



THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF POPULATIONS OF EUROPEAN BATS

Record of the 5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Contents:

Record of the Meeting.....	2
Annex 1: List of Participants.....	13
Annex 2: Report of the Administrative Working Group.....	21
Annex 3: Report of the Scientific Working Group.....	24
Annex 4: Resolution 5.1: Financial and Administrative Matters (Budget 2007 – 2010).....	30
Annex 5: Resolution 5.2: Bat Rabies in Europe.....	39
Annex 6: Resolution 5.3: Amendment of the Annex to the Agreement.....	45
Annex 7: Resolution 5.4: Monitoring Bats across Europe.....	48
Annex 8: Resolution 5.5: Amendment to Resolution 4.6: Guidelines for the Issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Captured Wild Bats.....	50
Annex 9: Resolution 5.6: Wind Turbines and Bat Populations.....	51
Annex 10: Resolution 5.7: Guidelines for the Protection of Overground Roosts, with Particular Reference to Roosts in Buildings of Cultural Heritage Importance.....	78
Annex 11: Resolution 5.8: Establishment of a Standing Committee of the Agreement...	80
Annex 12: Resolution 5.9: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee.....	83
Annex 13: Resolution 5.10: Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan.....	85
Annex 14: Resolution 5.11: Geographical Scope of the Agreement.....	90
Annex 15: Resolution 5.12: 2008 – Global Year of the Bat.....	99

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 - 6 September 2006

Record of the Meeting



1. Attendance

This is listed at **Annex 1** to this Record.

2. Opening remarks:

Mr. Peter Lina (The Netherlands), Chair of the Advisory Committee and acting Chair of the conference, opened the Meeting. He welcomed the participants and invited a representative of the host country (Slovenia) to make opening remarks.

On behalf of the Slovenian Government, Mr. Radovan Tavzes, Director General for the Ministry for Environment and Spatial Planning, welcomed the delegates to the meeting and expressed his pleasure that the 5th Session of the Meeting of Parties was being held in Slovenia. He also extended a warm welcome to the UNEP, UNON and UNEP/CMS representatives. He commented on the richness of biodiversity in Slovenia, which incorporates four biogeographical regions and noted the contribution of the EUROBATS Agreement to the Convention on Biological Diversity. He wished the delegates a successful and productive Meeting in contributing to nature conservation and bat conservation in particular.

Mr. Peter Lina thanked the Director General for his kind words and Slovenia for hosting the Meeting and also the organisers of the excellent field trip. He welcomed all delegates of Parties, Non-Party Range States and Non-Governmental Organisations. He thanked the Executive Secretary, Mr. Andreas Streit and his assistants, for organising the Meeting so successfully and also all the experts who had worked so hard to prepare the Meeting. He expressed a desire to improve pan-European conservation of bats and urged delegates to make wise decisions in the Meeting, because it was important for the implementation of the Agreement.

The Director of the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions, Mr. Bakary Kante had sent a welcoming address on behalf of the UNEP Executive Director, Mr. Achim Steiner,

which was read by the UNEP representative, Ms. Elizabeth Mrema. The Executive Director sent his thanks to the Government of Slovenia for the kind invitation to host the Meeting and expressed his best wishes for a successful outcome. He stressed that UNEP commitment to the implementation of the EUROBATS Agreement was stronger than ever. He further noted that UNEP administrative support would continue to improve in the future (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.53).

On behalf of the Executive Secretary of UNEP/CMS, Mr. Robert Hepworth, Ms. Paola Deda read a message in which he expressed his thanks for the opportunity to address the Meeting on the 15th Anniversary of the signing of the Agreement. He sent his best wishes for the Meeting and noted that the continuing success of the Agreement could be measured in terms of the growing number of Parties. He further noted the fact that following the auditing process, the auditors had acknowledged that EUROBATS had been managed very effectively by the Secretariat (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.54.Rev.1).

Mr. Andreas Streit (Executive Secretary) thanked the Director General for providing excellent facilities for the Meeting, as well as such a beautiful excursion the day before, and expressed gratitude to Slovenia for hosting the Meeting. He welcomed the Secretariat to the Bern Convention. He further expressed thanks to all who had helped to prepare the Meeting, especially his excellent staff members and EUROBATS interns. He thanked the United Kingdom for provisions of a voluntary contribution to support delegates from countries with economies in transition and noted that the contribution had helped the Meeting to take place. He wished delegates to note that this Session of the Meeting of Parties was a special occasion, marking the 15th Anniversary of the conclusion of the Agreement and that there would be a special reception in celebration. He expressed hope that the good spirit of lively debate without confrontation that had been a long tradition of EUROBATS Meetings would continue throughout this Session of the Meeting of Parties. He also welcomed the Non-Governmental Organisations to the Meeting.

3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

The Executive Secretary noted that the Rules of Procedure were the same as for the previous Session of the Meeting of Parties. Norway requested clarification of Rule 3 referring to credentials on who should be considered the proper authority for signing credentials. It was agreed that in future there would be a more detailed description on how credentials should be issued.

4. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The delegate from Macedonia proposed Mr. Peter Skoberne from Slovenia to be Chair of the Meeting. The nomination was seconded by the delegates from Croatia and the Ukraine and was carried by consensus.

The delegate from Sweden proposed Ms. Tuuli Lovén from Finland to be Vice-Chair, as Finland holds the EU Presidency. The nomination was seconded by Estonia and The Netherlands and was carried by consensus.

5. Adoption of the Agenda (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.1.Rev.2)

The Agenda was formally adopted without amendments by consensus.

6. Election of the Chairpersons of the Administrative and Scientific Working Groups

The delegate from Belgium proposed Ms. Luisa Rodrigues from Portugal to Chair the Administrative Working Group. The proposal was seconded by the UK and the Slovak Republic and carried by consensus.

The delegate from Sweden proposed Mr. Peter Lina from The Netherlands as Chair of the Scientific Working Group. The proposal was seconded by the UK and Macedonia and agreed by consensus.

7. Establishment of the Credentials Committee

The Chair noted the importance of this role for legal procedures and for the status of the Meeting. It was agreed by consensus that the UK, as Depositary for the Agreement, should Chair the Committee with Sweden, the Ukraine and Macedonia participating.

8. Admission of observers

The Meeting formally admitted all observers by consensus.

9. Welcoming addresses

Oral welcoming addresses were given by Germany, as the host country for the UNEP/CMS and its co-located Agreement Secretariats, the United Kingdom as Depositary (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.57) and from Finland on behalf of the European Union Member States and accession countries and candidate countries (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.55).

The delegate from Italy extended a warm greeting to everyone on the occasion of attending for the first time as a Party to the Agreement and noted the importance of EUROBATS for raising public awareness for the need for bat protection in Italy.

10. Report of the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee

The Chair of the Advisory Committee, Mr. Peter Lina, referred to the written Report (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.5). He drew attention to the successful outcomes of the bat rabies workshop, including Europe-wide acceptance of the recommendations by medical and veterinary authorities, especially with respect to monitoring rabies in bats. The workshop had also contributed to dispelling negative attitude towards bats and rabies.

11. Secretariat Report

The Executive Secretary, Mr. Andreas Streit, referred to the written Report (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.6). He noted that the move of the Secretariat to new premises had taken place and that it was good to be co-located with UNEP/CMS Convention and other CMS Agreements once again. He thanked the government of Germany, sincerely, for having provided the excellent office facilities. He noted that for this Session of the Meeting of Parties many National Implementation Reports had arrived very late and some were still missing. Therefore it had not been possible to produce a synthesis of reports for the Meeting. He recognised the great burden for Parties, to report to Conventions and Agreements they are parties to, but advised that work was underway within the UNEP/CMS to provide a new online reporting system to help with submission of national reports.

He was happy to report that since the 4th Session of the Meeting of Parties, Slovenia, Estonia and Italy had joined the Agreement. He extended a warm welcome to all new Parties, and was glad that he could count on their future cooperation and support for the successful operation of the Agreement. He also noted that there were key Non-Party Range States with very important bat populations, and it was important to encourage them to accede to the Agreement. He urged Parties to assist in lobbying towards these countries on behalf of the Secretariat, because it was impossible for the Secretariat to carry out this work alone.

He was very pleased to report on the continued success of European Bat Night celebrations, and expressed delight that people continue to organise and participate in local initiatives and that many countries had found the production of Bat Night posters

very helpful and useful. He thanked the German Ministry of the Environment for hosting and funding an event in Bonn prior to the Meeting.

He expressed great pleasure in the ever-increasing amount of voluntary contributions for projects managed by EUROBATS. While noting the importance of the project work, he mentioned the increased work of the Secretariat.

He expressed thanks to the UNEP/CMS Secretariat for continued support on a daily basis.

There was a request from Luxembourg that their voluntary contribution should go towards projects on bat conservation, rather than towards the costs of Advisory Committee meetings. The Executive Secretary supported the proposal, but noted that the actual costs of Advisory Committee meetings depended greatly on voluntary contributions. He asked Parties to ensure that the regular budget in the future would cover the cost of meetings, which should be helped by adopting the proposed new structure.

12. Report of the Depository (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.49)

The United Kingdom was pleased to inform the Meeting that since the 4th Session of the Meeting of Parties, Slovenia, Estonia and Italy had acceded to the Agreement. The Depository encouraged those Parties who had not yet done so, to deposit their instruments of acceptance for the second Amendment to the Agreement.

13. Review of the implementation of the Agreement

All present Parties and Non-Party Range States made oral presentations regarding bat conservation measures of the last triennium. Range States also informed the Plenary about the progress made in acceding to the Agreement. Non-Governmental Organisations reported on bat conservation work in their countries.

France commented that bat conservation required a united approach across many different sectors and that it was essential to receive information documents at least one month in advance of Meetings, in order to obtain support from different sectors.

Concerning progress on acceding to the Agreement, Austria advised that there was no plan to become Party to the Agreement at present. The Russian Federation called for assistance to join UNEP/CMS and the Agreements. Serbia advised that they were preparing to join UNEP/CMS and were likely to join the EUROBATS Agreement as well. They also agreed to provide the name of a Focal Point in Montenegro.

Société Française pour l'Étude et la Protection des Mammifères (SFEMP) reported on a Life Programme project for *R. euryale*, *M. schreibersii* and *M. capaccinii*, which was aiming to determine the foraging habitats of the 3 species.

Naturschutzbund Deutschland (NABU) – reported great interest among members in taking part in a pan-European project for monitoring underground sites.

Gruppo Italiano Richerche Chiroteri advised that there was strong and effective cooperation with the Italian Government and increased public awareness of bat conservation.

The Wildlife Conservation Society, MUSTELA in Serbia advised that they had successfully initiated founding of a bat group in Montenegro and that all monitoring work and bat workers training was continuing.

The Bat Conservation Trust reported great interest in the pan-European monitoring project and that it was delighted to take forward the BatLife project as requested at AC11.

IUCN Europe advised that the IUCN was carrying out a Red List assessment for all European mammals, including all bats. The results were in a consultation process and should be available later this year.

14. Report of the Credentials Committee

The Chair of the Credentials Committee, Mr. Huw Thomas (UK), reported that 25 Parties had presented valid credentials. Those of Albania were signed by the Environment Minister and not the Head of State, Head of Government or the Minister of Foreign Affairs but they were accepted.

Those of Hungary were also signed by the Environment Minister and are presently a faxed photocopy and not the original document and are thus not satisfactory. The Committee was, however, content to accept them on a provisional basis, on condition that the original document is submitted to the Secretariat within two weeks after the Meeting of the Parties. There was no obvious official seal on the Credentials of Finland or Ireland but the documents were accepted as presented.

No credentials were provided by Macedonia, the Slovak Republic and Lithuania.

The Chair of the Credentials Committee urged the Parties to ensure that the credentials submitted to the next Session of the Meeting of Parties should meet all formal

requirements. The provision of translations into English as the working language of the Agreement, or otherwise French or German was considered helpful.

Finally, Mr. Huw Thomas (UK) thanked the delegates from Sweden, the Ukraine and FYR Macedonia, for kindly volunteering to assist with this task.

15. Allocation of Tasks to the Working Groups

The documents for discussion by the working groups were allocated as follows:

Administrative Working Group

- i) Draft Resolution 5.1: Financial and Administrative Matters (Budget 2007 – 2010).
- ii) Draft Resolution 5.8: Establishment of a Standing Committee of the Agreement (StC).
- iii) Draft Resolution 5.9: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee (AC).

Scientific Working Group

- i) Draft Resolution 5.2: Bat Rabies in Europe
- ii) Draft Resolution 5.3: Amendment of the Annex to the Agreement.
- iii) Draft Resolution 5.4: Monitoring Bats across Europe.
- iv) Draft Resolution 5.5: Amendment to Resolution 4.6: Guidelines for the issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Captured Wild Bats.
- v) Draft Resolution 5.6: Wind Turbines and Bat Populations.
- vi) Draft Resolution 5.7: Guidelines for the Protection of Overground Roosts, with particular reference to roosts in buildings of cultural heritage importance.
- vii) Draft Resolution 5.10: Establishment of the EUROBATS Implementation Advisory Board (EIAB)
- viii) Draft Resolution 5.11: Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan (2007 – 2010).
- ix) Draft Resolution 5.12: Geographical Scope of the Agreement.

16. Reports of the Administrative and the Scientific Working Groups

The Working Groups presented their reports that are attached as **Annexes 2 and 3**.

17. Draft Resolution 5.1: Financial and Administrative Matters (Budget 2007 - 2010)

The Netherlands wishes, in regard to the audit report, to maintain its contribution as proposed in Draft Resolution 5.1. The Netherlands further instructed the Secretariat to use this voluntary increase in contribution to cover an increase in the host country (the staff salary increases) and other unforeseen shortfalls. The Secretariat commented that budget negotiations had been difficult and that there was an option to consider countries not taking a cut in their budgets, but either accepting the original proposal of an increase or of no change either way. A number of Parties supported the decision of the Netherlands. The Meeting was pleased to hear that those countries whose contributions, based on the adopted budget, would be lower in the coming four years, decided that they did not wish this to happen. Some Parties decided to revert to their contributions resulting from the original budget proposal. These were: (Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, FYR Macedonia, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden). Other Parties decided to maintain the same level of contribution as in the past triennium. These were: (Czech Republic, Hungary, Luxembourg, Moldova and Ukraine).

A number of Parties wished to include in the Record their wish that the Draft budget presented by the Secretariat for consideration at future Sessions of the Meeting of Parties should include realistic itemised provision for all anticipated costs and contingencies. The Secretariat explained that the audit report was a key document and that the Auditors had indicated an increase in the budget was required to cover contingencies but that this should be left to the Parties to decide.

The Resolution and relevant Annexes were adopted with amendments (**Annex 4**).

The Executive Secretary noted for the record that the Parties had decided not to follow most of the Auditors recommendations and that this involved a potential risk for shortfalls in the coming financial years.

18. Draft Resolution 5.2: Bat Rabies in Europe (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.8.Rev.3)

The Resolution was adopted by the Meeting by consensus as amended (**Annex 5**).

19. Draft Resolution 5.3: Amendment of the Annex to the Agreement (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.9 and Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.9.Rev.1)

The Resolution was adopted by consensus (**Annex 6**).

**20. Draft Resolution 5.4: Monitoring Bats across Europe
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.10)**

The Resolution was adopted by consensus (**Annex 7**).

**21. Draft Resolution 5.5: Amendment to Resolution 4.6: Guidelines for the issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Captured Wild Bats
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.11.Rev.2)**

The Resolution was adopted by consensus with amendments (**Annex 8**).

**22. Draft Resolution 5.6: Wind Turbines and Bat Populations
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.12.Rev.3).**

A small group revised the Draft Resolution and its Annex. After amendments were presented to the Plenary the document was adopted (**Annex 9**).

**23. Draft Resolution 5.7: Guidelines for the Protection of Overground Roosts, with particular reference to roosts in buildings of cultural heritage importance
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.13.Rev.1).**

The Resolution was adopted by consensus (**Annex 10**).

24. Draft Resolution 5.8: Establishment of a Standing Committee of the Agreement (StC) (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.14.Rev.2)

The Resolution was adopted by consensus after some discussion and with amendments (**Annex 11**).

**25. Draft Resolution 5.9: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.15)**

The Resolution was adopted by consensus (**Annex 12**).

26. Draft Resolution 5.10: Establishment of the EUROBATS Implementation Advisory Board (EIAB)

The Draft Resolution was withdrawn, since the Scientific Working Group had the opinion that on this subject an Intersessional Working Group of the Advisory Committee should be created (see Annex 3 of the Record). The Meeting accepted this suggestion, as such a mandate was also covered by paragraph 1 of the Conservation and Management Plan.

27. Draft Resolution 5.11: Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.17.Rev.2)

The Resolution was adopted by consensus with amendments and **renumbered to 5.10 (Annex 13)**.

28. Draft Resolution 5.12: Geographical Scope of the Agreement (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.20.Rev.1)

The Resolution was adopted by consensus and **renumbered to 5.11 (Annex 14)**.

29. Draft Resolution 5.13: 2008 - International Year of the Bat

The Secretariat introduced this Resolution and noted that UNEP/CMS felt there should be attention to bats on a global as well as regional scale and hoped that other regions would develop Agreements similar to EUROBATS. UNEP/CMS were requesting EUROBATS Parties to endorse the proposal. It was noted that there had recently been an International Year of the Bat and it was suggested to change the wording to “Global” instead of “International”. The Resolution was adopted by consensus with that amendment and **renumbered to 5.12 (Annex 15)**.

30. Election of Members of the Standing Committee

The delegate from Sweden proposed Finland as a member and this was seconded by Latvia.

The delegate from the Netherlands proposed Czech Republic and this was seconded by Croatia and Slovenia.

The delegate from France proposed Italy and this was seconded by Albania.

The delegate from Moldova, seconded by Ireland, proposed Ukraine.

The delegate from Belgium, seconded by Portugal, proposed France.

