threaten the long-term survival of the population, and if the harvest is in accordance with the goals formulated in the action plan.*

Done.

4.2.1. *The lynx should be given strict legal protection and the law should be enforced.*

Done.

4.2.2. *Identify the status of the population and establish a monitoring programme.*

Done.

4.2.4. *Public information campaigns to secure the support of the people for the conservation of the lynx should be launched.*

Done through articles published in hunters' magazine.

4.2.5. *The viability of the population should be increased through measures that allow the establishment of a viable meta-population (reducing threatening and limiting factors, expand the area or the density of the population, re-introductions, etc.).*

Not relevant.

4.2.6. *The genetic status of the population (degree of inbreeding, heterozygosity, relationship to other European populations) should be analysed in order to determine the necessity and strategy of re-stockings.*

In progress.

4.3.1. *The forest and landscape in lynx areas or potential lynx areas should be managed according to the requirement of the species. Deforestation is halted wherever it is a problem for the survival of the lynx, and forests are managed in a way to provide good habitat for the lynx and for its most important local prey species.*

Not relevant.

4.3.2. *Sub-populations forming a potentially viable lynx meta-population should be connected by habitat corridors. These corridors are maintained or restored wherever they are important for the survival of a sub-population and the genetic exchange between sub-populations.*

No problem.

4.3.3. *The food supply for the lynx should be guaranteed through proper management and conservation of its most important local prey species. The lynx' needs and the impact of the lynx predation are incorporated in the hunting management of the native ungulate populations.*

Done through the hunting plans.

4.4.1. *Livestock husbandry procedures and protective devices apt to prevent depredation of lynx on sheep, goats, or semi-domestic reindeer in the lynx area should be tested and implemented.*

There are no semi-domestic reindeer, otherwise it is done. Electric fences are not always effective.

4.4.2. *The economic loss of livestock owners due to lynx depredation should be compensated for. Compensation systems should aim to promote the co-existence of livestock breeders with lynx rather than to let the owners simply profit from losses.*

Done.

4.4.3. *Rules should be fixed saying under what conditions and how lynx causing intolerable losses in livestock herds can be removed.*

Done.

4.4.4. *The impact of lynx on its wild prey populations should be recognised and taken into consideration when defining the hunting management of the local (ungulate) populations.*

Done.

4.4.5. *Harvest of viable lynx populations through hunting should be allowed when the population can tolerate it.*

Done. Hunters keep the trophies.

4.5.1. *Information campaigns should be launched in order to teach the broad public about all aspects of lynx conservation and management.*

Done partly (locally).

4.5.2. *Detailed educational programmes should be initiated for specific interest groups such as hunters or livestock owners.*

Done partly (locally).

4.5.3. *Local people should be integrated into the planning and implementation of lynx action plans. Establishing boards incorporating all local interest groups could do this.*

Different interest groups are represented in the committee.

4.5.4. *Local people (e.g. represented through management boards) should permanently be involved into decisions concerning lynx management and conservation.*

Lynx is not a problem.

4.6.1. *Applied research on Eurasian lynx should be co-ordinated, and exchange of methods, ideas, and results must be certain.*

Currently there are no active projects.

4.6.2. *National or local monitoring systems for the lynx should be designed, tested, implemented and co-ordinated among countries sharing the same lynx population.*

Exists.

4.6.3. *Human dimension research projects should be launched in order to understand the conflicts between humans and lynx.*

Lynx is not a problem.

4.6.4. *Research on minimum viable population size, genetic status, (meta-) population dynamics, habitat requirements must be advanced in regard to the restoration of viable lynx populations.*

In progress.

4.6.5. *Long-term research projects should investigate the impact of lynx on its prey population in relation to human influences of the same populations.*

In progress.

4.6.6. *Applied and co-ordinated projects should test methods to protect livestock from lynx depredation.*

Quotas are given in order to encourage the hunters to monitor the situation; there is a poaching problem; quotas are so small (5 animals) so that the population cannot be threatened.

Action Plan for the conservation of wolves (*canis lupus*) in Europe

Revision of ACTION POINTS for the Dinara-Pindus range wolf population.

5. Actions required in each country

Albania

Status summary:

Population: Stable or increasing. There are no isolated populations. Estimation in 2001: 900 – 1000, in 2002 1500 (probably overestimated). Feral dogs are not a problem.

Legal: Protected, but not strictly. In cases of problems (damage) a license is issued for killing the wolf. There is no trophy hunting in last 10 years. Before that there was a bounty (1 sheep per 1 killed wolf)

Prey: During last 2 decades wolves are livestock dependent. Wild prey is very reduced due to hunting. There is an initiative to minimize the pressure on prey in order to help recovery of prey species. There is also competition between wildlife and domestic animals.

Damages: Farmers readily use guarding dogs. If the land use activities remain the same, wolves will not represent a problem. Flocks of sheep in size of 200 – 2000.

Compensations: There is no compensation.