Duly, Finland, Czech Republic, France, Ukraine and Italy were elected to join the United Kingdom (Depositary) and Germany (host country of the Secretariat) as members of the Standing Committee.

The Chair and Vice-Chair will be elected by the members of the Committee in the first formal Meeting of the Committee.

31. Arrangements for the 6th Session of the Meeting of Parties

The delegate from the Czech Republic wished to invite the next Session of the Meeting of Parties in 2010 to take place in the Czech Republic.

32. Any other business

There was no other business.

33. Adoption of the Record of the Meeting

The Record and its Annexes were adopted by consensus.

34. Close of Meeting

The Executive Secretary expressed his gratitude about the successful outcomes of the Meeting. He thanked the Chair and the Vice-Chair for having handled the proceedings in such an excellent manner. He also thanked again the Slovenian Ministry of Environment for having hosted the Meeting. Furthermore the Executive Secretary thanked his assistants, Ms. Ayhan Polat, Ms. Dessislava Krüger, Ms. Janina Dräger and Mr. Max Jones for their excellent work.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its excellent work in preparation for and during the Meeting. He also expressed thanks to the Vice-Chair and Chairs of the Working Groups for their assistance. Furthermore he thanked the delegates for their substantial contributions to the successful work of the Meeting.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the Meeting formally closed at 00.05 on 7th September 2006.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

List of Participants



PARTIES

ALBANIA

Ms. Elvana Ramaj
Ministry of the Environment,
Forest and Water Administration
Nature Protection Policies Directorate
Rr. Durresi, Nr. 27
Tirana

Tel: +355 4 270 624

Fax: +355 4 270 627

E-mail: eramaj@moe.gov.al
eramaj@hotmail.com

BELGIUM

Dr. Ludo Holsbeek
Ministry of the Flemish Community
Department of Environment, Nature and
Energy

Koning Albert II - laan 20, bus 8
1000 Bruxelles

Tel: +32 2 553 03 05

Mob: +32 498 194667

E-mail: ludo.holsbeek@lne.vlaanderen.be

CROATIA

Ms. Andrea Štefan
Ministry of Culture
Nature Protection Directorate
Runjaninova 2
10 000 Zagreb

Tel: +385 1 48 66 124

Fax: +385 1 48 66 100

E-mail: andrea.stefan@min-kulture.hr

Ms. Zrinka Domazetovic
Ministry of Culture
Nature Protection Directorate
Runjaninova 2
10 000 Zagreb

Tel: +385 1 4866 127

Fax: +385 1 4866 100

E-mail: zrinka.domazetovic@min-kulture.hr

Dr. Nikola Tvrtković
Croatian Natural History Museum
Demetrova 1
10 000 Zagreb

Tel: +385 1 4851 700

Mob: +385 98 216 660

Fax: +385 1 4851 644

E-mail: Nikola.Tvrtkovic@hpm.hr

CZECH REPUBLIC

Ms. Libuse Vlasakova
Ministry of Environment
Department for the International
Conservation of Biodiversity
Vrsovicka 65

100 10 Praha 10 - Vršovice

Tel: +420 2 6712 2372

Fax: +420 2 6731 0328

E-mail: libuse_vlasakova@env.cz

Dr. Josef Chytil
Agency for Nature Conservation and
Landscape Protection
Pla Pálava, Namesti 32
692 01 Mikulov

Tel: +420 519 510 585

Fax: +420 519 511 130

E-mail: josef.chytil@schkocr.cz

DENMARK

Ms. Maj F. Munk
Ministry of the Environment
The Danish Forest and Nature Agency
Division for Wildlife Management
Haraldsgade 53

2100 Kopenhagen Ø

Tel: +45 39 47 2428

Fax: +45 39 47 2312

E-mail: mfm@sns.dk

ESTONIA

Ms. Lilika Käis
Ministry of the Environment
Narva str. 7A
15172 Tallinn
Tel: +372 62 62 881
Fax: +372 62 62 901
E-mail: lilika.kais@envir.ee

Ms. Kaja Lotman
State Nature Conservation Centre
Penijõe
90305 Lihula Lääne maakond
Tel: +37 47 24223
Fax: +37 47 24235
E-mail: kaja.lotman@lk.ee

FINLAND

Mr. Matti Osara
Ministry of the Environment
Land Use Department
P.O. Box 35
00023 Government of Finland
Tel: +358 9 160 393 34
Fax: +358 9 160 393 64
E-mail: Matti.Osara@ymparisto.fi

Ms. Tuuli Lovén
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 35
00023 Government
Tel: +358 9 160 39721
Fax: +358 9 160 39364
E-mail: tuuli.loven@ymparisto.fi

Ms. Eeva-Maria Kyheröinen
Finnish Museum of Natural History
P.O. Box 26
00014 University of Helsinki
Tel: +358 9 191 44272
Fax: +358 9 191 44441
E-mail: eeva-maria.kyheroinen@helsinki.fi

FRANCE

Dr. Nathalie Lacour
Ministère d'Écologie et du
Développement Durable
Direction de la Nature et des Paysages
20 avenue de Ségur
75302 Paris 07 SP
Tel: +33 1 42 19 19 39
Fax: +33 1 42 19 19 30
E-mail: nathalie.lacour@ecologie.gouv.fr

Dr. Michel Perret
Ministère de l'Écologie et du
Développement Durable
Direction de la Nature et des Paysages
20 avenue de Ségur
75302 Paris 07 SP
Tel: +33 1 42 19 18 69
Fax: +33 1 42 19 19 30
E-mail: michel.perret@ecologie.gouv.fr

Prof. Stéphane Aulagnier
Comportement et Ecologie de la
Faune Sauvage
I.N.R.A.
B.P. 52627
31326 Castanet - Tolosan Cedex
Tel: +33 5 61 28 5133
Fax: +33 5 61 28 5500
E-mail: aulagnie@toulouse.inra.fr

GEORGIA

Ms. Ann Rukhadze
Ministry of Environment Protection
and Natural Resources of Georgia
Biodiversity Protection Service
6, Gulua str.
0114 Tbilisi
Tel: +995 32 275731
Fax: +995 32 275731
E-mail: biodepramsar@moe.gov.ge

Mr. Ioseb Natradze
Field Researchers' Union "Campester"
2A, Tamarashvili street, Flat 6
0162 Tbilisi
Tel: +995 32 23 20 83
Mob: +995 99 55 42 40
Fax: +995 32 33 01 90
E-mail: ioseb.natradze@campester.ge
natradze@yahoo.com

GERMANY

Mr. Jochen Flasbarth
Federal Ministry for the Environment
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
International Nature Conservation
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
Tel: +49 1888 305 2600 / 2601
Fax: +49 1888 305 2694
E-mail: jochen.flasbarth@bmu.bund.de

Ms. Nicola Breier
Federal Ministry for the Environment
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
International Nature Conservation
Division N I 4
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
Tel: +49 1888 305 2619
Fax: +49 1888 305 2684
E-mail: nicola.breier@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Oliver Schall
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety,
International Nature Conservation
Division N I 4
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
Tel: +49 1888 305 2632
Fax: +49 1888 305 2684
E-mail: oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Joachim Schmitz
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety,
International Nature Conservation
Division N I 4
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
Tel: +49 1888 305 26 34
Fax: +49 1888 305 26 84
E-mail: joachim.schmitz@bmu.bund.de

Dr. Peter Boye
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 2
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
Tel: +49 1888 305 26 26
Fax: +49 1888 305 26 94
E-mail: peter.boye@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Johannes Treß
Biosphärenreservat Vessertal -
Thüringer Wald
Waldstr. 1
98711 Schmiedefeld (Rennsteig)
Tel: 036782-666-0
Fax: 036782-666-29
E-mail: johannes.tress@br-
np.thueringen.de

HUNGARY

Dr. Zoltán Bihari
University, of Debrecen ATC
Böszörményi út 138,
4032 Debrecen
Tel: +36 70 221 7336
Fax: +36 52 413 385
E-mail: bihari@agr.unideb.hu

IRELAND

Dr. Ferdia Marnell
Department of the Environment,
Heritage and Local Government,
National Parks and Wildlife Service
7 Ely Place
Dublin 2
Tel: +353 1 888 3290
Fax: +353 1 888 3278
E-mail: Ferdia.Marnell@environ.ie

Mr. Peter Carvill
Department of the Environment,
Heritage and Local Government,
National Parks and Wildlife Service
7 Ely Place
Dublin 2
Tel: +353 1 8883220
Fax: +353 1 8883272
E-mail: Peter.Carvill@environ.ie

ITALY

Mr. Felice Cappelluti
Ministero dell'ambiente e della tutela del
territorio e del mare
Direzione generale per la protezione della
natura
Via Capitan Bavastro 174
00154 Roma
Tel: +39 06 5722 8403
Fax: +39 06 5722 8468
E-mail: cappelluti.felice@minambiente.it

Ms. Teresa Catelani
Ministero dell'ambiente e della tutela del
territorio e del mare
Direzione generale per la protezione della
natura
Via Capitan Bavastro 174
00154 Roma
Tel: +39 06 5722 8404
Fax: +39 06 5722 8468
E-mail: catelani.teresa@minambiente.it

LATVIA

Mr. Vilnis Bernards
Ministry of Environment
Nature Protection Department
Peldu str. 25
1494 Riga
Tel: +371 70 26 524
Fax: +371 78 20 442
E-mail: vilnis.bernards@vidm.gov.lv

Dr. Gunars Petersons
Latvian University of Agriculture
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
8 K. Helmana street
3004 Jelgava
Tel: +371 3024 662
Fax: +371 3027 344
E-mail: Gunars.Petersons@llu.lv

LITHUANIA

Prof. Dainius H. Pauza
Kaunas University of Medicine
A. Mickeviciaus street 9
44307 Kaunas
Tel: +370 37 327313
Fax: +370 37 220 733
E-mail: daipau@kmu.lt

LUXEMBOURG

Mr. Laurent Biraschi
Direction des Eaux et Forêts
16 rue Eugène Ruppert
2453 Luxembourg
Tel: +352 402 201 221
Fax: +352 402 201 250
E-mail: laurent.biraschi@ef.etat.lu
bat@ef.etat.lu

Ms. Edmée Engel
Musée National d'Histoire Naturelle
25 rue Münster
2160 Luxembourg
Tel: +352 46 22 33 414
Fax: +352 47 51 52
E-mail: eengel@mnhn.lu

MACEDONIA, FYR

Mr. Aleksandar Nastov
Ministry of the Environment and
Physical Planning
Agency of Environment
Drezdenska 52
1000 Skopje
Tel: +389 2 3066 930 ext.160
Fax: +389 2 3066 931
E-mail: a.nastov@moepp.gov.mk
infoeko@moe.gov.mk

Prof. Branko Micevski, Dr. Sci.
Faculty of Natural Sciences
Institute of Biology
Zoological Department
Gazi Baba b.b. P.Box: 162
1000 Skopje
Tel: +389 2 432 072
Fax: +389 2 432 072
E-mail: brankom@ukim.edu.mk

MOLDOVA

Ms. Diana Celac
Ministry of Ecology and Natural
Resources
9, Cosmonautilor Str.
2005 Chisinau
Tel: +373 22 20 45 30
Fax: +373 22 22 68 58
E-mail: celacd@mediu.moldova.md

NORWAY

Mr. Øystein Størkersen
Senior Advisor
Directorate for Natur Management
Tungasletta 2
7485 Trondheim
Tel: +47 7358 0500
Fax: +47 7358 05 01 / 05
E-mail: oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no

POLAND

Prof. Dr. Bronislaw W. Woloszyn
Polish Academy of Sciences
Institute of Animal Systematics
And Evolution
Ul. Sławkowska 17
31 016 Kraków
Tel: +48 12 422 6410
Fax: +48 12 422 6410
E-mail: woloszbr@isez.pan.krakow.pl

PORTUGAL

Ms. Luisa Rodrigues
Instituto da Conservação
da Natureza, Divisão de
Habitats e Ecossistemas
Rua de Santa Marta, 55
1150-294 Lisboa
Tel: +351 21 350 79 00
Fax: +351 21 350 79 84
E-mail: rodriguesl@icn.pt
rodriguesl100@gmail.com

Mr. Rui Almeida
Embassy of Portugal
TRG Republike, 3 X
1000 Ljubljana
Tel: +386 1 4790 557

ROMANIA

Ms. Alina Frim
Ministry of Environment and Water
Management
Blvd. Libertatii 12, Sector 5
70005 Bucharest
Tel: +40 21 316 0531
Fax: +40 21 316 0531
E-mail: alina.frim@mappm.ro

Dr. Dumitru T. Murariu
National Museum of Natural History
Grigore Antipa
Sos. Kiseleff Nr. 1, Sectorul 1
011341 Bucharest 2
Tel: +40 21 312 8886 / 8863
Fax: +40 21 312 8886 / 8863
E-mail: dmurariu@antipa.ro

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Mr. Peter Pilinský
Ministry of the Environment
Department of Nature and Landscape
Protection
Námestie L'udovíta Stúra 1
812 35 Bratislava 1
Tel: +421 2 59 56 2189
Fax: +421 2 59 56 2207
E-mail: pilinsky.peter@enviro.gov.sk

Dr. Lubomira Vavrová
State Nature Conservancy of
Slovak Republic
Lazovná 10
974 01 Banská Bystrica
Tel: +421 48 471 36 22
Mob: +421 911 12 12 77
Fax: +421 48 915 38 66
E-mail: vavrova@sopsr.sk

SLOVENIA

Mr. Peter Skoberne
Ministry of the Environment
and Spatial Planning
Dunajska 48
1000 Ljubljana
Tel: +386 1 309 4562
Fax: +386 1 309 4593
E-mail: peter.skoberne@gov.si

Ms. Tina Mikuš
Ministry of the Environment
and Spatial Planning
Dunajska 48
1000 Ljubljana
Tel: +386 1 3094 555
Fax: +386 1 3094 593
E-mail: tina.mikus@gmail.com

Ms. Mateja Blazic
Ministry of Environment
and Spatial Planning
Vojkova 1b
1000 Ljubljana
Tel: +386 1 2804012
Fax: +386 1 2804025
E-mail: mateja.blazic@gov.si

Ms. Teja Bozovic
Ministry of Environment
and Spatial Planning
Dunajska 48
1000 Ljubljana
Tel: +386 3 1273127
E-mail: tejaaa15@yahoo.com

Mr. Primož Presetnik
Center for Cartography of Fauna
and Flora
Antoličičeva 1
2204 Miklavž na Dravskem polju
Tel: +386 41 732 392
Fax: +386 1 4382445
E-mail: primoz.presetnik@ckff.si

SWEDEN

Ms. Marie Nedinge
Swedish Environmental Protection
Agency
Naturvardsverket
106 48 Stockholm
Tel: +46 8 698 1272
Fax: +46 8 698 1585
E-mail: marie.nedinge@naturvardsverket.se

THE NETHERLANDS

Ms. Gelare Nader
Ministry of Agriculture,
Nature and Food Quality,
Department of Nature
P.O. Box 20 40 1
2500 EK Den Haag
Tel: +31 70 378 5457
Fax: +31 70 378 6146
E-mail: g.nader@minlnv.nl

Mr. Peter H.C. Lina
Ministry of Agriculture,
Nature and Food Quality
c/o Reference Centre for Bat Studies
and Conservation (RCBSC)
P.O. Box 835
2300 AV Leiden
Tel: +31 71 531 49 79
Fax: +31 71 576 62 68
E-mail: phc.lina@tiscali.nl
lina@naturalis.nnm.nl

UKRAINE

Dr. Volodymyr Domashlinets
Ministry of the Environmental
Protection of Ukraine
Urytskogo str. 35
03035 Kiev
Tel: +380 44 206 31 27
Fax: +380 44 206 31 34
E-mail: domashlinets@menr.gov.ua
vladdy@uct.kiev.ua

Ms. Lena Godlevska
Schmalhausen Institute of Zoology
of NAS of Ukraine
Bohdan Khmelnytsky Str. 15, MSP
01601 Kiev-30
Tel: +380 44 235 1070
Fax: +380 44 234 1569
E-mail: lgodlevska@mail.ru

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Huw M. Thomas
Department for Environment,
Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA),
Zone 1/08c, Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6EB
Tel: +44 117 372 8296
Fax: +44 117 372 8688
E-mail: huw.thomas@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Dr. Jane Goodwin
Department for Environment,
Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA),
European Wildlife Division
Zone 1/09, Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS3 6EB
Tel: +44 117 372 8854
Mob: +44 117 372 8854
Fax: +44 117 372 8182
E-mail: jane.goodwin@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Dr. Anthony Mitchell-Jones
English Nature
Northminster House
Peterborough PE1 1UA
Tel: +44 1733 455 250
Fax: +44 1733 455 147
E-mail: Tony.Mitchell-Jones@
naturalengland.org.uk

Mr. Robert Raynor
Scottish Natural Heritage
Great Glen House
Leachkin Road
Inverness
Tel: +44 1463 725244
+44 1463 725000
E-mail: robert.raynor@snh.gov.uk

NON-PARTY RANGE STATES

AUSTRIA

Dr. Friederike Spitzenberger
Naturhistorisches Museum
Säugetiersammlung
Burgring 7
1010 Wien
Tel: +43 1 52 177 312
Fax: +43 1 52 177 234
E-mail: Friederike.Spitzenberger@
nhm-wien.ac.at

AZERBAIJAN

Ms. Solmaz Mammadova
Ministry of Ecology and Natural
Resources of Republic of Azerbaijan
B. Aghayev Str. 100 A
1073 Baku
Tel: +994 12 492 73 69
Fax: +994 12 492 52 07
E-mail: solmaz_menr_81@mail.ru

Prof. Irina K. Rakhmatulina
Institute of Zoology Azerbaijan NAS
Passage 1128, Block 504
370073 Baku
Tel: +994 124 39 73 71
Fax: +994 124 98 28 89
+994 12 439 73 53
E-mail: rakhmat@azeurotel.com

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mr. Jasminko Mulaomerovic
Savez speleologa BiH
Speleological Association of BiH
Branilaca Sarajeva 30
71000 Sarajevo
Tel: +387 33 235 940
Mob: +387 61 491 053
Fax: +387 33 663 835
E-mail: jasminko.mulaomerovic@
bhtelecom.ba

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Dr. Suren Vladimirovich Gazaryan
Institut of Ecology of Mountain
Territories RAS
Rossiyskaya str. 94 fl. 23
350901 Krasnodar
Mob: +7 928 421 7448
E-mail: s-gazaryan@yandex.ru

REPUBLIC OF SERBIA

Dr. Milan Paunovic
Natural History Museum and Wildlife
Conservation Society MUSTELA
Njegoseva 51
11000 Belgrade
Tel: +381 63 444 766
Fax: +381 11 3446 580
E-mail: milan.paunovic@nhmbeo.org.yu

OBSERVERS

Intergovernmental Organisations

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Ms. Carolina Lasen-Diaz
Council of Europe
Bern Convention Secretariat
67075 Strasbourg, France
Tel: +33 3 90 21 56 79
Fax: +33 3 88 41 37 51
E-mail: carolina.lasen-diaz@coe.int

UNEP

Ms. Elizabeth Mrema
UNEP - DEC
P.O. Box 30552
00100 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 42 52
Fax: +254 20 762 39 26
E-mail: elizabeth.mrema@unep.org

UNON

Mr. Abderrahmane Jai
UNON
United Nations Campus
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel: +49 228 815 24 62
Fax: +49 228 815 24 49
E-mail: ajai@cms.int

UNEP/CMS

Ms. Paola Deda
UNEP/CMS
United Nations Campus
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel: +49 228 815 24 62
Fax: +49 228 815 24 49
E-mail: pdeda@cms.int

Non-Governmental Organisations

FRANCE

Ms. Marie-José Dubourg-Savage
Société Française pour l'Etude et la
Protection des Mammifères (SFEPM)
Les Rieux
82140 St Antonin N.V.
Tel: +33 5 63 68 21 47
Fax: +33 5 63 68 21 47
E-mail: mjo.ds@club-internet.fr

GERMANY

Dr. Christine Harbusch
Naturschutzbund Deutschland (NABU)
Orscholzerstr. 15
66706 Perl-Kesslingen
Tel: +49 6865 93 934
Fax: +49 6865 93 935
E-mail: ProChirop@aol.com

ITALY

Dr. Dino Scaravelli
Gruppo Italiano Ricerche Chiroterri
c/o - As. Chiroptera Italica
via Veclezio 10A
47100 Forli

Tel: +39 0543 480959
Mob: +39 338 609 6094
Fax: +39 0543 33435
E-mail: dinosc@tin.it

REPUBLIC OF SERBIA

Mr. Branko Karapandza
Wildlife Conservation Society
MUSTELA
Njegoseva 51
11000 Belgrade

Tel: +381 11 3442 149
Fax: +381 11 3446 580
+381 11 31 31 569

E-mail: branko.karapandza@gmail.com

SLOVENIA

Ms. Maja Zagmajster
SDPVN - Slovenian Association for
Bat Research and Conservation
Vecna pot 111
1000 Ljubljana

Tel: +386 41 901122
E-mail: maja.zagmajster@guest.arnes.si
maja.zagmajster@bf.uni-lj.si

UNITED KINGDOM

Ms. Amy Coyte
The Bat Conservation Trust
15 Cloisters House
8 Battersea Park Road
London SW8 4BG

Tel: +44 20 75013632
Fax: +44 20 7627 2628
E-mail: acoyte@bats.org.uk

Dr. Katie Parsons
The Bat Conservation Trust
15 Cloisters House
8 Battersea Park Road
SW8 4BG London

Tel: +44 207 501 3630
Fax: +44 207 627 2628
E-mail: Kparsons@bats.org.uk

Mr. Anthony M. Hutson
IUCN/SSC Chiroptera Specialist Group
c/o Winkfield
Station Road
Plumpton Green
East Sussex BN7 3BU

Tel: +44 1273 890 341
Fax: +44 1273 890 341
E-mail: hutson.t@btinternet.com

EUROBATS Secretariat

Mr. Andreas Streit
Ms. Ayhan Polat
Ms. Dessislava Krüger
Mr. Max Jones
Ms. Janina Dräger
UNEP/EUROBATS Secretariat
United Nations Campus
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn, Germany

Tel: +49 228 815 2420 / 31 / 32
Fax: +49 228 815 2445
E-mail: eurobats@eurobats.org

Dr. Jessamy E. Battersby
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY

Tel: +44 1733 866 808
E-mail: jessa.battersby@jncc.gov.uk

Report of the Administrative Working Group

The Working Group met on 4th, 5th and 6th September, being chaired by Ms. Luisa Rodrigues (Portugal). Appointed delegates of the Parties attending the Meeting were present: Ms. Elvana Ramaj (Albania), Dr. Ludo Holsbeek (Belgium), Ms. Zrinka Domazetovic (Croatia), Ms. Andrea Štefan (Croatia), Ms. Libuse Vlasakova (Czech Republic), Ms. Maj F. Munk (Denmark), Ms. Lilika Kais (Estonia), Mr. Matti Osara (Finland), Ms. Tuuli Loven (Finland), Dr. Nathalie Lacour (France), Dr. Michel Perret (France), Ms. Ann Rukhadze (Georgia), Mr. Jochen Flasbarth (Germany), Mr. Oliver Schall (Germany), Mr. Joachim Schmitz (Germany), Dr. Zoltan Bihari (Hungary), Mr. Peter Carvill (Ireland), Mr. Felice Cappelluti (Italy), Ms. Teresa Catelani (Italy), Mr. Vilnis Bernards (Latvia), Mr. Laurent Biraschi (Luxembourg), Mr. Aleksandar Nastov (Macedonia), Ms. Diana Celac (Moldova), Ms. Gelare Nader (The Netherlands), Mr. Øystein Størkersen (Norway), Prof. Bronislaw Woloszyn (Poland), Ms. Alina Frim (Romania), Mr. Peter Pilinský (Slovakia), Mr. Peter Skoberne (Slovenia), Ms. Mateja Blazic (Slovenia), Ms. Marie Nedinge (Sweden), Dr. Volodymyr Domashlinets (Ukraine), and Mr. Huw Thomas (United Kingdom). Mr. Andreas Streit (Executive Secretary UNEP/EUROBATS), Ms. Elisabeth Mrema (UNEP), Mr. Abderrahmane Jai (UNON), and Ms. Paola Deda (UNEP/CMS) were also present in the meeting.

The Working Group discussed the documents *Draft Resolution 5.1* (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.7), *Budget Option 2* (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP.5.18), *Option 3 - Draft Budget Estimates for 2007-2010* (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.21), and *Draft Resolution 5.8* (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.14).

i) Draft Resolution 5.1: Financial and Administrative Matters (Budget 2007-2010), Budget Option 2, and Option 3 - Draft Budget Estimates for 2007-2010

The Executive Secretary opened the session and presented the documents *Report of the 2006 targeted Audit of the Secretariat and Budget* (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.19), *Report on income and expenditure for the financial year 2003* (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.4), *Report on income and expenditure for the financial years 2004 and 2005* (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.5), *Trust Fund Status for the financial years 2004-2005* (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.6), and *Trust Fund Status as at 31.07.2006* (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.7). Parties congratulated the Executive Secretary for the outcome of the Audit concerning his successful management of the budget.

Draft Resolution 5.1 was then introduced by the Secretariat. Two additional options were also introduced. Option 2 prepared by the Secretariat upon the request of UK, Germany and France (and on behalf of Italy) during AC 11, and option 3 proposed by UK. After initial discussions, the Parties decided to discard option 3, and to focus the discussions on option 2. Parties concluded that on budget line 1303 the Secretariat staff should remain part-time. Budget line 3302 should be 0 for the meetings of the Standing Committee, as they will meet at the CMS Family headquarters in Bonn. Budget line 3303 should have a total of Euro 36.000: being 0 in 2008 as it will occur back to back with the European Bat Research Symposium in Romania. For budget line 5201, Germany has proposed to pay 50% (total of Euro 16.000 for the period of 4 years) from the annual regular 25.600 voluntary contributions. The remaining 50% (total of EUR 16.000 for the period of 4 years) plus the budget line 5202 (EUR 800 for the period of four years) will be financed by a voluntary contribution from The Netherlands. The commitment to fund these budget lines (5201 and 5202) by voluntary contributions is for this coming period of four years only and at the next MoP shall be revised again.

The Executive Secretary presented different scenarios where the total maximum contribution percentage of the ceiling was varied to see an overall effect on levels of contributions. The working group found this to be very useful during the course of the discussion and concluded that the ceiling should remain unchanged (maximum 20% for any one Party).

At the request of the Parties the Chair of the MoP will send a letter to the Executive Director of UNEP to accommodate the costs of the extraordinary audit from the UNEP programme Support costs (budget line 6000). Should this be the case, the Euro 4.000 will be used for contingency, in accordance with the audit report.

Paragraph 13 of Draft Resolution 5.1 was changed. “*Authorises* the Standing Committee in case of unforeseen major shortfalls on established budget lines and subject to satisfactory documentation provided by the Secretariat, to decide upon withdrawals from the Trust Fund reserve as deemed appropriate” was replaced by “*Instructs* the Standing Committee, through the Secretariat, to advise the Executive Director of UNEP, when requested, of its priorities for expenditure to enable the consideration of any need for withdrawing funds from the Trust Fund reserve”.

The UNON adviser informed the Parties that they are expecting an 3% VAT increase in Germany soon, which will affect the staff costs of the Secretariat and should be taken

into consideration when reviewing the budget. He recommended a 7% increase in the budget for unforeseen costs in the future. This proposal was not taken up.

After being reviewed and agreed by the working group, the estimate was incorporated in Draft Resolution 5.1 as Annex 1, and Annex 2 was changed accordingly.

A new version of the Draft Resolution was prepared (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.7.Rev.2).

ii) Draft Resolution 5.8: Establishment of a Standing Committee of the Agreement

Some concerns were expressed that there had not been sufficient time to consider this draft resolution but it was subsequently agreed that a Standing Committee should be established. It was noted that Poland would not support the establishment of the Standing Committee if it would impose additional budgetary pressure.

It was considered that five members were insufficient and a posed operational difficulties in the event of absences and it was agreed that there should be seven, with the Depositary and host government of the Secretariat as permanent members.

It was also agreed that any Party should be entitled to participate in the deliberations of the Standing Committee but not to vote on decisions. In this regard it was important that Parties received the working documents concurrently with the Standing Committee.

It was understood that the Standing Committee would remove budgetary and administrative issues from the remit of the existing Advisory Committee, and that this would lead to greater effectiveness and efficiency in progressing business under the Agreement. With this in mind, it was decided that the Standing Committee should not require budgetary provision on the basis that any necessary meetings will be held at the premises of the Secretariat in Bonn.

It was understood that the Standing Committee, and in particular the Chair of the Committee, may in appropriate circumstances, also have a representational role as regards the interests of the Agreement and the Parties to it.

The Working Group considered the provision in the Draft Resolution for having due regard to geographical distribution in the composition of the Standing Committee and then proceeded to identify proposed members. It was agreed that the Standing Committee should elect its own Chair and Vice Chair.

A new version of the Draft Resolution was prepared (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.14.Rev.2).

Report of the Scientific Working Group

The Working Group met on the 4th and 5th September, being chaired by Mr. Peter Lina (The Netherlands).

List of those present: Dr. Nikola Tvrković (Croatia), Dr. Josef Chytil (Czech Republic), Ms. Kaja Lotman (Estonia), Ms. Eva-Maria Kyheröinen (Finland), Prof. Stephane Aulagnier (France), Mr. Ioseb Natradze (Georgia), Dr. Peter Boye (Germany), Mr. Johannes Treß (Germany), Dr. Ferdia Marnell (Ireland), Dr. Gunars Petersons (Latvia), Prof. Dainius Pauza (Lithuania), Ms. Edmée Engel (Luxembourg), Prof. Branko Micevski (Macedonia, FYR), Dr. Dumitru Murariu (Romania), Dr. Lubomira Vavrová (Slovak Republic), Mr. Primož Presetnik (Slovenia), Ms. Maja Zagmajster (SDPVN, Slovenia), Ms. Lena Godlevska (Ukraine), Dr. Jane Goodwin (UK), Dr. Anthony Mitchell-Jones (UK), Mr. Robert Raynor (UK), Dr. Friederike Spitzenberger (Austria), Ms. Solmaz Mammadova (Azerbaijan), Prof. Irina Rakmatulina (Azerbaijan), Mr. Jasminko Mulaomerovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Dr. Suren Gazaryan (Russian Federation), Dr. Milan Paunovic (Serbia), Mr. Branko Karapandza (Mustela, Serbia), Ms. Marie-José Dubourg-Savage (SFEPM, France), Dr. Christine Harbusch (NABU, Germany), Dr. Dino Scaravelli (Italy), Ms. Amy Coyte (BCT, UK), Dr. Katie Parsons (BCT, UK), Mr. Tony Hutson (IUCN/SSC, UK), Dr. Jessamy Battersby (JNCC, UK).

Relevant Draft Resolutions were discussed, amendments made where appropriate and then taken forward to the Plenary for adoption. Where further discussion was required, Intersessional Working Groups met and reported back to the Scientific Working Group on the outcomes of their discussions.

Draft Resolution 5.2: Bat Rabies in Europe (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.8.Rev.3)

Mr. Peter Lina introduced the Draft Resolution, which was accepted after some minor amendments to the wording of the Resolution text and the attached Annexes. The document was passed to the Plenary.

Draft Resolution 5.3: Amendment of the Annex to the Agreement (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.9 and Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.9.Rev.1)

Mr. Tony Hutson introduced the Draft Resolution, which was accepted following minor amendments to the text of the relevant information document. Germany wished to take the opportunity to thank Mr. Tony Hutson and the others on the Intersessional Working Group for their hard work in producing such a helpful and clear summary of the taxonomic situation for European bats. The documents were passed to the Plenary.

Draft Resolution 5.4: Monitoring Bats across Europe (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.10)

The Draft Resolution was accepted without change and passed to the Plenary.

Draft Resolution 5.5: Amendment to Resolution 4.6: Guidelines for the issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Captured Wild Bats (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.11.Rev.2)

The Draft Resolution was accepted following minor amendments to the text and passed to the Plenary.

Draft Resolution 5.6: Wind Turbines and Bat Populations. (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.12.Rev.3)

The Draft Resolution was accepted following minor amendments and the addition of a request to the Advisory Committee. It was then presented to the Plenary by Germany.

Draft Resolution 5.7: Guidelines for the Protection of Overground Roosts, with particular reference to roosts in buildings of cultural heritage importance. (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.13.Rev.1)

Dr. Ferdia Marnell introduced the Draft Resolution, which was based on a draft report that had been produced by the Intersessional Working Group. He noted that Range States needed to address some factors that were highlighted in the report. He drew attention to the fact that the report was biased towards Western Europe and requested further case studies from eastern and southern Europe in order to make the report recommendations relevant across the EUROBATS range.

The Draft Resolution was accepted following minor amendments to the text and passed to the Plenary.

Draft Resolution 5.10: Establishment of the EUROBATS Implementation Advisory Board (EIAB)

A small working group was set up to look at the issue and report back to the Scientific Working Group. The group comprised Dr. Peter Boye (Germany), Ms. Amy Coyte (BCT, UK), Dr. Jane Goodwin (UK), Mr. Tony Hutson (UK, IUCN), Mr. Peter Lina (The Netherlands), Ms. Kaja Lotman (Estonia), Dr. Anthony Mitchell-Jones (UK).

After discussion the group proposed the setting up an Intersessional Working Group under the EUROBATS Scientific Advisory Committee to:

- Approach UNEP/CMS to consider a central mechanism for all the Agreements to deal with requests for advice.

- Approach the Bern Convention and ask how they currently operate their mechanism in dealing with requests for advice concerning implementation and to ask to be informed of all bat cases. To liaise closely with the Bern Convention Secretariat.
- Develop criteria for assessing cases.
- Review how to approach measuring progress of Parties against commitments.
- Make recommendations on how to proceed in the future.
- Review the requests for advice communicated to the Secretariat from MoP5 onwards.

These recommendations were reflected by a paragraph added to the Conservation and Management Plan 2007 - 2010.

The representative from the Council of Europe expressed her interest in cooperating with the UNEP/CMS Agreements on this subject.

The approach was agreed by the Group and taken forward for discussion at the Plenary.

Draft Resolution 5.11: Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.17.Rev.2)

Dr. Anthony Mitchell-Jones introduced the Draft Resolution, which was accepted following minor alterations to the text and with the addition of a paragraph concerning reviewing the implementation of the Agreement.

Draft Resolution 5.12: Geographical Scope of the Agreement (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP5.20.Rev.1)

Mr. Tony Hutson introduced the Draft Resolution, which was accepted with minor amendments to the Annex. Germany was concerned that the Draft Resolution might restrict the involvement of countries outside the designated geographical scope of the Agreement. After some discussion it was noted that the Articles of the Agreement do not preclude countries outside the geographical scope from acceding to the Agreement. The example of the Bern Convention, which has a similar geographical scope and which has African countries as Parties, was cited.

Agenda item 13: Protecting and managing underground sites for bats

Dr. Anthony Mitchell-Jones advised that a draft of the manual had been supplied for the Meeting. He was anticipating that the draft would be agreed for publication and requested any final comments on the draft. He informed the Group that English and French versions of the manual would be available. All Parties agreed to the draft after minor amendments and Germany advised that a German version will also be available in the near future. The MoP recalled that the guidelines shall be published in English, French and German. It will be checked whether a publication in Russian is possible.

Agenda item 14: Impact on bat populations of the use of antiparasitic drugs for livestock

The Intersessional Working Group met to discuss this subject and reported back to the Scientific Working Group. Registered members of the group attending were: Mr. Tony Hutson (Convenor), Ms. Marie-José Dubourg-Savage (SFPEM, France), Dr. Jane Goodwin (UK), Dr. Christine Harbusch (Germany), Mr. Peter Lina (The Netherlands), Ms. Kaja Lotman (Estonia), Dr. Katie Parsons (BCT, UK), Dr. Dino Scaravelli (Italy).