Public: Attitudes are negative.

International cooperation: Through BalkaNet.

Mortality: There is no evidence about wolf mortality. During 1970 - 1985 when poisons were used, annually about 300 wolves were killed. After the poisoning was abandoned, there is no information about mortality.

1.1 The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.

Not in the country domain.

1.2 The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.

Not in the country domain.

2.1 The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.

Not in the country domain.

2.2 The Group of Experts identifies all current and potential connection areas. Through this process, wolf recovery and management will be linked to the overall planning for the restoration of European ecosystems.

Not in the country domain.

2.3 Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.

To be done.

2.4 The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.

To be done.

2.5 *The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.*

To be done.

Action points to be added on country list:

4.1 Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan

5.2 Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions (reintroductions, managing hunting seasons and quotas, artificial feeding).

7.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of adopting the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.

7.4 Assess the genetic identity of local wolves in view of assessing/preventing wolf/dog hybridisation.

7.6 Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and getting the most out when using Large Guarding Dogs.

7.7 Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.

7.8 Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.

8.1 Assess the quality of wolf hunting in its biological and social perspectives.

8.2 When necessary, prepare a new proposal for hunting regulations including areas, quota seasons and methods

8.5 Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey populations and on the effects of wolves spatial organisation on ungulate populations and forest damage. More research on the hunter/wolf/prey-relation in the ecosystem is also urgent.

9.1 Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.

12.1 Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with funds availability and local priority

12.2 Maintain a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe

12.3 Co-ordinate the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

NEW country in ACTION PLAN

Status summary:

Population: Stable. Estimation 600 to 700 wolves. There are no isolated populations. Wolf areas are identified; 2/3 of the country is wolf habitat, 48% of country forested.

Legal: Wolf is not protected, but hunting law requires maintenance of all species. Also sanitary functions are acknowledged. Bounties were cancelled in 1986. Bern convention is not signed yet and no expert group formally established.

Prey: Natural prey is reduced.

Damages: There is a large amount of damages to livestock.

Compensations: There is no compensation.

Public: In current situation any campaign is not feasible.

International cooperation: International communication on individual level. No organized international cooperation.

Mortality: When the records were kept there was 200 killed wolves per year on average and the population was not endangered.

Action points proposed for the country:

- 2.5 Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.*
- 2.6 The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.*
- 2.5 The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.*
- 4.1 Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan*
- 5.2 Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions (reintroductions, managing hunting seasons and quotas, artificial feeding).*
- 7.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of adopting the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.*
- 7.4 Assess the genetic identity of local wolves in view of assessing/preventing wolf/dog hybridisation.*
- 7.7 Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.*
- 7.8 Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.*
- 8.1 Assess the quality of wolf hunting in its biological and social perspectives.*
- 8.2 When necessary, prepare a new proposal for hunting regulations including areas, quota seasons and methods*
- 8.6 Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey populations and on the effects of wolves spatial organisation on ungulate populations and forest damage. More research on the hunter/wolf/prey-relation in the ecosystem is also urgent.*
- 9.1 Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.*
- 12.1 Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with funds availability and local priority*
- 12.2 Maintain a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe*
- 12.3 Co-ordinate the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.*

Bulgaria

1.1 The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.

Not in the country domain.

1.2 The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.

Not in the country domain.

2.1 The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.

2.2 *The Group of Experts identifies all current and potential connection areas. Through this process, wolf recovery and management will be linked to the overall planning for the restoration of European ecosystems.*

Not in the country domain.

2.3 *Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.*

Not in the country domain.

2.4 *The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.*

2.5 *The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.*

Not in the country domain.

3.1 *Design a national PR campaign with the aim of informing the public opinion and making the wolf a political issue.*

Several separate public education activities performed and the systematic national PR campaign to be done.

3.2 *Prepare a document on the ways the Country and the EU are implementing the international laws and directives they have signed.*

Only general information on the EU documents – the country is negotiating on the implementation of the EU environmental laws.

3.3 Organise logistics and funding for national and international networks of government and NGO representatives on wolf management issues.

New – to be added.

3.4 *Ask the European Union to review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves*

Not relevant.

4.1 *Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan.*

No national wolf management group. National action plan in process by one NGO.

4.2 *Co-ordinate the work at national level with that of the international Group of Experts established by the Bern Convention.*

To be done.

5.1 *Identify all potential corridors among population fragments.*

Not evaluated yet. Current study on the wolf population by Balkani Wildlife Society.

5.2 *Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions.*

To be done.

6.1 *Assess the status of all recovering and small populations, including counting or monitoring wolf abundance, identifying wolf habitat quality and quantity (i.e., prey distribution and abundance).*

Not relevant, the population is growing in numbers and expanding nevertheless the legal hunting.

7.1 *Assess the feasibility and desirability of the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.*

To be done.

7.2 *Assess and manage the problem of feral and stray dogs, and the existing legislation to control them.*

In process, dog shelters, castration, legal extermination by hunters in forest areas.