A draft interim report was discussed, particularly in relation to the results of a questionnaire that had been distributed to all Parties and Non-Party Range States, to potential research projects, to potential means of alleviating the impact of these drugs and to the further gathering of relevant information and external contacts. The work of the group will continue into the next four years period.

Taking Forward a Pan-European Monitoring Project for Underground Sites

In connection with Draft Resolution 5.4, Monitoring Bats across Europe, BCT provided the Group with background information on workshops that had taken place and development of a way forward to implement a pan-European Monitoring project for Underground Sites (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP5.58). A feasibility project is proposed with the aim of producing a detailed project proposal to submit to EU Life Plus and other potential funders in September / October 2007. If successful the full project would commence in the Global Year of the Bat in 2008.

BCT noted that expressions of interest in participating in the project had previously been made by the UK and The Netherlands and requested further support.

The Republic of Ireland supported the project and confirmed that the Irish government will be able to financially contribute. The government can justify this commitment because the project will help to EU Habitats Directive obligations.

Germany supported the tremendous collaborative project and reported that the Ministry in Germany responsible for the development of the Life Plus programme had indicated that the concept met with the Life Plus criteria. However, Life is only 50% funding and further funding would need to be secured. The feasibility project will need to investigate this.

Further support was also offered by Estonia and symbolic offers were made by the NGOs Wildlife Conservation Society, MUSTELA (Serbia), Gruppo Italiano Ricerche Chiroteri (Italy), the Slovenian Association for Bat Research and Conservation and CAMPESTER (Georgia).

The need for long-term government commitment to such work was highlighted.

BCT advised that it will continue to work to secure further funds to take forward the feasibility project.

Producing Guidelines on Bat Monitoring Methods to Assess Population Trends at Different Levels

The Intersessional Working Group met to discuss progress with drafting the guidelines, which have relevance for Draft Resolution 5.4, Monitoring Bats across Europe.

Present: Dr. Jessamy Battersby (UK, Convenor), Prof. Stéphane Aulagnier (France), Dr. Peter Boye (Germany), Dr. Josef Chytil (Czech Republic), Ms. Amy Coyte (BCT, UK), Ms. Marie-José Dubourg-Savage (SFEPM, France), Ms. Edmée Engel (Luxembourg), Dr. Christine Harbusch (NABU, Germany), Ms. Tony Hutson (UK, IUCN), Dr. Suren Gazaryan (Russian Federation), Mr. Branko Karapandža (WCS Mustela, Serbia), Ms. Eeva-Marie Kyheröinen (Finland), Mr. Peter Lina (The Netherlands), Dr. Ferdia Marnell (Ireland), Dr. Anthony Mitchell-Jones (UK), Dr. Dumitru Murariu (Romania), Mr. Ioseb Natradze (Georgia), Dr. Milan Paunović (Serbia), Prof. Danius Pauza (Lithuania), Dr. Gunārs Pētersons (Latvia), Mr. Primož Presetnik (Slovenia), Mr. Rob Raynor (UK), Dr. Friederike Spitzenberger (Austria), Dr. Lūbomíra Vavrová (Slovak Republic), Ms. Maja Zigmajster (Slovenia).

The group met and discussed the revised guidelines. The original intention was to have final draft guidelines for adoption by the Parties at MoP5. However, although the latest draft was close to finalisation there was still some work to be done. The guidelines include information on reasons for carrying out surveillance and monitoring, factors to consider when developing surveillance schemes, a list of surveillance methods, a list of all European species with appropriate methods and some examples of surveillance

schemes in operation in different countries. The guidelines will be published in due course on the EUROBATS website and will be updated periodically. The completed draft guidelines will be presented to AC12 for adoption.

Bats as Bioindicators

The Intersessional Working Group met to discuss development of this topic.

Those present: Dr. Katie Parsons (UK, BCT, acting Convenor), Ms. Maja Zagamajster (Slovenia), Mr. Primož Presetnik (Slovenia), Dr. Josef Chytil (Czech Republic), Ms. Kaja Lotman (Estonia), Dr. Suren Gazaryan (Russia), Prof. Stephane Aulagnier (France), Ms. Eeva-Maria Kyheroinen (Finland), Ms. Edmeé Engel (Luxembourg), Dr. Lůbomira Vavrová (Slovakia), Dr. Dumitru Murariu (Romania), Dr. Nikola Tvrtković (Croatia), Dr. Dino Scaravelli (Italy), Mr. Branko Karapandža (Serbia), Ms. Marie-José Dubourg-Savage (SFEPM, France), Mr. Jasminko Mulaomerovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Dr. Friederike Spitzenberger (Austria), Mr. Tony Hutson (UK, IUCN), Dr. Ferdia Marnell (Ireland).

The Bats as Bioindicators IWG had its inaugural Meeting during AC11. During that Meeting the group's convenor, Dr. Karen Haysom (BCT, UK), agreed to provide some background information on biodiversity indicators, suggested sources of more information, and questions to capture the interests of the IWG. This information was provided in a document circulated to members of the AC11 IWG by email at the start of MoP5 and also in hard copy to members of the brief IWG meeting during the morning of 5 September at MoP5. The proposed aims of the IWG were presented for discussion and group members were requested to supply answers to the questions given in the information document to aid the future development of the IWG at AC12. The information document will be circulated via e-mail to the group to permit electronic return of answers. Group members were kindly asked to please send their responses as soon as possible to Dr. Karen Haysom and to Dr. Lůbomira Vavrová who between them will collate responses.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution No. 5.1

Financial and Administrative Matters
(Budget 2007 – 2010)



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter "the Agreement"),

Having regard to Article V (1) of the Agreement which states that the Meeting of Parties shall consider and decide upon "financial rules, including the provision of the budget and the scale of contributions for the next financial period";

Recalling Resolution No. 1 adopted at its 4th Session (Sofia, Bulgaria, September 2003) on financial and administrative matters;

Noting the request by the Secretariat to strengthen the capacity of the Secretariat of the Agreement to enable it to better serve the Parties;

Expecting that the Secretariat of the Agreement shall co-operate effectively with the other Agreement Secretariats in the UNEP/CMS Agreements Unit;

Acknowledging with appreciation the substantial contribution of the German Government in providing, and agreeing to continue to provide, the accommodation for the Secretariat on a rent-free basis and its annual voluntary contribution of EURO 25,600 in support of special measures and projects aimed at improving the implementation of the Agreement;

Noting the recommendations made by the Office of Internal Oversight Services in the Audit Report, but considering it not possible to follow them at this times;

1. *Confirms* that all Parties shall contribute to the budget adopted at the scale agreed upon by the Meeting of Parties in accordance with Article V (1) of the Agreement;
2. *Discharges and approves* the income and expenditure for the year 2003 and the income and expenditures for the years 2004/2005 as presented to the Meeting by the Secretariat and UNEP/UNON. The Meeting further

agrees that the expenditures for the year 2006 should be discharged and approved by the 6th Session of the Meeting of the Parties.

3. *Adopts* the budget for 2007 - 2010 attached as Annex 1 to this resolution;
4. *Agrees* to the scale of contributions of Parties to the Agreement as listed in Annex 2 to this resolution, subject to revision by the Secretariat as soon as the UN scale of contributions for 2007 - 2009 becomes available, and to the application of that scale *pro rata* to new Parties;
5. *Requests* all Parties to pay their annual contributions promptly as far as possible but in any case not later than the end of June of the year to which they relate;
6. *Takes note* of the medium-term plan for 2007 - 2013 attached as Annex 4 to this resolution;
7. *Urges* all Parties to make voluntary contributions to support requests from countries with economies in transition to participate in and implement the Agreement throughout the four year period;
8. *Invites* Non-Party Range States, governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations to make voluntary contributions towards special activities for the implementation of the Agreement;
9. *Requests* the Executive Director of UNEP to extend the duration of the Trust Fund for the administration of the budget to 31 December 2010;
10. *Approves* the Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund as set out in Annex 3 to this Resolution, for the period 2007 – 2010;
11. *Instructs* the Secretariat to report on its income and expenditure to the Standing Committee at each of its meetings, and to report back to the Meeting of Parties at its next session.
12. *Instructs* the Standing Committee, through the Secretariat, to advise the Executive Director of UNEP, when requested, of its priorities for expenditure to enable the consideration of any need for withdrawing funds from the Trust Fund reserve.
13. *Decides* to maintain its decision taken in Resolution 4.1 that the maximum contribution of single Parties shall be 20% within a financial year.

Budget Estimates for 2007 - 2010 (in EURO)

Budget line	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
10 Personnel					
1100 Professional Staff					
1101 Executive Secretary (P4)	131,800	133,500	135,300	137,100	537,700
1220 Consultancies	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	6,000
1300 Administrative Support					
1301 Administrative Assistant (G5, part-time)	31,400	32,200	33,000	33,800	130,400
1302 Administrative Assistant (G5, part-time)	31,400	32,200	33,000	33,800	130,400
1303 Secretary (G4, part-time)	29,400	30,150	30,850	31,550	121,950
1600 Travel on official business					
1601 Secretariat staff	12,000	13,000	14,000	14,000	53,000
1602 Experts on mission	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
1999 Personnel Subtotal	239,500	244,550	249,650	253,750	987,450
20 Subcontracts	0	0	0	0	0
30 Meetings					
3301 Meeting of Parties	0	0	0	20,000	20,000
3302 Meeting of the Standing Committee	0	0	0	0	0
3303 Meeting of the Advisory Committee	12,000	0	12,000	12,000	36,000
3999 Meetings Subtotal	12,000	0	12,000	32,000	56,000
40 Equipment and Premises					
4100 Expendable equipment					
4101 Miscellaneous office supplies	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
4200 Non-expendable equipment					
4201 Office equipment	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
4300 Premises					
4301 Rent and maintenance costs*	0	0	0	0	0
4999 Equipment and Premises Subtotal	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
50 Miscellaneous Costs					
5100 Operation and Maintenance					
5101 Operation/maintenance computers	500	500	500	500	2,000
5102 Operation/maintenance of photocopier/fax	900	900	900	900	3,600
5200 Reporting Costs					
5201 Information material (incl. European Bat Night)**	0	0	0	0	0
5202 Reference material**	0	0	0	0	0
5300 Sundry					
5301 Telephone and Fax	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
5302 Postage and miscellaneous	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
5303 Bank charges	400	400	400	400	1,600
5401 Hospitality	400	400	400	400	1,600
5501 Audit costs***	4,000	0	0	0	4,000
5601 Operational Reserve for Contingency****	9,154	11,990	9,812	10,023	40,979
5999 Miscellaneous Costs Subtotal	19,354	18,190	16,012	16,223	69,779
SUBTOTAL	274,854	266,740	281,662	305,973	1,129,229
6000 UNEP programme support costs (13%)	35,731	34,676	36,616	39,777	146,800
GRAND TOTAL	310,585	301,417	318,278	345,750	1,276,029

* Paid entirely by the host country (Germany).

** To be covered through voluntary contributions from The Netherlands and Germany.

*** Retroactive for 2006 extraordinary audit.

**** Covered through additional contributions of certain Parties. See MoP 5 Record, page 9.

Budget Estimates for 2007 - 2010 (in USD*)

Budget line	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
10 Personnel					
1100 Professional Staff					
1101 Executive Secretary (P4)	164,750	166,875	169,125	171,375	672,125
1220 Consultancies	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875	7,500
1300 Administrative Support					
1301 Administrative Assistant (G5, part-time)	39,250	40,250	41,250	42,250	163,000
1302 Administrative Assistant (G5, part-time)	39,250	40,250	41,250	42,250	163,000
1303 Secretary (G4, part-time)	36,750	37,688	38,566	39,438	152,442
1600 Travel on official business					
1601 Secretariat staff	15,000	16,250	17,500	17,500	66,250
1602 Experts on mission	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
1999 Personnel Subtotal	299,375	305,688	312,066	317,188	1,234,317
20 Subcontracts	0	0	0	0	0
30 Meetings					
3301 Meeting of Parties	0	0	0	25,000	25,000
3302 Meeting of the Standing Committee	0	0	0	0	0
3303 Meeting of the Advisory Committee	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	45,000
3999 Meetings Subtotal	15,000	0	15,000	40,000	70,000
40 Equipment and Premises					
4100 Expendable equipment					
4101 Miscellaneous office supplies	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
4200 Non-expendable equipment					
4201 Office equipment	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
4300 Premises					
4301 Rent and maintenance costs**	0	0	0	0	0
4999 Equipment and Premises Subtotal	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	20,000
50 Miscellaneous Costs					
5100 Operation and Maintenance					
5101 Operation/maintenance computers	625	625	625	625	2,500
5102 Operation/maintenance of photocopier/fax	1,125	1,125	1,125	1,125	4,500
5200 Reporting Costs					
5201 Information material (incl. European Bat Night)***	0	0	0	0	0
5202 Reference material***	0	0	0	0	0
5300 Sundry					
5301 Telephone and Fax	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
5302 Postage and miscellaneous	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
5303 Bank charges	500	500	500	500	2,000
5401 Hospitality	500	500	500	500	2,000
5501 Audit costs****	5,000	0	0	0	5,000
5601 Operational Reserve for Contingency*****	11,443	14,988	12,265	12,529	
5999 Miscellaneous Costs Subtotal	24,193	22,738	20,015	20,279	87,225
SUBTOTAL	343,568	333,426	352,081	382,467	1,411,542
6000 UNEP programme support costs (13%)	44,664	43,345	45,771	49,721	183,500
GRAND TOTAL	388,232	376,771	397,852	432,188	1,595,042

* Based on the average UN exchange rate 2006: 1 USD = 0.80 EUR (figures rounded up/down max. 50 Cent)

** Paid entirely by the host country (Germany).

*** To be covered through voluntary contributions by Germany and The Netherlands.

**** Retroactive for 2006 extraordinary audit.

***** Covered through additional contributions of certain Parties.

Party	UN Scale*	UN Scale*	UN Scale*	UN Scale*	Contributions	Contributions	Contributions	Contributions	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2007	2008	2009	2010	2007	2008	2009	2010
Albania	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	48	46	50	54	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Belgium**	1.069	1.069	1.069	1.069	11,912	11,973	12,199	13,244	3.45	3.45	3.45	3.45
Bulgaria	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.017	165	158	169	183	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Croatia**	0.039	0.039	0.039	0.039	435	437	445	483	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13
Czech Republic**	0.183	0.203	0.203	0.203	2,120	2,167	2,412	2,412	0.59	0.66	0.66	0.66
Denmark**	0.718	0.718	0.718	0.718	8,001	8,042	8,194	8,895	2.32	2.32	2.32	2.32
Estonia**	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	134	134	137	149	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Finland**	0.533	0.533	0.533	0.533	5,939	5,970	6,082	6,603	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72
France	6.030	6.030	6.030	6.030	58,480	56,024	59,785	65,085	19.48	19.46	19.46	19.46
Georgia	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	29	28	30	32	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Germany	8.662	8.662	8.662	8.662	60,048	57,574	61,438	66,885	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Hungary**	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	1,253	1,281	1,426	1,426	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41
Ireland**	0.350	0.350	0.350	0.350	3,900	3,920	3,994	4,336	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13
Italy	4.885	4.885	4.885	4.885	47,375	45,386	48,433	52,726	15.78	15.77	15.77	15.77
Latvia	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015	145	139	149	162	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Lithuania	0.024	0.024	0.024	0.024	233	223	238	259	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Luxembourg**	0.077	0.077	0.077	0.077	835	854	951	951	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
FYR Macedonia**	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	67	67	68	74	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Malta	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014	136	130	139	151	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Moldova**	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	21	21	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Monaco	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	29	28	30	32	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Netherlands**	1.690	1.690	1.690	1.690	18,833	18,928	19,286	20,938	5.46	5.45	5.45	5.45
Norway**	0.679	0.679	0.679	0.679	7,566	7,605	7,749	8,412	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.19
Poland	0.461	0.461	0.461	0.461	4,471	4,283	4,571	4,976	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49
Portugal**	0.470	0.470	0.470	0.470	5,237	5,264	5,363	5,823	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52
Romania**	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.060	669	672	685	743	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19
Slovakia	0.051	0.051	0.051	0.051	495	474	506	550	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
Slovenia**	0.082	0.082	0.082	0.082	914	918	963	1,016	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26
Sweden**	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.998	11,121	11,178	11,389	12,364	3.22	3.22	3.22	3.22
Ukraine**	0.039	0.039	0.039	0.039	553	566	630	630	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13
United Kingdom	6.127	6.127	6.127	6.127	59,420	56,926	60,747	66,132	19.79	19.77	19.77	19.77
Total	33.429	33.449	33.449	33.449	300,241	287,868	307,191	334,424	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Grand Total***	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	310,585	301,417	318,278	345,750	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* Scales based on those of 2006. To be reviewed when scales for 2007 - 2009 become available.

** These Parties have decided to pay additional contributions to budget line 5601. Therefore the columns with the UN scale and percentage are not applicable.

*** Including the additional contributions of certain Parties to budget line 5601 Operational Reserve for Contingency

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF
THE TRUST FUND FOR THE AGREEMENT ON THE
CONSERVATION OF POPULATIONS OF EUROPEAN BATS

1. The Trust Fund for the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) shall be extended for a period of four years to provide financial support for the aims of the Agreement.
2. The financial period shall be for four calendar years beginning 1 January 2007 and ending 31 December 2010.
3. The Trust Fund shall be administered by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), subject to the approval of the Governing Council of UNEP and the consent of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
4. The administration of the Trust Fund shall be governed by the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, and other administrative policies or procedures, promulgated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
5. In accordance with United Nations rules, UNEP shall deduct from the income of the Trust Fund an administrative charge equal to 13 per cent of the expenditure charged to the Trust Fund in respect of activities financed under the Trust Fund.
6. In the event that the Parties wish the Trust Fund to be extended beyond 31 December 2010, the Executive Director of UNEP shall be so advised in writing immediately after the 6th Session of the Meeting of Parties. It is understood that such extension of the Trust Fund shall be decided at the discretion of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
7. The financial resources of the Trust Fund for 2007-2010 shall be derived from:
 - (a) The contributions made by the Parties by reference to Annex 2, including contributions from any new Parties;
 - (b) Further contributions from Parties and contributions from States not Parties to the Agreement, other governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations and other sources.
8. All contributions to the Trust Fund shall be paid in EURO. For contributions from States that become Parties after the beginning of the financial period, the initial contribution (from the thirtieth day after deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession till the end of the financial period) shall be determined *pro rata* based on the contribution of other States Parties on the same level on the United Nations scale of assessment, as it applies from time to time. However, if the contribution of a new Party determined on this basis would be more than 20 per cent of the budget, the contribution of that Party shall be 20 per cent of the budget for the financial year of joining (or *pro rata* for a part-year).

Contributions shall be paid in annual instalments. The contributions shall be due on 1 January 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. Contributions shall be paid into the following account:

UNEP Trust Fund
Account No. 616 160 3755
J.P. Morgan AG
Gruneburgweg 2
60322 Frankfurt/Main, Germany
Wire transfers: Bank Code number 501 108 00
SWIFT number CHASDEFX

9. For the convenience of the Parties, for each of the years of the financial period the Executive Director of UNEP shall as soon as possible notify the Parties to the Agreement of their assessed contributions.
10. Contributions received into the Trust Fund that are not immediately required to finance activities shall be invested at the discretion of the United Nations, and any income shall be credited to the Trust Fund.
11. The Trust Fund shall be subject to audit by the United Nations Board of Auditors.
12. The budget estimates covering the income and expenditure for each of the three calendar years constituting the financial period to which they relate, prepared in EURO and US Dollars, shall be submitted to the ordinary session of the Meeting of Parties to the Agreement.
13. The estimates of each of the calendar years covered by the financial period shall be divided into sections and objects of expenditures, shall be specified according to budget lines, shall include references to the programmes of work to which they relate, and shall be accompanied by such information as may be required by or on behalf of the contributors, and such further information as the Executive Director of UNEP may deem useful and advisable. In particular estimates shall also be prepared for each programme of work for each of the calendar years, with expenditure itemised for each programme so as to correspond to the sections, objects of expenditure, and budget lines described in the first sentence of this paragraph.
14. In addition to the budget estimates for the financial period described in the preceding paragraphs, the Secretariat of the Agreement, in consultation with the Standing Committee and the Executive Director of UNEP, shall prepare a medium-term plan as envisaged in Chapter III of the Legislative and Financial Texts Regarding the United Nations Environment Programme and the Environment Fund. The medium-term plan will cover the years 2007-2013, inclusive, and shall incorporate the budget for the financial period 2011-2013.
15. The proposed budget and medium-term plan, including all the necessary information, shall be dispatched by the Secretariat to all Parties at least ninety days before the date fixed for the opening of the ordinary session of the Meeting of Parties.
16. The budget and medium-term plan shall be adopted by a three-quarters majority of the Parties present and voting at the ordinary session.

17. In the event that the Executive Director of UNEP anticipates that there might be a shortfall in resources over the financial period as a whole, the Executive Director shall consult with the Secretariat, who shall seek the advice of the Standing Committee as to its priorities for expenditure.
18. Commitments against the resources of the Trust Fund may be made only if they are covered by the necessary income of the Agreement. No commitments shall be made in advance of the receipt of contributions.
19. Upon the request of the Secretariat of the Agreement, after seeking the advice of the Standing Committee, the Executive Director of UNEP should, to the extent consistent with the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, make transfers from one budget line to another. At the end of any calendar year within the financial period, the Executive Director of UNEP may transfer any uncommitted balance of appropriations to the following calendar year, provided that the total budget approved by the Parties is not exceeded, unless this is specifically sanctioned in writing by the Standing Committee.
20. At the end of each calendar year within the financial period¹, the Executive Director of UNEP shall submit to the Parties, through the UNEP/EUROBATS Secretariat, the accounts for the year. The Executive Director shall also submit, as soon as practicable, the audited accounts for the financial period. These shall include full details of actual expenditure compared to the original provisions for each budget line.
21. Those financial reports required to be submitted to the Executive Director of UNEP shall be transmitted simultaneously by the Secretariat of the Agreement to the members of the Standing Committee.
22. The Secretariat of the Agreement shall provide the Standing Committee with an estimate of proposed expenditures over the coming year simultaneously with, or as soon as possible after, distribution of the accounts and reports referred to in the preceding paragraphs.
23. The present terms of reference shall be effective from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2010.

¹ The calendar year 1 January to 31 December is the accounting and financial year, but the accounts official closure date is 31 March of the following year. Thus, on 31 March the accounts of the previous year have to be closed, and it is only then that the Executive Director can submit the accounts of the previous calendar year.

Medium-Term Plan 2007 - 2013

Estimated costs in EURO							
Budget line	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
1000 Personnel	239,500	244,550	249,650	253,750	291,184	305,743	321,030
3000 Meetings	12,000	0	12,000	32,000	12,600	12,600	33,600
4000 Equipment and Premises	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,200	4,200	4,200
5000 Miscellaneous Costs	19,354	18,190	16,012	16,223	20,000	20,000	20,000
Subtotal	274,854	266,740	281,662	305,973	327,984	342,543	378,830
6000 UNEP psc (13%)	35,731	34,676	36,616	39,776	42,638	44,531	49,248
Total	310,585	301,416	318,278	345,749	370,622	387,074	428,078

Estimated costs in US Dollars							
Budget line	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
1000 Personnel	299,375	305,688	312,066	317,188	363,980	382,179	401,288
3000 Meetings	15,000	0	15,000	40,000	15,750	15,750	42,000
4000 Equipment and Premises	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,250	5,250	5,250
5000 Miscellaneous Costs	24,193	22,738	20,015	20,279	25,000	25,000	25,000
Subtotal	343,568	333,426	352,081	382,467	409,980	428,179	473,538
6000 UNEP psc (13%)	44,664	43,345	45,771	49,721	53,297	55,663	61,560
Total	388,232	376,771	397,852	432,188	463,277	483,842	535,098

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.2

Bats and Rabies in Europe



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter “the Agreement”),

Recalling that the Agreement’s Conservation and Management Plan recognises that bats depend heavily on artificial structures for roosting and that their conservation depends on favourable human attitudes (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14AnnexA, para 19);

Recalling that the Agreement’s Conservation and Management Plan also encourages Parties and Range States to cooperate in the conservation and management of bats and their habitats (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14AnnexA, para 24);

Noting the occurrence of Lyssaviruses (European Bat Lyssaviruses - variants of rabies viruses) in certain European bat species and that these bats may live in close association with humans;

Noting the negative public opinions that these viruses may encourage and their influence on bat conservation, including the association with sylvatic (or classic) rabies virus in the perspective of the medical and veterinary communities, the media and the general public;

Noting that European Bat Lyssaviruses (EBLVs) might be under-reported in bat species across Europe as prevalence is routinely reported only in countries that have a regular surveillance programme;

Noting the extremely rare incidence of these viruses in humans or other non-bat wild and domestic mammals;

Noting the need to understand the dynamics, epidemiology and pathogenesis of these viruses and their distribution, hosts and incidence in European bat species;

Noting the results and recommendations of the European Workshop on Bat Rabies, Vilnius, Lithuania, 16 May 2004 (EUROBATS.BatRabiesWorkshop.Report);

Noting the Conclusions and Recommendations of the First International Conference 'Rabies in Europe', Kiev, Ukraine, 15-18 June 2005;

Noting the recommendations of the EU Med-Vet-Net Workpackage 5: Molecular Epidemiology of European Bat Lyssaviruses (which aims to obtain, sequence and archive EBLV isolates from countries throughout Europe, and to set up a database to register submission details and sequence data for EBLV isolates);

Noting the facility to test for these viruses through surveillance of a) bats involved in high risk (species known to carry the virus or where there is a lack of information) biting or scratching incidents in humans (or their companion animals), b) all or any dead or sick bats, and c) through sampling of blood and/or saliva from wild caught animals;

Noting the recommendations of Med-Vet-Net regarding protocols for surveillance;

Urges Parties and Range States to:

1. *Establish* a national bat rabies surveillance network in close collaboration with bat specialists, which should be based on a surveillance programme through submission of bats that have died or been euthanised for welfare reasons, and/or by sampling of blood and saliva;
2. *Support* education efforts that reflect the best scientific advice available regarding the human health risks associated with bat rabies;
3. *Support* efforts to avoid overreaction to incidental bat bite exposures and to develop policies for determining the fate of bats involved in contact incidents with humans (and domestic animals such as cats);
4. *Ensure* that reasonable advice on precautions to avoid infection is available and implemented, including for the maintenance of colonies in buildings where rabies-positive bats have been recorded;
5. *Ensure* that rabies vaccination is compulsory or at least highly recommended for all people regularly handling bats;
6. *Maintain* collaboration with bat workers in the field, with respect to protocols for sampling and submission of specimens;
7. *Maintain* the use of standard record forms for the submission of bats for testing (Annex 1);

8. *Ensure* that the identification of submitted bats is confirmed by an appropriate authority;
9. *Ensure* that all test results are recorded, both negative as well as positive results;
10. *Attempt* to find a long-term depository for the tested specimens;
11. *Continue* efforts to develop national databases of bats tested, rabies exposures, treatments and outcomes;
12. *Adopt* recommendations of Med-Vet-Net regarding protocols for passive and active surveillance, the maintenance of appropriate databases of submissions and results, diagnostic tests, and of data of bats tested and viruses found (Annex 2);
13. *Ensure* comprehensive results of bats tested are submitted to WHO;
14. *Note* that some laboratories are able to carry out analysis of samples for countries where facilities are not available (especially for detailed virus typing);
15. *Make* results of scientific and epidemiological reports available in terms that are easily understood by the general public.

Annex 1. Standard form for submission of bats for rabies testing.

A standard form for bats submitted for rabies screening should include:

1. lab use only individual reference number
2. name and contact details for person or body submitting specimen
3. name and contact details of finder (if different from 2)
4. species, age, sex of bat if known
5. date and time of finding
6. date and time of death
7. location of finding (including address if appropriate)
8. map reference to finding locality
9. circumstances of finding (e.g. brought in by cat, found on lawn/pavement, seen hanging on wall for some days)
10. symptoms or condition when found (e.g. unable to fly, found dead)
11. cause of death if known (e.g. killed by cat, euthanised, died in captivity)
12. details of any biting or scratching incident involving a human or an animal
13. contact details of any human or animal involved in 12
14. contact details of any vet or medical doctor involved in 12
15. for lab use: date received, date tested, record of tests carried out (e.g. FAT, RTCIT, MIT, RT-PCR)

Annex 2. Passive and active surveillance of bat lyssavirus infections

Protocols based on recommendations of the EU Med-Vet-Net working group (*Rabies Bulletin Europe*, 2005(4): 3.1)

A national bat rabies surveillance network should be established in all European countries in close collaboration with bat specialists including international bat agencies.

Sampling for surveillance for bat lyssavirus infections has to comply with regulations of the Council Directive 92/43/EEC of the European Union on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora, with the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS), or national legislation. Sampling should also take account of the welfare of the bats, following the recommendations for the capture and study of captured wild bats (EUROBATS Resolution 4.6).

The following protocols for passive and active surveillance are based on recommendations of the First International Conference on 'Rabies in Europe', Kiev, Ukraine, 2005 and the EU Med-Vet-Net Work Group, Workpackage 5.

Protocol for passive surveillance

Passive surveillance is based on the testing of sick, rabies suspect (showing clinical signs or abnormal behaviour) or dead bats of all indigenous bat species for lyssavirus infections. Also, bats involved in contact incidents, e.g. biting or scratching, or animals caught by pets should be included. Further sources of frozen or alcohol or formalin preserved bat samples can be from archives of institutional zoological collections. Dead bats (regardless of species) should be submitted as much as possible to a National Rabies Reference Laboratory for lyssavirus testing.

Brain samples collection using a needle through the orbit of the eye socket can be used to cause minimal disruption to the bat skull and allow species identification. The bat can then be archived as a specimen. Identification of sample bats into species should be performed by a bat specialist only or by specialised laboratories using DNA analysis of patagium tissue samples. This method can be important for distinguishing closely related species such as sibling species.

The method of choice for lyssavirus antigen detection on brain smears is the Fluorescent Antibody Test (FAT) in accordance with WHO guidelines. FAT positive brain samples should be stored for further analysis. For virus characterisation of all lyssavirus positive bats standard sequencing techniques as described should be applied. Sequence data should be collated and archived across Europe on a common database. For laboratories that do not have capacity to carry out sequencing, assistance may be provided by other European laboratories. Collection of salivary glands or neck tissue of rabies positive bats can also be useful.

Protocol for active surveillance of bat rabies

Active surveillance is based on the monitoring of free-living indigenous bat populations for lyssavirus infections. The focus of research can either be on the screening of all abundant bat species or on surveillance of high risk bat species in a particular area.

Sampling has to be done without damaging bat populations: killing bats for active surveillance is unacceptable.

Capturing of bats should be conducted in close collaboration with bat conservationists. Bats can best be captured when leaving their shelters using mist-nets, harp traps, hand-nets, etc. according to the particular roosting site. Capturing in the open field may also be useful in particular at flight paths. Sampling should be performed on an annual basis, preferably in the same month in order to get comparable data. Surveyors should be aware that repeated sampling in the same year could cause excessive disturbance to bat colonies.

Blood sampling of bats requires skills, expertise and training to avoid serious injuries. The most efficient and harmless procedure is lancing veins, e.g. interfemoral vein (uropatagium) as well as antebrachial vein (propatagium). Veins in the patagium membranes should not be used because the risk of damages. Strictly avoid cardiac puncturing. Blood should quickly be aspirated through a syringe or pipette and transferred to an eppendorf vial and stored appropriately prior to testing. Saliva can be collected using cotton swabs and subsequently be stored in either 1 ml of RNA buffer or viral transport medium for Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) testing and virus isolation, respectively. The latter case is recommended since it offers both diagnostic procedures.

Virus neutralising antibodies can be detected using EBLV-modified versions of the Rapid Fluorescent Focus Inhibition Test (RFFIT) taking into account the small volume and haemolysis of the serum samples. If possible, sera should be tested separately against both EBLV-1 and EBLV-2. Nested RT-PCR or real time PCR as described is recommended for detection of EBLV-specific RNA in saliva swabs. The RNA extraction method may differ depending on the transport buffer. RT-PCR is considered as a highly sensitive screening method whereas virus isolation confirms shedding of viable and infectious virus.

Data collection

For both passive and active surveillance the following data should be collected: 1, ring or transponder identification number if the bat has been marked; 2. species; 3 gender and reproductive state; 4. age (estimated by the degree of ossification in fingers' metacarpals and phalanxes, together with tooth-wear levels); 5. weight (active surveillance); 6. collector (name, address, tel. no., e-mail); 7. accurate location; 8. date; 9 detail of exposure (contact, biting, scratching, part of the body); 10. information on abnormal behaviour, etc.; and 11. diagnostic test results (FAT, PCR, serology, and others if applicable).

It is recommended to use a uniform sample submission form for data collection.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.3

Amendment of the Annex to the Agreement



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter "the Agreement"),

Recalling Resolution No. 7 adopted at its Third Session (Bristol, July 2000), amending the Agreement and incorporating an Annex of bat species occurring in Europe to which the Agreement applies;

Appreciating that the majority of Parties has already accepted the Amendment to the Agreement and that it has entered into force in August 2001;

Recognising that there will be the need to amend the Annex from time to time in the light of recent research results;

Further recognising that the names of bat species included in the Annex should conform to the rules of nomenclature laid down by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature;

Noting that IUCN – The World Conservation Union as well as the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) identify *Mammal Species of the World* by Wilson and Reeder (Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington; John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore) as the standard list of mammals;

Acknowledges the establishment of an Advisory Panel of specialists to consider potential changes to the Annex;

Agrees to adopt the following changes to the Annex, on the recommendation of the Advisory Panel; and

Notes other potential changes to the Annex, but which are rejected or deferred pending the availability of further information;

Decides to:

1. Accept *Myotis punicus* Felten 1977 as the name for the species listed as *Myotis cf punicus*;
2. Replace *Plecotus alpinus* with *P. macrobullaris* Kuzyakin 1965;
3. Remove the brackets from round the author/date for *Taphozous nudiventris* Cretzschmar, 1830; *Myotis hajastanicus* Argyropulo, 1939; *Otonycteris hemprichii* Peters, 1859;
4. Amend date for *Barbastella leucomelas* (Cretzschmar, 1826);
5. Amend spelling of author's name for *Myotis aurascens* Kuzyakin, 1935;

Adopts the revised list of species for the Annex to the Agreement as attached to this Resolution.