7.3 *Prepare a census of existing facilities with captive wolves.*

Not evaluated, captive wolves are in zoos, only rarely in private people.

7.4 *Assess the genetic identity of local wolves.*

New – to be added.

7.5 *Review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves.*

New – to be added.

7.6 *Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and implementing the optimal use of Large Guarding Dogs.*

New – to be added. Underway, but needs more attention and more centralized efforts.

7.7 *Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.*

New – to be added.

8.1 *Assess the quality of wolf hunting in its biological and social perspectives.*

8.5 *Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey.*

New – to be added.

9.1 *Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.*

Not evaluated.

10.1 *Identify opinion leaders and stakeholders in wolf management; set up local management boards and involve them in management planning and implementation.*

New – to be added.

10.2 *Establish a permanent protocol of consultations with local people about the management actions to be implemented in their area.*

New – to added.

11.1 *Identify the need/desirability of an educational campaign at local or national level.*

Partial activities

11.2 *Design and implement an educational and information programme.*

Partial activities

11.3 *Design and implement a press campaign.*

To be done.

11.4 *Identify and empower credible wolf managers to represent the case of the wolf in front of the public and the press.*

To be done.

12.1 *Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with local priority.*

In process.

12.2 *Contribute to maintaining a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe.*

Partially done. Few contacts

12.3 *Contribute to the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.*

Partial contribution.

Croatia

Status summary:

Population: Stable. Estimation 130 to 170 wolves. There are no isolated populations. Wolf areas and zones are identified.

Legal: Wolf is protected since 1995, but illegal killing is going on.

Prey: Natural prey is limiting factor for wolves.

Damages: There is a large amount of damages to livestock, mostly sheep.

Compensations: There is compensation paid by government.

Public: Big survey done and campaign will follow.

International cooperation: International communication works.

Mortality: Each known case is recorded (about 5 per year)

1.1 The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.

Not in the country domain.

1.2 The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.

Not in the country domain.

2.1 The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.

Not in the country domain.

2.2 The Group of Experts identifies all current and potential connection areas. Through this process, wolf recovery and management will be linked to the overall planning for the restoration of European ecosystems.

Done, corridors are not problem so far.

2.3 Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.

Can be provided.

2.4 The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.

Yes, currently under way.

2.5 The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.

Not in the country domain at this point.

3.1 Design a national PR campaign with the aim of informing the public opinion and making the wolf a political issue.

Should be done based on survey done (proposal within the approved Life project).

3.2 Prepare a document on the ways the Country and the EU are implementing the international laws and directives they have signed.

Coordinated. Regular reports for the Bern Convention.

3.3 Organise logistics and funding for national and international networks of government and NGO representatives on wolf management issues.

Partly in process.

3.4 Ask the European Union to review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves

Not relevant at present.

4.1 Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan.

Continuous process.

4.2 Co-ordinate the work at national level with that of the international Group of Experts established by the Bern Convention.

Done.

5.2 Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions.

Action should be taken, evaluation was done.

5.3 Evaluate the presence and impact of existing and planned infrastructure in zones where the wolf is present or recovering.

Assessed. Proposed mitigation measures.

6.1 Assess the status of all recovering and small populations, including counting or monitoring wolf abundance, identifying wolf habitat quality and quantity (i.e., prey distribution and abundance).

Not relevant.

6.2 Identify and manage source populations to ensure their continued existence.

Done.

6.3 Assess the attitudes of humans in wolf recovery areas.

Done.

7.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.

Definition not good. Problem wolves are the wolves in problem areas.

7.2 Assess and manage the problem of feral and stray dogs, and the existing legislation to control them.

Depends on local hunters. Not enough efforts implemented.

7.3 Prepare a census of existing facilities with captive wolves.

Not relevant.

7.4 Assess the genetic identity of local wolves.

Underway.

7.5 Review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves.

Underway plans to provide a subsidy for each animal produced in wolf areas without paying any further compensation in case of losses

7.6 Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and implementing the optimal use of Large Guarding Dogs.

Underway, but needs more attention.

7.7 Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.

Working.

7.8 *Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.*

Subsidies instead of compensations are proposed.

8.1 *Assess the quality of wolf hunting in its biological and social perspectives.*

Not done yet.

8.4 *Establish strong and credible fines for illegal hunting of wolves and enforce them.*

It is not enforced.

8.5 *Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey.*

Underway.

9.1 *Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.*

Ministry of tourism expressed interest. There are some individual examples of ecotourism which involves wolves.

10.1 *Identify opinion leaders and stakeholders in wolf management; set up local management boards and involve them in management planning and implementation.*

Done.

10.2 *Establish a permanent protocol of consultations with local people about the management actions to be implemented in their area.*

Established.

11.1 *Identify the need/desirability of an educational campaign at local or national level.*

Needed. There were lectures for teachers from elementary schools.