Bat species occurring in Europe to which the Agreement applies:

Pteropodidae

Rousettus aegyptiacus (GEOFFROY, 1810)

Emballonuridae

Taphozous nudiventris CRETZSCHMAR, 1830

Rhinolophidae

Rhinolophus blasii PETERS, 1866

Rhinolophus euryale BLASIUS, 1853

Rhinolophus ferrumequinum (SCHREBER, 1774)

Rhinolophus hipposideros (BECHSTEIN, 1800)

Rhinolophus mehelyi MATSCHIE, 1901

Vespertilionidae

Barbastella barbastellus (SCHREBER, 1774)

Barbastella leucomelas (CRETZSCHMAR, 1826)

Eptesicus bottae (PETERS, 1869)

Eptesicus nilssonii (KEYSERLING & BLASIUS, 1839)

Eptesicus serotinus (SCHREBER, 1774)

Hypsugo savii (BONAPARTE, 1837)

Myotis alcathoe VON HELVERSEN & HELLER, 2001

Myotis aurascens KUZYAKIN, 1935

Myotis bechsteinii (KUHLE, 1817)

Myotis blythii (TOMES, 1857)

Myotis brandtii (EVERSMANN, 1845)

Myotis capaccinii (BONAPARTE, 1837)

Myotis dasycneme (BOIE, 1825)

Myotis daubentonii (KUHLE, 1817)

Myotis emarginatus (GEOFFROY, 1806)

Myotis hajastanicus ARGYROPULO, 1939

Myotis myotis (BORKHAUSEN, 1797)

Myotis mystacinus (KUHLE, 1817)

Myotis nattereri (KUHLE, 1817)

Myotis nipalensis (DOBSON, 1871)

Myotis punicus FELTEN, 1977

Myotis schaubi KORMOS, 1934

Nyctalus lasiopterus (SCHREBER, 1780)

Nyctalus leisleri (KUHLE, 1817)

Nyctalus noctula (SCHREBER, 1774)

Otonycteris hemprichii PETERS, 1859

Pipistrellus kuhlii (KUHLE, 1817)

Pipistrellus nathusii (KEYSERLING & BLASIUS, 1839)

Pipistrellus pipistrellus (SCHREBER, 1774)

Pipistrellus pygmaeus (LEACH, 1825)

Plecotus auritus (LINNAEUS, 1758)

Plecotus austriacus (FISCHER, 1829)

Plecotus kolombatovici DULIC, 1980

Plecotus macrobullaris KUZYAKIN, 1965

Plecotus sardus MUCEDDA, KIEFER, PIDINCHEDDA & VEITH, 2002

Vespertilio murinus LINNAEUS, 1758

Miniopterus schreibersii (KUHLE, 1817)

Molossidae

Tadarida teniotis (RAFINESQUE, 1814)

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.4

Monitoring Bats across Europe



The Meeting of Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter 'the Agreement'),

Recalling Resolution 2.2 Consistent Monitoring Methodologies (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP2.5.Rev.1AnnexA), which recommends the adoption of consistent monitoring methods for bats across Europe;

Recalling also the recommendations of the Agreement's Conservation and Management Plan 2003-2006 Resolution 4.9 (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP4.15.Rev.2) which recognises the importance of long-term monitoring of bat species (EUROBATS.MoP4.Record.Annex12a);

Recalling further the recommendations of the Agreement's Conservation and Management Plan 2003-2006, which recognise the importance of international information exchange and cooperation in developing monitoring strategies for bats;

Noting the work of the Advisory Committee in producing Guidelines on Bat Monitoring Methods to Assess Population Trends at Different Levels as recommended in the Agreement's Conservation and Management Plan 2003-2006;

Noting the results and recommendations of two workshops held in the UK to develop the idea of pan-European surveillance of bats;

Noting the work of the Advisory Committee on compiling a database of information on important underground sites for bats across Europe as recommended in Resolution 2.4;

Noting also the imminent EUROBATS publication of guidelines on management of underground sites for the protection of bats;

Recognising the importance of the surveillance and monitoring of bats at a European level to report on the conservation status of bats as protected species under relevant international conventions and European Directives;

Recognising the possibility for bats to be indicators of environmental quality and to contribute to assessment of CBD biodiversity targets;

Urges Parties and Range States to:

1. *Support* the development of long-term pan-European surveillance to provide Europe wide population trends for bat species and site condition monitoring of protected sites for bats, with particular reference to underground sites;
2. *Raise awareness* of the importance of underground sites for bats at the local, regional, national and supranational scales;
3. *Maintain* collaboration and information exchange within the EUROBATS Agreement area on surveillance and monitoring activities in their country;
4. *Support* the use of the Guidelines on Bat Monitoring Methods to Assess Population Trends at Different Levels in developing common protocols for bat surveillance across Europe;
5. *Support* the development of standardised survey forms for use in pan-European bat surveillance and monitoring;
6. *Support* the development of appropriate data storage and analysis mechanisms to facilitate the production of Europe-wide trends for bat species;
7. *Encourage and assist* with capacity building of bat workers and surveyors and, where possible, volunteer networks in their country, to carry out bat surveillance projects.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution No. 5.5



Amendment to Resolution 4.6: Guidelines for the Issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Captured Wild Bats

The Meeting of Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter called “the Agreement”),

Recalling Resolution 4.6. adopted at MoP 4;

Noting a request for clarification of paragraph 8;

Noting also the last paragraph, which requests “the Advisory Committee to continue to develop and, as appropriate, revise the attached ‘Notes for the guidance of national authorities’ (Annex 9b) and ‘Recommended ring sizes for European bat species’ (Annex 9c)”;

Agrees to the following amendments:

1. Paragraph 8 of the resolution should be replaced by ‘Licensing authorities should develop a means of recommending standards for equipment that is approved for the activities carried out in 5 above, including the recommendation of suitable sources of equipment and of the materials used for the equipment;
2. In the Annex 9b – Notes for the Guidance of national authorities, under ‘Ref. para.5’ remove the section in brackets in line 1, which would then read ‘Approved methods of capture include;
3. In Annex 9c – Recommended ring sizes for European bat species, remove ring size 2.9 (closed internal diameter) from the recommendation for the middle-sized horseshoe bats, *Rhinolophus blasii*, *euryale* and *mehelyi*.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.6

Wind Turbines and Bat Populations



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter “the Agreement”),

Noting the importance that wind energy has in the implementation of the Kyoto protocol to reduce CO₂ emissions in context of combating climate change;

Recalling Resolution 2.2 Consistent Monitoring Methodologies, which recommends the adoption of consistent monitoring methods for bats across Europe;

Recalling the Agreement’s Conservation and Management Plan 2003-2006, which recognises the importance of international information exchange and cooperation in developing monitoring strategies for bats;

Recalling further the Agreement’s Conservation and Management Plan 2003-2006, which recognises the conservation of bat habitats in all cases of land management and development especially when foraging areas or linear features directing to roosts are affected.

Noting the work of the Advisory Committee in producing Guidelines for the planning process and to assess the impacts of wind turbines on bats at a European level;

Recognising the importance of standardised methods to be able to find accurate mitigation and/or avoidance measures;

Recognising also the necessity of implementing research

Urges Parties and Range States to:

1. Raise awareness of the impacts that wind turbines might have on bat populations;
2. Raise awareness of the existence of some unsuitable habitats or sites for the construction of wind turbines at a local, regional and national scale;

3. Make developers of wind energy plants aware of the necessity of supporting research and monitoring;
4. Recognise the necessity to find suitable methods for assessing bat migration corridors;
5. Develop appropriate national guidelines, drawing on the current version of the generic guidelines in Annex1.

Requests the Advisory Committee to:

6. ensure, in cooperation with the Secretariat, the publication of the generic guidelines;
7. keep the generic guidelines updated.

Annex1 to Resolution 5.6

Wind Turbines and Bats: Guidelines for the planning process and impact assessments

(Version 1.0, September 2006)

Authors

Luísa Rodrigues (Convenor; Portugal), Lothar Bach (Germany), Laurent Biraschi (Luxembourg), Marie-Jo Dubourg-Savage (SFEPM, France), Jane Goodwin (UK), Christine Harbusch (NABU, Germany), Tony Hutson (IUCN), Teodora Ivanova (Bulgaria), Lauri Lutsar (ELF, Estonia), Katie Parsons (BCT, UK)

on behalf of the Advisory Committee of the EUROBATs Agreement

Index

1. Introduction
2. General aspects of the planning process
 - 2.1 Site selection phase
 - 2.2 Construction phase
 - 2.3 Operation phase
 - 2.4 Decommissioning phase
3. Carrying out impact assessments
 - 3.1 Pre-survey assessment
 - 3.2 Survey
 - 3.2.1 Survey design
 - 3.2.2 Survey methods
 - a) Land based wind turbines
 - b) Off-shore wind turbines
 - 3.2.3 Survey effort
 - 3.2.4 Type of survey
 - a) Inland survey
 - b) Off-shore survey
 - 3.2.5 Survey report and evaluation
 - 3.3. Repowering
4. Monitoring the impacts
 - 4.1 Loss of habitats
 - 4.2 Monitoring of mortality
 - 4.2.1 Searching for bat fatalities
 - 4.2.2 Estimation of mortality rate
 - 4.3 Migration
 - 4.4 Behaviour
5. Research priorities
 - 5.1 Methodology development
 - 5.2 Mortality and potential effects on bat populations
 - 5.3 Migration
 - 5.4 Collision
 - 5.5 Disturbance, barrier effect
 - 5.6 Mitigation and/or avoidance
6. Conclusions and further work
7. References / further reading

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

Following the assessment of the evidence of the impact of wind turbines on bat populations, the EUROBATS Advisory Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to develop generic guidelines for the planning process and impact assessments to assist in determining where wind turbines can be best sited to reduce impacts on bats.

Guidelines for the development of wind turbines have been prepared in some countries, but there are few examples where bats are considered. There is a need to provide more instructive bat guidelines within the EUROBATS Agreement Area. The primary purpose of these guidelines is to raise awareness amongst developers and planners of the need to consider bats and their roosts, their migration routes and feeding areas when they are assessing applications for wind turbines. These generic guidelines should also be of interest to local and national consenting authorities who are required to draw up strategic sustainable energy plans. It may also be useful checklist for local authorities to ensure that schemes have taken the possible presence of bats and the effects on bats into account, when considering planning applications.

Europe is faced with a need to tackle climate change and environmental pollution and to find sustainable methods to meet demands for the generation of power, accordingly to Directive 2001/77/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 September 2001 on the promotion of electricity produced from renewable energy sources in the internal electricity market. European countries' governments have made commitments to source power from renewable resources, e.g. the UK Government is committed to ensure that 10% of the country's electricity should be generated from renewable sources by 2010/11 with an aspiration to double this by 2020¹.

Contracting Parties of the EUROBATS Agreement are committed towards a common goal: the conservation of bats throughout Europe. Contracting Parties are also mindful of the need to reduce climate change for the long-term survival of migratory species. Bats are protected species under the EU Habitats Directive and the Berne Convention. Bats are migratory species and regularly migrate between their summer roosts and the sites for hibernation. Some bat species also migrate over hundreds of kilometres across regional and national boundaries. Where bat migration crosses borders, any Strategic Environmental Assessment of wind energy plans with the potential for cross boundary impacts, should seek international co-operation from other governments.

Wind turbines have been described as a problem for birds for many years (Reichenbach 2002, Phillips 1994, Winkelmann 1989): discussion is mainly about their negative effect through bird-strike, but also the avoidance of wind farms during breeding and migratory times by some bird species (Reichenbach 2002). Since the 1990s, parallel to the discussions and findings about birds, it has been assumed that bat species foraging in open air could similarly be affected. In the mid-1990s wind energy concerned mainly coastal areas, and the problems about "bats and wind energy" were discussed for the first time in two papers published in 1999 (Bach *et al.* 1999, Rahmel *et al.* 1999 [Germany]). About the same time, in the US, Johnson *et al.* (2000) published bird-strike findings, showing that the number of dead bats found under wind turbines was sometimes higher than the number of dead birds. Meanwhile other reports have corroborated the findings of bat collisions with wind farms, both in Germany and abroad (e.g. Ahlén 2002 [Sweden], Alcalde 2003 [Spain] and Dürr 2001, Trapp *et al.* 2002, Dürr and Bach 2004 [Germany]). Please see Table 1 for further details. Altogether 19 European bats species were found to suffer collision fatalities, 21 bat species are considered to be potentially affected (Please see Table 2 for further details). Wind turbines may also have negative impacts on bat populations, as well as their prey and habitats, such as:

¹ "Securing the Future – The UK Sustainable Development Strategy" HM Government, March 2005. Available from http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/documents/publications/strategy/SecFut_complete.pdf

- Damage, disturbance or destruction of foraging habitats and commuting corridors
- Damage, disturbance or destruction of roosts
- Increased collision risk for bats in flight
- Disorientation of bats in flight through emission of ultrasound noise

2. General aspects of the planning process

These guidelines are applicable to schemes in urban as well as rural areas, ranging in size from domestic to the commercial scale and may also be applied to wind turbines planned for the offshore area. The impact of placing small turbines on the side of properties and their effect on bat roosts should also be considered.

There is growing awareness of the issue of climate change and the role of renewable energy in combating it. Planning is usually organised at the local or regional scale and each locality or region has its own spatial strategies to deal with a broad range of planning issues, including economic development, transport, housing, environment and energy. Planning policies/strategies regarding wind turbines need to address various environmental factors. It is reasonable to assume that, depending on the selected site, there may be very little impact on bats. However, where there is reasonable likelihood of bats being present and affected by the development, planning authorities should seek to ensure ecological surveys and assessments are carried out at appropriate times and by experienced personnel.

The need to consider possible impacts on bats as part of the development control process and to adapt policy and practices in light of experience of the placement of existing wind turbines is vital to ensure that bats are not faced with an unnecessary threat to their survival. Possible mitigation measures might include planning conditions requiring the shutting down of turbines at critical times of the year. For example there are plans for some wind turbines in Germany to shut down for varying periods between August and October. The turbines will shut down either for the whole of the night or the first half of the night, and in late September/early October during the late afternoon.

Planning authorities can regulate the construction and operation of wind turbines by means of planning conditions and/or a planning obligation. Planning conditions and obligations can apply to a range of issues including size, nature and location of the project. When assessing planning applications for wind turbines and when they draw up conditions or obligations, planners should be mindful of possible effects of wind turbines on bats in terms of disturbance, severance of foraging or migratory routes, habitat loss or damage, and collision. Planners should also insist that impacts of the turbines are monitored.

The phases involved in producing energy using wind turbines may have an impact on bats to a greater or lesser extent:

2.1 Site selection phase

Developers should consider locating wind turbines away from narrow bat migration routes and concentrated feeding, breeding and roosting areas. Buffer zones could be created around nationally and regionally important roosts. The presence of habitats such as forests, wetland and hedgerow networks, and habitat features such as individual trees, waterbodies or water courses likely to be utilised by bats should be taken into account. Their presence will increase the likelihood that bats may forage in these areas. Very open habitat may be less important for foraging, although they may form commuting or migratory corridors. Information on habitats and places where wind turbines may have an impact would aid decision making.

The following table shows the most important impacts related to the siting and functioning of wind turbines, and to what extent they effect either the local or migratory population. More details are found in Bach and Rahmel (2004).

Impacts related to siting		
Impact	Summer time	During migration
Loss of hunting habitats during construction of access roads, foundations, etc.	Small to medium impact, depending on the site and species present at that site	Small impact
Loss of roost sites due to construction of access roads, foundations, etc.	Probably high or very high impact, depending on the site and species present at that site	High or very high impact, e.g. loss of mating roosts
Impacts related to operating the wind farm		
Impact	Summer time	During migration
Ultrasound emission	Probably a limited impact	Probably a limited impact
Loss of hunting areas because the bats avoid the area	Medium to high impact	Probably a minor impact in spring, a medium to high impact in autumn and hibernation period
Loss or shifting of flight corridors	Medium impact	Small impact
Collision with rotors	Small to high impact, depending on the species	High to very high impact

2.2 Construction phase

Construction phase activity should be planned for times of the day/year when bats are not active. This requires local knowledge about the bat species in the area and understanding their annual life cycle. A typical year in the life of bats involves a period when they are active (usually April - October) and a period when they are usually less active or in hibernation (November to March). Timing will vary for each species according to geographical location, and also from one year to the next, depending on weather conditions. Behaviour of some species will also play a part, as some cold-tolerant species are much more active during winter than other species of bat. Construction activity should be clearly delineated in any plan to ensure operations are restricted to less sensitive times.

Permanent access roads and buildings related to the construction of the site should also be considered as potential sources of disturbance or damage. Construction should take place at appropriate times to minimise impacts of noise, vibrations, lighting and other related disturbance on bats.

2.3 Operation phase

Depending on the locality and level of impact, consideration should be given to the use of planning conditions to planning consents to restrict the operation of wind turbines at times of peak bat activity such as during the autumn migration period.

2.4 Decommissioning phase

Planners can include conditions and/or planning agreements to accompany planning permission that extend to the deconstruction phase. Wind turbines can be decommissioned easily and rapidly. Consideration should be given to carrying out decommissioning at a time of year that minimises disturbance to bats and their habitats. In drawing up site restoration conditions local planning authorities should consider the need to include conditions that are favourable to bats and their habitats.

3. Carrying out impact assessments

Several studies have shown that in the course of a year most dead bats are found in late summer and autumn (Alcalde 2003, Johnson *et al.* 2003]) and are frequently migratory species (Ahlén 1997, Ahlén 2002, Johnson *et al.* 2003, Petersons 1990). Bats from local populations may also be affected (Arnett *et al.* 2005, Brinkmann *et al.* 2006). Therefore an environmental impact assessment needs to include both periods: summer and migration time. This is especially true because wind turbines are no longer just a coastal phenomenon: the modern high-performance turbines are also found inland and bat migration is not restricted to coasts. Wind turbines are preferentially built on hill-tops which have a higher exposure to the wind: such sites are often at the edge of, or even in, woodland. In these locations the wind farm can have an effect, as is typical in the plains, but its site and construction in forest areas can also affect bat habitats. Bat foraging habitats can be affected and roosts destroyed by the site clearance to build turbines and access roads, and the placement of cables connecting to the power network.

The assessment methodology must take into account the summer, spring and autumn migration aspects, in order to avoid and mitigate the impacts satisfactorily. It is recommended that planners (after consultation with bat experts) consider and assess potential impacts on bats when considering applications for all proposed wind turbines (e.g. Ahlén 2002, Bach and Rahmel 2004, Behr and v. Helversen 2005, Brinkmann *et al.* 2006, Dürr and Bach 2004, Endl *et al.* 2005, Johnson and Strickland 2004).

The following section provides information on impact assessments that are not a statutory requirement. Developers will also need to undertake formal assessments to meet Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) requirements, where appropriate. Where certain development is likely to have significant environmental effects on bats (e.g. effects on either/and roosts, flight paths, feeding grounds and seasonal migrations) an environmental impact assessment will be required before a planning authority can take a decision on whether to grant planning permission.

3.1 Pre-survey assessment

The aim of the pre-survey assessment is to identify the species as well as the landscape features used by bats that are potentially at risk within the selected area. These results form the basis of an evaluation and conflict analysis, and for providing subsequent advice for avoiding, mitigating, or adjusting the impacts. Given the impacts that wind turbines may have on bats, it is recommended that a pre-survey assessment be undertaken for all new inland and off-shore wind turbine proposals. The pre-survey assessment is a preliminary step to gather evidence of any likely impact on bats that may be present to help the developer in his decision making and whether a more detailed survey is required.

Consideration should be given to including the following as part of the pre-survey assessment:

- (a) Collation and review of existing information.
A range of information sources should be reviewed to help identify potential habitats for bats and impacts that may arise from a proposed wind turbine.

These should include:

- Aerial photographs/maps/habitat survey map
- Species distribution maps/consider species distributions
- Records of known roosts and bat sightings. For off-shore sites this should include records from oil rigs, lighthouses and other open sea or coastal records
- If possible bird migratory routes as they can give us a hint on bat migration as well
- European bat migration data

Where appropriate consultations with key organisations that may hold data on bats should also be undertaken. Consultees could include:

- Local bat groups
- Biological Records Centres

- Wildlife Trusts
- Statutory Nature Conservation Organisations
- Bat Conservation Trusts
- Natural History Museums
- University research organisations
- Provincial authorities
- Consultancies that have worked in the area

(b) Assess the likelihood of bats being present.

In addition to the desk study it is recommended that a preliminary site survey be undertaken to identify/confirm potential features within the survey area that could be used by bats. The preliminary survey is likely to require a broad scale approach to identify the possible functions for each part of survey area, for example, for roosting, foraging and commuting. This part of the assessment should also consider potential migration routes.

(c) Identify potential impacts.

The existing information and the site survey should be used to decide if bats are known to be present, the number of species, what landscape features are good for bats (roost, foraging, corridors) and what impacts are likely or could potentially arise. For each wind turbine proposal, consideration should be given to how it may affect bats. In particular wind turbines potentially can result in the following impacts:

- Death through collision with rotary blades
- Disturbance or severance of migration routes
- Disturbance or severance of local commuting routes
- Disturbance or loss of foraging habitat
- Disturbance or loss of roosts, although this is more likely to occur where turbines are located in woodland habitats or close to buildings.

(d) Identify the scale of the assessment and future survey likely to be needed.

When considering the potential effects of a proposed wind turbine, consideration should be given to local movements of bats to and from foraging sites and also long distance movements of bats between summer and hibernation sites, particularly migration routes/major movement e.g. autumn movement /swarming.

Migration routes over land and off-shore should be considered. Particular consideration should be given to migration routes for wind turbine locations close to prominent landscape features such as river valleys, upland ridges, upland passes and coastlines. For off-shore proposals the location of the wind turbine in relation to flight lines between principal land masses and islands should also be taken into account, especially where there are records for bats on islands. It is recommended that for land based wind turbines the pre-survey assessment should consider bat activity within a 10km radius of the wind turbine.

3.2 Survey

3.2.1 Survey design

Survey design will differ depending on the proposed location of the wind turbine. However, consideration should be given to the spatial scale of the survey, which should closely reflect the size and number of wind turbines, potential use of the site by bats and how this may affect the timing of survey work.

Larger wind turbines blades have a typical rotation zone of between 25 and 180 metres above the ground and therefore consideration should be given to the height at which survey work should take place. Such turbines are likely to affect high flying species, although it is recommended that all species are considered and assessed.

Given the potential impacts on bats it is unrealistic to present an accurate and complete EIA for a specific wind farm project, without taking into account the possible presence of bats throughout a timescale which reflects the full cycle of bat activity. According to species and geographical situation in Europe this cycle of activity can vary from mid-February to mid-December. The

intensity of survey work throughout this period may also vary depending on the location of the proposed wind turbine and the potential use of the site.

Although the timing of the survey is strongly dependent on weather conditions, it should not only provide a good picture of use for foraging and commuting purposes by local bat populations, but should also identify migration of bats. As a consequence it is recommended that a greater intensity of survey should be undertaken in spring and autumn when bats are migrating. The timing of such surveys could be guided by consideration of records e.g. of when bats begin to leave their hibernation quarters, when maternity roosts disperse, or when mating takes place and swarming starts in the area.

3.2.2 Survey methods

a) Land based wind turbines

Surveys of proposed wind turbine sites should also consider the benefits of including survey techniques proposed for open space activity surveys such as hand held or automated bat detector surveys, radio tracking whenever necessary and also trapping (in forests or highly structured areas only). However, consideration should be given to the height at which surveys may need to be undertaken. These should reflect the proposed height of the wind turbines and surveys using automated bat detectors from the ground and/or attached to kites or to helium balloons should be considered, in addition to undertaking standard hand held detector surveys. Existing structures (towers, masts or lighthouses) at the studied site can be used to place automated stations.

It has been suggested that the use of radar, sited along foraging, commuting or migratory routes, in combination with bat detectors at different altitudes and night vision equipment (infrared or thermal cameras), could also provide data indicating the height at which bats are flying, but more tests are necessary to authenticate the results and prove the usefulness of this equipment. This latter technique is not a tool on its own but must be used with conventional methods. It is recommended that intensive activity surveys should be undertaken within a 1 km radius of each proposed wind turbine throughout the survey period and determine seasonal use of roosts within a 10 km radius. To provide an indication of migration routes, intensive survey of a 1km radius around the proposed wind turbine site to identify an increase in migratory species should be undertaken in spring and late summer/early autumn.

Wind turbines should as a rule not be installed within woodlands, nor at a distance less than 200 m due to the risk that this type of siting implies for all bats. In the vicinity of woods the height issue should be highlighted. Special interest should be the bat activity above the canopy. Imaging cameras and kites/balloons with bat detectors will give an indication of height. Radar, if they prove to be operational, may be less useful here than in less cluttered habitats. Focus on species using open spaces as well as all species known to fly above the canopy e.g. *Pipistrellus* sp., *Hypsugo savii*, *Myotis bechsteinii*, *Barbastella barbastellus*, *Myotis nattereri*, *Myotis myotis*, *Eptesicus* sp., *Vespertilio murinus* and *Nyctalus* sp.

b) Off-shore wind turbines

Off-shore wind turbines should be surveyed in the same manner as land based turbines, but will require surveys to be undertaken from boats, lighthouses, etc. Off-shore wind turbine surveys, however, should concentrate on migration routes rather than foraging areas. Surveys should be concentrated in spring (April/May) and autumn (August/September), unless bats are found on nearby oil rigs, islands etc. indicate their presence at any other time of the year. A study at sea in Sweden should provide more information soon.

3.2.3 Survey effort

Depending on the local geographical conditions and on the species hibernating in the region, the dates for the beginning and the end of the survey will vary, as hibernation is shorter in southern Europe than in northern parts of the continent. The survey can therefore take place between mid-February and the end of November (or even mid-December) but the effort will also vary. The

survey effort should be tailored to the individual site and the potential impacts using local information.

Different stages of bat activity must be investigated (for dates see 3.2.4 a) 4 Timing of survey):

- (a) Commuting between post-hibernation roosts
- (b) Spring migration
- (c) Activity of local populations, checking also for flight paths, foraging areas etc. and concentrating on high flying species
- (d) Dispersion of colonies, start of autumn migration
- (e) Autumn migration, mating roosts and territories

3.2.4 Type of survey

a) Inland survey

1. Search for new nurseries within for example a 5 km radius to help assessing the stages (c) and (d) of bat activity (May to August).
2. Ground surveys
 - Bat detector surveys (manual and automatic from the ground) for all stages of bat activity to determine
 - an activity index for each habitat in the study area (1 km radius around the planned sitting of the wind farm) and for each planned sitting of wind turbine (activity index = number of bat contacts per hour). However in the results the % of feeding buzzes should also be noted.
 - preferably the species or groups of species (see above)
 - Infrared camera (or the expensive thermal imaging camera whenever available).
3. Height surveys
 - Automatic surveys with a bat detector on board balloon, kite, weather tower or any other suitable structure (for activity index and groups of species, at all stages of activity cycle).
 - The utility of a radar in combination
 - with automatic recording of ultrasonic microphones placed at different heights on a balloon guideline (in order to have a height reference)
 - with an infrared camerahas still to be shown.
4. Timing of survey
Depending on the local geographical conditions and on the presence of species with a very short hibernation period:
 - **15/02-30/03**²: stage (a): once a week, first half of night for 2 hours starting half an hour before dusk
 - **15/03**³-**15/05**: stage (b): once a week, first half of night from sunset for 4 hours and include 1 whole night in May for stage (c)
 - **01/06-15/07**: stage (c): four times, always a whole night
 - **01/08-31/08**: stage (d): once a week, first half of night from sunset for 4 hours including 2 whole nights
 - **01/09-31/10**: stage (e): once a week first half of night from sunset for 4 hours include 2 whole nights in September and for the first half of the night in October. During this stage one should also search for mating roosts and territories. End of September and October on the European continent, *Nyctalus noctula* have been noted in large numbers hunting in the afternoon from 5 to 100m high. Therefore the survey should start 3-4 hours before sunset, where this behaviour of *Nyctalus noctula* is suspected.
 - **01/11-15/12**⁴: stage (e): once a week (if climatic conditions are appropriate), first half of night for 2 hours starting half an hour before dusk

² Applies mainly for southern Europe, for *Miniopterus schreibersii*, *Rhinolophus euryale* and *Myotis capaccini*

³ If stage (a) was irrelevant in the area

⁴ Same as note 4

It is necessary to take cost implications into consideration (e.g. use of heat imaging cameras, of hiring radar with its technician, cost of helium for the balloon, etc.) Standardisation of post-installation surveys and monitoring is important so that impacts from turbines in different countries can be compared. Guidelines for monitoring are found in Chapter 4.

b) Off-shore survey

For off-shore wind farms it is more difficult to survey bat activity, particularly as methods have not been tried and tested. From experience and results in the Baltic area it may be possible to combine observations from land and sea:

- The survey should concentrate on the migration period.
- Survey from land
 - From (pointed) land marks, thought to be localities where bats leave in the direction to the planned wind farm.
 - Bat detector surveys (manual and automatic from the ground)
 - Infrared or thermal imaging camera whenever available
 - Automatic surveys with a bat detector on board kite, lighthouse or else (for activity index and groups of species)
- Survey on sea
 - Boat transects in the area of the planned wind farm (might be possible to combine with nocturnal bird census)
 - If possible from regularly nocturnal ferries crossing between two landmark tips that are believed to be important for bat migration (e.g. Bornholm-Rügen in the Baltic Sea).
 - Tracking radar from a lighthouse in combination with boat transects to check the radar determination of bats
- Timing of survey
 - From beginning of August until mid October (depending on the locality) at least twice a week.

3.2.5 Survey report and evaluation

As the survey report is aimed at people who have no or little knowledge of bat ecology and bat study, the report should set out:

- The species present in the geographical and administrative area and their status
- The methods and equipment used and their limitations
- Survey dates and weather conditions
- The species contacted during the survey and their deduced behaviour (passing through, foraging, swarming, migrating), as well as the date and hour of observation. These results could appear in tables where the different seasons in bat activity (post-hibernation transit [or spring migration], period of birth and rearing of the young, dispersion and swarming, migration) will be individualised to allow better comparison.
- The difference in activity according to different night phases
- The difference in activity at different altitudes, if a balloon (or another technique) has been used. However caution should be used when comparing ground results and height results monitored by different types of bat detector (the range and accuracy of detectors differ between systems and makes)
- The exact positioning on maps of every single contact, as well as the type of recording (hand-held bat detector, automatic recording boxes, on the ground, in the air, etc.)

The evaluation will take account of the local and regional situations in terms of protection and conservation status, function and use of the described habitats, the different impacts due to siting or to functioning in relation to species present or potentially present (especially in open agricultural habitats).

A conflict analysis should then be presented for each use of the site by each proven species and every wind turbine siting must be evaluated accordingly and proposals made to limit the impacts. The sequence of measures should be avoidance – mitigation – compensation.

For more details about the report and the analysis see Rahmel *et al.* (2004).

3.3 Repowering

It will be necessary to combine a search for bat fatalities under the existing wind turbines and a bat activity survey which accounts of the location and height of the future turbines. The monitoring methods proposed in Chapter 4 with a reduced number of survey nights in summer would be recommended. The search for bat fatalities will help to assess if there is a problem with bat collision on the site.

Search for dead bats

- Search radius if possible equal to the total height of the wind turbine and in any case no less than 50 m
- Same methods as in "Monitoring"
- Search under at least half of the existing wind turbines. This should be done every 2 to 5 days combined with a detector survey the preceding night.

4. Monitoring the impacts

Monitoring of wind farms will establish the impacts of wind turbines and different species and will help in the understanding of the problems involved. Only individual wind farms have been monitored to date and no study has been conducted regarding the cumulative effects of wind farms grouped in the same area. To assess the impacts of wind turbines on bats, studies should use standardised methods to produce comparable results. The aim of the present work is to present methods to achieve this goal and to try to find ways of reducing the impacts on bats.

The direct impact due to the functioning of the wind farm is not yet fully understood as in most cases the cause of the collision is unknown. Different hypotheses have been proposed, such as:

- Air turbulences
- A non-perception of the danger (too short series of echolocation calls by migrating species or too high velocity of the rotating blades)
- The speed of the blades is too high to be perceived by the sonar of bats
- A higher concentration of insect prey around the nacelle, which entices bats to forage in this area.

Monitoring the impacts of wind energy on bats has only a scientific value if it takes into account the initial state of bat populations in the area before the installation of the wind farm. A so-called BACI study (Before and After Construction Impacts) is therefore necessary.

A comprehensive monitoring scheme should focus on at least four following research themes highlighted in Section 2: loss of habitats, mortality, migration and behaviour.

4.1 Loss of habitats

To assess if the wind farm induces a loss of habitats for bats it is necessary to know:

1. (Survey year 1) which species are present in the area before the construction, which ones are foraging on the site or passing through during migration. A reference site (see below) should also be studied.
 - Roost inventory at least in a 10 km radius if the wind farm has been built without any bat survey, otherwise just check the known roosts
 - Study of habitat use (with bat detectors on the ground and at different altitudes – infrared cameras optional)
2. (Monitoring year 2) which species do not re-appear during construction (checking impacts on habitats and the disturbance the works bring to bats)
 - Monitoring of the roosts
 - Continuation of the study of habitat use

3. (Monitoring year 3 to 5) during the functioning phase, impact assessment on resident species (attractiveness, changes in behaviour and mortality) and on migrating ones (behaviour and mortality): 3 years minimum and according to the results another 3 years, if necessary, for a new analysis.

This can be achieved by checking with bat detectors which species are still present around the wind farm, if there is a noticeable decrease of activity index and a change of behaviour compared with the results of year 1 (Bach, 2002).

- bat detector monitoring at ground level (automatic and manual) and at different altitudes (balloons/zeppelins/kites/radar)
- late afternoon visual observations and infrared cameras for behavioural assessment and migration
- bat mortality monitoring (see below)

In order to avoid concluding that any change in bat activity pattern or behaviour is imputable to the wind farm when it can be due to yearly variations, one should also monitor a test zone in the vicinity of the wind park, with similar environmental characteristics (same types of habitats, same height of vegetation). No wind turbine should be built on this reference zone for the duration of monitoring.

4.2 Monitoring of mortality

The number of fatalities varies significantly according to the siting of the wind farm and the species to be found. The number of the findings is biased by predation (time necessary for a predator to find the victim before man) and by the efficiency of the searcher (depending also on the type of ground cover underneath the turbines). Therefore the monitoring will present 2 stages.

4.2.1 Searching for bat fatalities

a) Search plot size

Ideally a radius equal to the total height of the wind turbine should be searched as bat bodies can be drifted far away by high winds (Grünkorn *et al.* 2005). As in most cases this area cannot be searched properly due to the height of ground cover or to natural obstacles, it is advisable to search a smaller surface area that can be clear of vegetation all year round or at least covered with only very short vegetation. If possible the radius should be the total height, but not less than 50 m.

The search area (prefer a square to a circle) will be marked out by 4 corner poles and two opposite sides with other poles indicating 10m or 5m distance bands. The transects walked from one pole to the other will allow checking a band of respectively 5 or 2.5 m wide on each side.

If for some reason the area cannot be walked entirely, the percentage of the searched area should be calculated for each wind turbine.

b) Number of sampled wind turbines

If possible, every wind turbine of the wind farm should be sampled. In the case of extensive farms the turbines close to landscape features will automatically be checked and some other randomly selected. The number will depend on the size of the wind farm and its siting.

c) Time interval between samples

The smaller the time interval between samples, the higher the number of retrieved fatalities and therefore the smaller the bias of predation. An interval of 1 day between samples is suggested for small wind parks, with a 5-days interval (maximum) for larger wind farms (for comparison of results according to the time interval, see Arnett *et al.* 2005).

d) Monitoring schedule

Mortality monitoring should start as soon as bats become active after hibernation and last as long as they are not settled in their hibernaculum. But the schedule will vary according to the geographical and meteorological conditions. For example in Southern Europe monitoring may start

as soon as mid-February and finish as late as mid-December. As the highest numbers of dead bats have been recorded during migration periods the search effort will be more intensive in spring and autumn

- 15/02 – 31/03 : 1 control/week or less
- 01/04 – 15/05 : 1 control every 2 or 3 days
- 16/05 – 31/07 : 1 control/week
- 01/08 – 15/10 : 1 control every 2 or 3 days
- 16/10 – 15/12 : 1 control/week or less

e) Search methods

The searcher will walk each transect at a slow and regular pace, looking for fatalities on both sides of the line. The search will start 1 hour after sunrise, when the lighting conditions enable to distinguish dead bats.