11.2 *Design and implement an educational and information programme.*

Needed. There were lectures for teachers from elementary schools.

11.3 *Design and implement a press campaign.*

Not done.

11.4 *Identify and empower credible wolf managers to represent the case of the wolf in front of the public and the press.*

Not done.

12.1 *Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with local priority.*

Working.

12.2 *Contribute to maintaining a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe.*

Working.

12.3 *Contribute to the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.*

FYR Macedonia

Status summary:

Population: Stable. Estimation 600 to 800 wolves. Some authors estimate 1000 – 1100. There are believed to be 2 populations of wolves divided by the fenced highway (east and west part of the country).

Legal: Wolves are not protected and there are bounties – 5€ or more per wolf paid by hunting associations. Poisoning was abandoned in 1980. There are some illegal poisoning cases.

Prey: Natural prey is limited. Stray dogs are not a problem.

Damages: Each flock of sheep has at least 2 guarding dogs, but there are some damages. Flocks 100 – 1000 sheep.

Compensations: Not compensation, only through insurance.

Public: There was a limited survey of public attitudes toward wolves (in 80s).

International cooperation: None. Wolves were never systematically studied.

Mortality: Shooting before 1980 was 200 – 400 per year. Recently numbers of killed wolves are increasing (200 per year).

1.1 The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.

Not in the country domain.

1.2 The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.

Not in the country domain.

2.1 The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.

Not in the country domain.

2.2 The Group of Experts identifies all current and potential connection areas. Through this process, wolf recovery and management will be linked to the overall planning for the restoration of European ecosystems.

Not in the country domain.

2.3 Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.

Not done.

2.4 The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.

Not done.

2.5 The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.

Not in the country domain.

Action points to be added on country list:

4.1 Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan

5.2 Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions (reintroductions, managing hunting seasons and quotas, artificial feeding).

7.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of adopting the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.

Definition not good. Problem wolves are the wolves in problem areas. Reduction of numbers is required.

7.4 Assess the genetic identity of local wolves in view of assessing/preventing wolf/dog hybridisation.

7.9 Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and getting the most out when using Large Guarding Dogs.

7.10 Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.

7.11 Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.

8.1 Assess the quality of wolf hunting in its biological and social perspectives.

8.2 When necessary, prepare a new proposal for hunting regulations including areas, quota seasons and methods

8.7 Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey populations and on the effects of wolves spatial organisation on ungulate populations and forest damage. More research on the hunter/wolf/prey-relation in the ecosystem is also urgent.

9.1 Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.

12.1 Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with funds availability and local priority

12.2 Maintain a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe

12.3 Co-ordinate the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.

Greece

1.1 The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.

Not in the country domain.

1.2 The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.

Not in the country domain.

2.1 The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.

Not in the country domain.

2.5 The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.

Not in the country domain at this point.

3.1 Design a national PR campaign with the aim of informing the public opinion and making the wolf a political issue. (NEW)

Very important, as wolf is already a political issue in Greece. The PR campaign has to be consisted by two parts: One considering local people in wolf areas (shepherds, hunters) and one considering the urban people. Even if wolf population in Greece is stable and even increasing these campaigns has to be organized; in fact it is also the same important as if the species was endangered. Side negative effects of wolf recovery like illegal use of poisons, rumors against ecological groups, social tensions and other problems has to be faced and the public has to be correctly informed about.

3.2 Prepare a document on the ways the Country and the EU are implementing the international laws and directives they have signed.

Partially accomplished through a relevant study during LIFE project.

3.4 Ask the European Union to review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves

Not accomplished. Feasible if organized from the group of experts with the co-operation of representatives by each country creating a working group.

4.2 Co-ordinate the work at national level with that of the international Group of Experts established by the Bern Convention.

Partially applied. Representatives from the Arcturos NGO maintain co-operation with the group of experts through the LCIE and also with other Balkan countries experts through the project "BALKAN NET". Common actions are irregularly organized with neighboring countries.

5.2 Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions.

This action is considered as a top priority one. Some steps are under way.

6.1 Assess the status of all recovering and small populations, including counting or monitoring wolf abundance, identifying wolf habitat quality and quantity (i.e., prey distribution and abundance).

5.3 Evaluate the presence and impact of existing and planned infrastructure in zones where the wolf is present or recovering. (NEW)

The action will be applied in a pilot region in Northern Pindos range. A monitoring project will start during 2002, to plan mitigation measures prior the construction of a new highway. The project is planned to continue during also the construction and the usage period of the highway.

6.1 Assess the status of all recovering and small populations, including counting or monitoring wolf abundance, identifying wolf habitat quality and quantity (i.e. prey distribution and abundance). (NEW)

Wolf population estimates have been applied at a national and regional level. Monitoring of wolf population is discontinued after the end of the relevant LIFE project.

6.2 Identify and manage source populations to ensure their continued existence.

Identification of source populations has been accomplished from the LIFE project. A detailed list of all NATURA 2000 areas that wolf exist has been prepared and a classification of these areas according to importance for species conservation has been made. Efforts to maintain and ensure population's existence have been discontinued after the end of the project.

6.3 Assess the attitudes of humans in wolf recovery areas. (NEW)

A preliminary study exists for the evaluation of attitudes of shepherds in a pilot region in central Greece.

7.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of the management approach of removing selected problem wolves. (NEW)

It must be added to the action plan and experimentally enforced and studied in selected regions. Feasible, if illegal harvesting is going to be reduced significantly. It is important to study first, if problem wolves do really exist.

7.2 Assess and manage the problem of feral and stray dogs, and the existing legislation to control them.

A preliminary assessing has been made during the LIFE project. Problem areas have been identified. Probably not feasible to control feral dogs due to social constraints and lack of personnel from local forest services. More feasible appear the education of hunters, shepherds and citizens and also the restriction of open garbage dumps, which support these dogs.

7.4 Assess the genetic identity of local wolves.

Accomplished, during the LIFE project. No hybridization occurred with dogs or seems rare. NGO Arcturos maintains some co-operation with laboratories to analyze more wolf samples.

7.5 Review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves.

Partially accomplished as shepherds can get an incentive for traditional guarding dog use through the agro-environmental organic livestock program. Very difficult if only taking account of wolf conservation. Wolf conservation is not considered a priority from relevant authorities as to promote or modify special policies for carnivore conservation.

7.6 Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and implementing the optimal use of Large Guarding Dogs.

Partially applied during the LIFE project. It can be accomplished only locally. Shepherd dog use and reconstruction of traditional breeds is highly accepted from shepherds and all relevant authorities. It is a major link between conservationists and farmers.

7.7 Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.

Already applied from the national organization for farmers insurance (ELGA). A more detailed monitoring system was active from 1998-2000 from LIFE project at a regional level. It is feasible to include the collection of data regarding ecology of depredation from ELGA. Needs some co-operation and training from an NGO (Arcturos).

7.8 Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.

The maintenance of a uniform compensation system covering also dog damage was accomplished. Proposals for the improvement of the national compensation system have been made. The ratio actual/covered by compensation damage caused by canids has been estimated. Better damage coverage can be successful but needs a lot of pressure from the NGO's.

8.4 Establish strong and credible fines for illegal hunting of wolves and enforce them. (NEW)

Not enforced. Greek legislation is strict for wolf killing but it can only be enforced especially to shepherds after drastic establishment of preventive measures, effective compensation and recovery of natural prey. In other words it must be considered to follow only after several years of efforts on appropriate conflict management. Enforcement of the law to hunters (which are not shepherds) has to be enforced. Information campaign is needed to explain hunters the aspects of wolf management.

8.5 Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have to local prey. (NEW)

Not accomplished. It is necessary and very important to be included in the action plan as totally nothing is known in Greece considering this aspect of great importance.

11.1 Identify the need/ desirability of an educational campaign at local or national level. (NEW)

Wolf management aspects have to be presented to local people and also to urban people. It is important to include them in a more intergraded way considering the need for a better way of managing ecosystems. Wolf can be the symbol and also the challenge of human societies of successful management when human activities and conservation needs are in real conflict.

11.2 Design and implement an educational and information programme.

It will be applied during 2002 in the wolf information center of Arcturos in northern Greece.

11.3 Design and implement a press campaign. (NEW)

Accomplished through years 1998-2001. Successful to reverse at least opinions of journalists for wolf conservation and make mass media more "wolf friendly".

12.1 Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with local priority.

Not-accomplished but feasible through RTD E.U projects.

12.2 Contribute to maintaining a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe.

Applied mainly through LCIE.

12.3 Contribute to the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.

Applied mainly through LCIE.

SFR - former Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

Status summary:

Population: Trend is stable and increasing. Estimations Serbia: 700, Montenegro: 200 – 300. Minimum 400.

Legal: In Vojvodina wolves are protected as natural rarity, in other parts wolves are not protected. Cases of poisoning wolves by shepherds.

Prey: Natural prey is limited.

Mortality: Annually approximately 200 wolves are killed in Serbia, there is no information from Montenegro.

1.1 The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.

Not in the country domain.

1.2 The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.

Not in the country domain.

2.1 The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.

Not in the country domain.

2.2 The Group of Experts identifies all current and potential connection areas. Through this process, wolf recovery and management will be linked to the overall planning for the restoration of European ecosystems.

Not in the country domain.

2.3 Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.

Not in the country domain at this time.

2.4 The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.

To be done.

2.5 The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.

Not in the country domain.

3.1 Design a national PR campaign with the aim of informing the public opinion and making the wolf a political issue.

Planned.

3.2 Prepare a document on the ways the Country and the EU are implementing the international laws and directives they have signed.

Not prepared, waiting for Bern Convention to be signed.

3.3 Organise logistics and funding for national and international networks of government and NGO representatives on wolf management issues.

There are some initiatives to do that.

4.1 Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan.

Not established, but there is an agreement among all interest groups to make management plans for all large carnivores.

4.2 *Co-ordinate the work at national level with that of the international Group of Experts established by the Bern Convention.*

5.2 *Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions.*

According to the hunting information, there is a decrease in numbers of prey species.

5.3 *Evaluate the presence and impact of existing and planned infrastructure in zones where the wolf is present or recovering.*

Planned.

6.1 *Assess the status of all recovering and small populations, including counting or monitoring wolf abundance, identifying wolf habitat quality and quantity (i.e., prey distribution and abundance).*

There is an isolated population close to Romania (connected with the Romanian population). Barriers between the two populations are significant.

6.2 *Identify and manage source populations to ensure their continued existence.*

Done.

6.3 *Assess the attitudes of humans in wolf recovery areas.*

Attitudes are negative.

7.1 *Assess the feasibility and desirability of the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.*

There is no management approach (wolves are not protected)

7.2 *Assess and manage the problem of feral and stray dogs, and the existing legislation to control them.*

Big problem, but not in wolf areas.

7.3 *Prepare a census of existing facilities with captive wolves.*

There are captive wolves (as pets).

7.5 *Review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves.*

Not done. There is a problem, but it is not the government's priority.

7.6 *Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and implementing the optimal use of Large Guarding Dogs.*

There is no such a program.

7.7 *Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.*

Incomplete monitoring, none in Montenegro.

7.8 *Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.*

According to the law yes, but not practiced. Compensations should be paid by hunters and government.

8.1 *Assess the quality of wolf hunting in its biological and social perspectives.*

Hunting cannot threaten the population at present. There is some stimulation from the hunting association for hunting.

8.4 *Establish strong and credible fines for illegal hunting of wolves and enforce them.*

There was one court case in Vojvodina, but the poacher wasn't punished.

8.5 *Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey.*

There is only some data from hunting association.

9.1 *Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.*

There is an initiative for trophy hunting.

10.1 *Identify opinion leaders and stakeholders in wolf management; set up local management boards and involve them in management planning and implementation.*

Should be done.

10.2 *Establish a permanent protocol of consultations with local people about the management actions to be implemented in their area.*

Will be applied.

11.1 *Identify the need/desirability of an educational campaign at local or national level.*

Some NGOs and experts started.

11.2 *Design and implement an educational and information programme.*

Some NGOs and experts started.

11.3 *Design and implement a press campaign.*

Should be done.

11.4 *Identify and empower credible wolf managers to represent the case of the wolf in front of the public and the press.*

Will be done.

12.1 *Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with local priority.*

At the moment none, but there is a need and desire to start.

12.2 *Contribute to maintaining a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe.*

Should be done.

12.3 *Contribute to the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.*

Should be done.

Slovenia

Status summary:

Population: Population is expanding. Since the protection the population is recovering and expanding. Forested areas increased 300 000 to 350000 ha in last 40 – 50 years.

Legal: It is legally protected in 1993.

Prey: Natural prey is not a limiting factor for wolves.

Damages: The extend of the damages is now approaching that of the damages done by brown bear. During last 10 years number of sheep increased 6 times, while damage prevention is not adequate.

Compensations: There is compensation paid by government.

Monitoring: Very good monitoring system established.

1.1 *The Bern Convention adopts this Action Plan and the Country participate in establishing a Group of Experts on Wolf Management.*

Not in the country domain.

1.2 *The Group of Experts produces a detailed European Wolf Management Plan and submits the Plan to be approved by the Bern Convention.*

Not in the country domain.

2.1 *The Group of Experts identifies at large scale all areas of Europe where wolves or their potential wild prey are still present with viable populations.*

Not in the country domain.

2.2 *The Group of Experts identifies all current and potential connection areas. Through this process, wolf recovery and management will be linked to the overall planning for the restoration of European ecosystems.*

Not in the country domain.

2.3 *Each area (or group of areas at regional, national or sub-national level) is provided with a detailed Management Plan (National or Regional) drafted by national authorities in co-ordination with neighbouring countries.*

Not in the country domain at this time.

2.4 *The national and local public is involved in the process of area identification and drafting of the preliminary Management Plans.*

2.5 *The final European Wolf Management Plan, composed by all national and/or regional Plans is submitted to the Bern Convention for approval, and national legislation is adjusted accordingly.*

3.1 *Design a national PR campaign with the aim of informing the public opinion and making the wolf a political issue.*

Underway. Ministry of environment is competent.

3.2 *Prepare a document on the ways the Country and the EU are implementing the international laws and directives they have signed.*

3.3 *Organise logistics and funding for national and international networks of government and NGO representatives on wolf management issues.*

Does not work.

3.4 *Ask the European Union to review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves*

Nothing has been done from the EU. It was requested.

4.1 *Identify and establish national wolf management groups and empower them to design the national wolf management plan.*

There is wolf management group, plan will be done.

4.2 *Co-ordinate the work at national level with that of the international Group of Experts established by the Bern Convention.*

No information.

5.1 *Identify all potential corridors among population fragments.*

Not a problem. Wolves are just near the Julian Alps.

5.2 *Evaluate the status of the food supply for the wolf in various regions and identify the needs for specific actions.*

Data exists, food supply is not a problem for wolves.

5.3 *Evaluate the presence and impact of existing and planned infrastructure in zones where the wolf is present or recovering.*

6.1 *Assess the status of all recovering and small populations, including counting or monitoring wolf abundance, identifying wolf habitat quality and quantity (i.e., prey distribution and abundance).*

Not relevant. What is a small population? There are some individual dispersions into new areas.

6.2 *Identify and manage source populations to ensure their continued existence.*

Done.

6.3 *Assess the attitudes of humans in wolf recovery areas.*

Done.

7.1 *Assess the feasibility and desirability of the management approach of removing selected problem wolves.*

Not good definition – all wolves are problem wolves. There are hotspots defined where all wolves are problem wolves.

7.2 *Assess and manage the problem of feral and stray dogs, and the existing legislation to control them.*

Not a problem, assessed.

7.3 *Prepare a census of existing facilities with captive wolves.*

Do not have it.

7.4 *Assess the genetic identity of local wolves.*

Underway.

7.5 *Review and correct the economic incentives policies to shepherds in areas with wolves.*

Problem. Compensation of the damages does function. Government is subsidizing new pastures.

7.6 *Establish a sound scientific programme for assessing and implementing the optimal use of Large Guarding Dogs.*

One of the most important points. This tradition was forgotten, but there are big interests. Round table was organized.

7.7 *Establish a permanent monitoring programme for damages caused by wolves and other predators.*

Exists.

7.8 *Define the most suitable compensation scheme for each national/regional group of wolf areas.*

In progress.

8.4 *Establish strong and credible fines for illegal hunting of wolves and enforce them.*

One hunter was punished for killing a wolf. Fine is around 5000€

8.5 *Implement more research on the impact wolves and hunters have on local prey.*

There is research and there is no problem.

9.1 *Assess the feasibility for an economic exploitation of the wolf.*

Not seems to be possible.

10.1 *Identify opinion leaders and stakeholders in wolf management; set up local management boards and involve them in management planning and implementation.*

In process.

10.2 *Establish a permanent protocol of consultations with local people about the management actions to be implemented in their area.*

Damage inspectors only.

11.1 *Identify the need/desirability of an educational campaign at local or national level.*

Articles were published, but it has to be done continuously.

11.2 *Design and implement an educational and information programme.*

11.3 *Design and implement a press campaign.*

11.4 Identify and empower credible wolf managers to represent the case of the wolf in front of the public and the press.

12.1 Co-ordinate a programme of scientific research at European level, distributing research topics along with local priority.

Running according to the possibilities, also with Framework 6.

12.2 Contribute to maintaining a close link among all researchers working on the wolf in Europe.

Works.

12.3 Contribute to the regular gathering of all necessary data to monitor the management and biological conditions of the wolf in all European countries.

Works.

COUNTRY	NAME	AFFILIATION	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER/S	FAX NUMBER/S	E-mail Address
ALBANIA	Ferdinand Bego	Albanian Society for the Protection of Birds and Mammals (A.S.P.B.M.)	Museum of Natural Sciences, Rr e Kavajes TIRANA Albania	+355 42 29028	+355 42 29028	ferdibego@albaniaonline.net
ALBANIA	Haki Zoto	General Directorate of Forests and Pastures	RR. Mihael Gromeno Ap. 7818 Titono, Albania	+355256786	+355256785	haki.zoto@alonco.opp.net
ALBANIA	Mr. Haxhi Aliko	Vet. Fac. (retired)				
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	Vlado Soldo	Šume HercegBosne	Hrvatskih branitelja bb., 88000 Mostar Bosna i Hercegovina	387-36-322699 387-66-327452	387-36-316236	Vlado [vlado.soldo@tel.net.ba]
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	Milan Micevic	LOVACKI SAVEZ REPUBLIKE SRPSKE	Romanijska 3/1 SOKOLAC 71350 SOKOLAC BOSNA I HERCEGOVINA	oo387-57-447 052	oo387-57-447 052	lsrs@paleol.net
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	Živko Rapaic	Lovacki savez republike Srpske (retired)	Grbavicka 2	387-33-9510478		rapaic@bih.net.ba
BULGARIA	Diana Zlatanova	Sofia Zoo, Education and Research Centre Srebarna Str. 1, PoB 67 1407 Sophia, Bulgaria	Alitcho 43, Kasitchene, Sofia 1532 Bulgaria	+35988796040 +35929995695 +35929620449	+359268202	zlite@mbox.infotel.bg
CROATIA	KUSAK Josip	University of Zagreb Biology Dept., Vet. Faculty	Heinzlova 55 10000 ZAGREB Croatia	385 1.2390 142	+385 1 244 1390	kusak@vef.hr
CROATIA	HUBER Djuro	University of Zagreb Biology Dept., Veterinary Faculty	Heinzlova 55 10000 ZAGREB Croatia	385 1 2390 141	+385 1 24 41 390	duro.huber@zg.tel.hr
CROATIA	Tomislav Gomercic	University of Zagreb Biology Dept., Veterinary Faculty	Heinzlova 55 10000 ZAGREB Croatia	385 1 2390 141	+385 1 24 41 390	tomislav.gomercic@zg.hinet.hr
CROATIA	Alojzije Frkovic		Kvarnerska 43 51000 Rijeka	051.546236	-	alozjije.frkovic@ri.hinet.hr
CROATIA	Ana Štrbenac	Ministarstvo za zaštitu okoliša i prostorno planiranje	Vukovarska 78 10000 Zagreb Croatia	385-1-6106522		ana.strbenac@duzo.tel.hr
CROATIA	Branko Ivcek	Ministarstvo poljoprivrede i šumarstva	Vukovarska 78 10000 Zagreb Croatia	385-1-6106645	385-1-6109203	-
CROATIA	Aleksandra Majic	Cnada, Memorial University of New Founland	Dep. of Geography SN-2005, A1B 3X9 St. John's, NF, Canada			Ialmajic@inet.hr
SLOVENIA	ADAMIC Miha,	Biotechnical Faculty, Department of Forestry and Renewable Forest	Vecna Pot 83, p.p 2995 1001 LJUBLJANA Slovenia	+386 61 123 1161 +386 61 152 7020 (home)	+386 61 271 169	miha.adamic@uni-lj.si
SLOVENIA	Marko Jonozovic	Zavod za gozdove Slovenije	Vecna pot 2 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia	386-1-4235432 (loc.109)	386-1-4235361	marko.jonozovic@gov.si
SLOVENIA	Mateja Blažic	Environmental Agency of the Republic of Slovenia	Vojcova 1b 1001 Ljubljana Slovenia	386-1-4784533	386-1-4784051	mateja.blazic@gov.si
MACEDONIA	Dimitar Rolevski	Ministerstvo za zivotna sredina i prostorno planiranje	"Drezdenska"-52 1000 Skopje Republika Makedonija	+389 2 366 930, lok. 122	Faks: +389 2 366 931	Dimitar Rolevski [rolemk@yahoo.com]
YUGOSLAVIA	Bratislav Grubac	Zavod za zastitu prirode Srbije	Zavod za zastitu prirode Srbije, Treci Bulevar 106, 11070 Novi Beograd	381-1-1142281 381-1-114165	381-1-1142211	Bratislav Grubac [grubacs@ptt.yu]
YUGOSLAVIA	Mr Milan Paunovic	Prirodnjacki muzej - kustos	Zoolosko odelenje za Vertebrata Prirodnjacki muzej Njegoseva 51, p.p. 401 11000 Beograd Yugoslavia	381.11.3442.147	381.11.3442.265	Mustela [paunmchi@EUnet.yu]
Switzerland	Anja Jobin Molinari	Kora / SCALP	Rueti 62c 3855 Sdwander? Switzerland	387-33-202056		JobinMolinari@aol.com

<i>COUNTRY</i>	NAME	AFFILIATION	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER/S	FAX NUMBER/S	E-mail Address
<i>Italy</i>	Paolo Molinari	University of Padova Italian lynx project	Via A. Diaz, 90 33018 Tarvisio, Italy	39-0428-40335 39-028-40148	39-0428-40335 39-028-40148	p.molinari@progetto-lince-italia.it

Excused

GREECE	Yorgos Mertzanis	ARCTUROS	3, Victor Hugo Str. GR-546 25 THESSALONIKI Greece			Yorgos Mertzanis [mertzanis@arcturos.gr]
YUGOSLAVIA	Ceda Ivanovic	Prirodnjacki muzej	Prirodnjacki muzej, trg Nikole Kovacevica 81000 Podgorica, Crna Gora, Jugoslavija	381 81 633184		Lynx [lynx@cg.yu]
MACEDONIA	doc. dr. Ljupco Melovski	Faculty of Science Institute for Biology	Arhimedova bb Skopje Macedonia	389-91-117055		melovski@iunona.pmf.uki m.edu.mk
MACEDONIA	Dr. Svetozar Petkovski	Macedonian Natural History Museum	Ilindenska 8 Skopje Macedonia	389-91-117669		svetozar@unet.com.mk
LCIE	PRATESI URQUHART William,		Craigston Castle TURRIFF GB-Aberdeenshire AB53 7PX Scotland	+44 1888 55 12 28 Mobile: +44 370 94 53 13	+44 1888 551 717	wpratesi@csi.com / Williamurquhart@craigston.com