The searcher will note the position of the carcass (GPS coordinates, direction to the WT, distance to the tower), its state (fresh, a few days old, decayed, remnants, etc.) with the type of wounds, the vegetation height where it was found (see below), etc.

It will be necessary to record weather conditions in-between controls (temperature, wind – force and direction, thunderstorm) and the moon phases.

4.2.2 Estimation of mortality rate

A statistical analysis will be necessary to estimate the mortality rate on the monitored wind farm. This analysis will have to take biases into consideration (removal of carcasses by scavengers or predators, searcher efficiency).

a) Carcass removal trials to estimate the predation rate

To estimate scavenging and predation, trials need to be done at least 4 times a year to account for variable height of vegetation on the searched area. As for carnivores bat flesh is probably less attractive than bird flesh, it is advisable to use available frozen bat bodies (they will be thawed before use). But in most cases trials will have to be performed with small passerines or one-day old chickens (preferably dark).

Each trial will last 10 consecutive days to determine how long a carcass stays on the ground before being eaten, removed or buried by mammals, birds and insects.

b) Searcher efficiency trials

- Classification of ground cover

As the searcher efficiency depends on the ground cover (height of vegetation and type of habitat affecting visibility, and season), it is important to determine detectability classes for fatalities. They will combine height and percentage of ground cover and of habitat features (type of vegetation, obstacles on the ground, slope) - for details see e.g. Habitat Mapping p. 26 & 28 in Arnett *et al.* 2005 or Brinkmann *et al.* 2006. These classes are important for the statistical analysis.

- Trials

The searcher efficiency will be tested with different heights of vegetation (4 times a year).

Bat bodies will be distributed at random on the search area of some turbines, the coordinates of each location been noted (as well as direction and distance to the mast and the type and height of vegetation of each spot.

The searcher will proceed as for a normal carcass recovery.

- Use of trained dogs

A dog trained to point at bats might be used for searching for victims but its efficiency will also be tested the same way as above. A pointer dog must be preferred to a retriever, so that his master will be able to locate and register precisely the spot where the victim has fallen.

4.3 Migration

Large river valleys are usually used by most species in migration and special attention must be given to migrating species around wind farms situated in these valleys or on the nearby plateaux or ridges. The same should be done along coastlines.

Visual observations should start mid-afternoon, looking especially for *Nyctalus* species, and continue all night through with bat detectors (time expansion or frequency division on the ground combined with automatic time expansion, heterodyne or frequency division recording at different altitudes).

The study of migration needs to take into account bats passing through at altitudes out of range of the bat detectors on the ground. This can only be achieved with balloons, radar and/or infrared cameras (preferably thermal imaging cameras). But the cost of running radar and cameras implies that this equipment is limited to either large wind farms, problematic sitings or fundamental research.

A helium balloon (airship type zeppelin) with automatic recording of ultrasounds (via Batboxes) has been tested in France by the Museum of Natural History in Bourges and used successfully in France (Sattler and Bontadina 2006) and in Belgium. This equipment shows that bat activity is different in mid-air and close to the ground. Comparison of the activity index at different hours of the night can show a sudden increase in bat contacts which may indicate migration.

4.4 Behaviour

Except at dusk and dawn when visual observations of bats can be made, the study of bat behaviour relies upon expensive technologies such as infrared cameras, either thermal imaging or with a powerful illuminator. Due to its cost, the use of this equipment is limited to either problematic sittings or for fundamental research. However with a hand-held bat detector it is possible to get hints of bat behaviour and at least to separate foraging from passing.

5. Research priorities

Our knowledge of the impact of wind turbines and wind farms on the environment and particularly bats is limited at present and there is a need for further research. Investigations so far confirm the large influence that wind farms may have on bats through collision and loss of hunting habitat. Further research projects are needed to increase our understanding on the impact of wind farms on bats either at an individual or population level. Compared to birds, the general knowledge about bat biology is rather selective and little is known about the bat migration routes throughout Europe. This information is key to evaluating the risks in the planning of new wind farm projects. Furthermore research projects should assess the risk of existing wind farms for bats. There is an urgent need to find solutions that will minimise their impact which can then be applied to planning of future wind farms.

Several, recent European and American studies have identified research needs which fall into six categories:

- Methodology development
- Mortality and (population) effects
- Migration
- Collision
- Disturbance, barrier effect
- Mitigation and/or avoidance

The following section outlines the research needs and marks those that are priorities in *italic*. As well as highlighting the research needs, possible investigation methods are also mentioned.

5.1 Methodology development

Develop methods to observe and measure around existing and operating wind farms:

- bat migration
- bats at high altitudes
- species distribution on a broad level (pre survey phase)

Research project	Possible methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Further development and testing of existing methods (such as from Arnett et al. 2005, Grünkorn et al. 2005, Traxler et al. 2004 for collision mortality studies), as well as novel techniques for measuring the impacts of wind farms, for example how to monitor bat collision rates or long-term effects such as the possible reduction of biological fitness of animals due to the loss of hunting habitat.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technique used by Arnett <i>et al.</i> (2005) (to provide cross continental comparability) • Construction of a statistically robust model for collision mortality that can be universally applied to ensure comparability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish adequate census methods for bat activity at different altitudes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thermal imaging camera • Tracking radar • Detector/multi microphone arrays • Bat activity registration systems • At ground level and high altitude
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and test methods to investigate bat activity and collision rate at offshore wind farms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking radar • Boat tours • Automatic bat registration box
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and test methods to investigate bat migration. Over land and sea. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio tracking • Tracking radar • Ringing⁵ • Broadscale, repeated and synchronized bat detector samples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and test methods models of geographical and ecologically relevant species distribution maps. This highlights the most important foraging areas across a broad geographical scale and acts in a graduated fashion (most to least important) (e.g. Jaberg and Guisan 2001). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GIS and habitat suitability models, (e.g. Ecological Niche Factor Analysis)

5.2 Mortality and potential effects on bat populations

Further information is needed on:

- whether bat mortality occurs at all sites or whether there are differences between sites?
- what factors from bat ecology and behaviour, as well as from wind farm and individual wind turbine characteristics' are affecting bat mortality
- is it possible to use information on landscape characteristics to avoid or mitigate problems?
- the effects at the population level: if there is mortality, is this a problem for populations?

⁵ See also the EUROBATS Resolutions No. 4.6 and 5.5: Guidelines for the Issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Capture Wild Bats

Research project	Possible methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At what times of the year do bat collisions occur? Several studies in the USA show a concentration of collisions in late summer/beginning of autumn. Data from Europe seems to support this, but several recent studies have concentrated on late summer and the beginning of autumn, so that statistical data about the seasonal distribution from several different localities are not available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematically collision mortality studies throughout the whole season (methods after Arnett <i>et al.</i> 2005, Grünkorn <i>et al.</i> 2005)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The investigation of collision rates of bats per year and per different bat species with respect to different wind farm localities should be given a high priority. Systematic studies of bat mortality at large scale wind farms which are located in different risk zones i.e. on migration routes but also in forests and areas with high hedgerow densities are needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematically collision mortality studies throughout the whole season (methods after Arnett <i>et al.</i> 2005, Grünkorn <i>et al.</i> 2005)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Potential population level impacts on bat collision mortality are completely unknown.</i>⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic collision mortality studies throughout the whole season (methods after Arnett <i>et al.</i> 2005, Brinkmann <i>et al.</i> 2006, Grünkorn <i>et al.</i> 2005) Genetic studies Population studies Population models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a total absence of quantitative data on the cumulative effects of onshore and offshore wind farms on migrating bats. 	

5.3 Migration

Further information is needed on:

- where in space and when in time/season?
- are flyways / migration zones existing and recognizable?
- and if so, what is their relation to landscape on a rougher and finer landscape scale
- is it possible to use info on 'peak migration activity' and 'migration fly ways in the landscape' to avoid problems?

Research project	Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Identifying migration routes / corridors and stop stones. There are several studies on bat</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bat ringing projects along migration routes Mist netting along migration routes

⁶ Not only for bat collision mortality as a result from wind farms, but also effects on the population resulting from mortality through bat traffic collision or reduced reproduction through disturbance of roosts et cetera resulting from other types of development, are not known. → this kind of research should be set up in broader sense.

<p><i>migration in different isolated places of Europe, but a continuous map of migration routes or stepping stones are not available. Specific information on offshore migration paths across the Sea such as the North Sea and Baltic are missing. Studies and observations do show that bats are crossing the open Sea (Ahlén 1997, Ahlén et al. 2002, Ahlén and Bach unpubl., Russ et al. 2001, 2003, Walter et al. 2004, Hüppop pers. comm.).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do landscape structures (river valleys, coastal lines, valleys between mountain ridges...) guide migration?</i> • <i>We need to prove and understand any anecdotal information that stepping stones are important, such as forests with traditional mating sites for <i>N. noctula</i> and <i>P. nathusii</i></i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International genetic studies (see Petit and Mayer 2000) • Radio-tracking • Tracking radar studies • Detector studies on selected migration points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is not known under which weather conditions migration takes place onshore/on-land and off-shore. In general wind (and visibility) will change behaviour and routes. Only a few examples exist about different weather conditions that bats will migrate. Arnett et al. (2005) and Behr and Helversen (2005) describes the main activity at wind speed <6 m/sec. but many collisions appear at >6m/sec. From the morphology of <i>Nyctalus</i> and <i>Miniopterus</i> it is likely that they are also able to migrate in higher wind speeds. More data is needed on bat migration, such as site-specific information of migratory routes and the numbers of bats that use them, species-specific flight altitudes, how timing, routing and direction are influenced by weather conditions, and how often bats stop to rest or forage.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detector studies from ground, towers, wind turbines, balloons etc. • Thermal imaging camera studies • Radar • Physiological and behavioural studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study of the orientation of migrating bats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there bat activity offshore and at what distances from the shore? Which species are active offshore and is it only during migration? Does the migration also involve foraging and is it related to movements towards islands? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detector studies from lighthouses, boat transect (hand held, automatic bat registration systems) • Thermal imaging • (Tracking) radar

5.4 Collision

Further information is needed on:

- why bats collide with wind turbines
- is it impossible / too difficult for bats to observe the wind turbine and understand the hazard?
- could they be attracted to wind turbines?
- can techniques be developed to warn off bats

Research project	Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Why do bats collide with turbines? Arnett et al. (2005) describe avoidance behaviour of several bats in front of the blades, while others did not show any avoidance behaviour. How do bats perceive the rotating blades with their echolocation system? This knowledge could be used to find ways of making blades more noticeable to bats.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behavioural studies with detectors and thermal imaging cameras • Laboratory experiments • Echolocation experiments • Physiological and behavioural studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent studies from Germany (e.g. Behr and Helversen 2005) indicate that not only migrating bats collide with turbines, but foraging bats from the local populations as well. Migrating bats may also take the chance to forage during migration (e.g. Arnett et al. 2005, Ahlén and Bach unpub.). Little genetic data of migrating and local bats is available to compare with data on bat fatalities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genetic studies • Thermal imaging camera and detector • Radio tracking • Insect studies at the wind turbine

5.5 Disturbance, barrier effect

- We need to know more about behavioural responses of foraging local bats?
- Do they avoid wind turbines or habituate after a while?
- Does habituation result in bat collision?

Research Project	Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How foraging bats respond to wind turbines is not known. Adding to experience gained through collision studies we know that local serotine bats avoid foraging close to wind turbines (Bach 2002). We need to know more about the loss of hunting habitat of high flying bat species such as <i>Nyctalus</i>, <i>Vespertilio</i>, <i>Miniopterus</i> and the effect on their populations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio tracking • Detector studies • Habitat use studies • BACI (before and after construction) studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic studies are needed on the behavioural responses of different species based on life history traits, 	

<p>population dynamics, ecology and abundance in response to construction, operational and removal phases of wind farms. This will establish species-specific sensitivities to several types of large scale wind farms and identify the influence of turbine lighting on behavioural responses.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence of habitat availability on displacement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio tracking • Detector studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effect that tower height has on foraging activity displacement needs attention. • Potential population level impacts on bats of disturbance displacement, barriers to movement, collision mortality and habitat loss or damage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat use • Population studies • Radio tracking • Detector studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The barrier effect on migrating and commuting bats is relatively unknown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio tracking • Detector studies • Study of behavioural response • Population studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Term studies are required to determine long-term effects of wind farms. Such effects could for example include habituation of bats to wind farms, which could cause the impact to decrease over time. For migrating bats such phenomena is not expected but could be possible for local bats. Significant impacts on the population only become apparent in the long term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ringing • Population studies

5.6 Mitigation and/or avoidance

Further information is needed on:

- would it be possible to warn them off?
- what techniques can be developed to do this?
- is it possible to avoid or mitigate problems?

Research project	Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any possibilities to deter bats from wind turbines? It should be studied, to find out if different kind of noise /sound signals and/or light signals might be a possible way of deterring or warning bats or whether it might actually attract them. Bats may react negatively to strong radar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise emission studies (infra, normal, ultra sound) • Radar studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Develop methods and instruments which can automatically record</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematically collision mortality studies throughout the whole

<p><i>intensive hunting or high numbers of passing bats such as heat sensors and radar, which can feedback to and permit temporary shutting down of wind turbines during migration and inclement weather conditions.</i></p>	<p>season (methods after Arnett <i>et al.</i> 2005, Brinkmann <i>et al.</i> 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automatic bat registration systems at high altitudes • Thermal imaging camera
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some parts of Germany and Sweden it is known or suspected that bats roost inside gondolas. The gondolas should be closed to prevent bats from roosting inside. To reduce the risk of collision through cog wheels it is important to find ways to prevent bats from entering gondolas. It is also suspected that bats can roost also in other man-made structures, such as transformer installations. One bat was observed flying out from a transformer building (Lutsar unpub) and one <i>V. murinus</i> and one <i>P. pipistrellus/pygmaeus</i> were observed landing in the islets between 22h and 23h, in Finland (Laanetu and Masing 2004). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laboratory experiments • Field observations

6. Conclusions and further work

This paper sets out generic guidelines for the planning process and impact assessments to take account of the effect of wind turbines on bats. Additionally it summarises relevant research priorities. It is by no means complete and requires further development particularly within the European context.

The current impact of wind farms on bats should be investigated further in order to find solutions to minimise the impacts of future wind farm developments.

7. References / further reading

- Ahlén, I. (1997): Migratory behaviour of bats at south Swedish coasts. - Zeitschrift für Säugetierkunde 62:375-380.
- Ahlén, I. (2002): Fladdermöss och fåglar dödade av vindkraftverk. - Fauna och Flora 97:3:14-22.
- Ahlén, I., Bach, L. & Burkhardt, P. (2002): Bat migration in southern Sweden. – Poster at IXth European Bat Research Symposium, Le Havre, France 2002.
- Alcalde, J.T. (2003). Impacto de los parques eólicos sobre las poblaciones de murciélagos. - Barbastella 2: 3-6.
- Arnett, E.B., technical editor (2005): Relationships between Bats and Wind Turbines in Pennsylvania and West Virginia: an Assessment of Fatality Search Protocols, Pattern of Fatality, and Behavioral Interactions with Wind Turbines. A final report submitted to the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA. 187 pp.

- Bach, L., R. Brinkmann, H. Limpens, U. Rahmel, M. Reichenbach & A. Roschen (1999): Bewertung und planerische Umsetzung von Fledermausdaten im Rahmen der Windkraftplanung – Bremer Beiträge für Naturkunde und Naturschutz 4: 162-170
- Bach, L. (2002): Auswirkungen von Windenergieanlagen auf das Verhalten und die Raumnutzungen von Fledermäusen am Beispiel des Windparks „Hohe Geest“, Midlum - Endbericht. – unpubl. report for Instituts für angewandte Biologie, Freiburg/Niederelbe: 46 pp.
- Bach, L. & U. Rahmel (2004): Überblick zu Auswirkungen von Windkraftanlagen auf Fledermäuse - eine Konfliktabschätzung - Bremer Beiträge für Naturkunde und Naturschutz Band 7: 245-252.
- Behr, O. & O. von Helversen (2005): Gutachten zur Beeinträchtigung im freien Luftraum jagender und ziehender Fledermäuse durch bestehende Windkraftanlagen. Wirkungskontrolle zum Windpark "Roßkopf" (Freiburg i. Br.). - Unpubl. report: 37 pp + maps.
- Brinkmann, R., H. Schauer-Weisshahn & F. Bontadina (2006): Untersuchungen zu möglichen betriebsbedingten Auswirkungen von Windkraftanlagen auf Fledermäuse im Regierungsbezirk Freiburg. Report for Regierungspräsidium Freiburg by request of Naturschutzfonds Baden-Württemberg: 66 pp.
<http://www.rp-freiburg.de/servlet/PB/show/1158478/rpf-windkraft-fledermaeuse.pdf>
- Dürr, T. (2001): Fledermäuse als Opfer von Windkraftanlagen. – Naturschutz und Landschaftspflege in Brandenburg 10: 182.
- Dürr, T. & L. Bach (2004): Fledermäuse als Schlagopfer von Windenergieanlagen - Stand der Erfahrungen mit Einblick in die bundesweite Fundkartei. - Bremer Beiträge für Naturkunde und Naturschutz Band 7: 253-264.
- Endl, P., U. Engelhart, K. Seiche, S. Teufert & H. Trapp (2005): Untersuchungen zum Verhalten von Fledermäusen und Vögeln an ausgewählten Windkraftanlagen im Landkreis Bautzen, Kamenz, Löbau-Zittau, Niederschlesischer Oberlausitzkreis, Stadt Görlitz Freistaat Sachsen. Unpubl. report for Staatliches Umweltfachamt Bautzen: 135 pp.
- Grünkorn, T., A. Diederichs, B. Stahl, D. Dörte & G. Nehls (2005): Entwicklung einer Methode zur Abschätzung des Kollisionsrisikos von Vögeln an Windenergieanlagen. Unpubl. report for Landesamt für Natur und Umwelt Schleswig-Holstein: 92 pp.
- Hutterer, R., T. Ivanova, C. Meyer-Cords & L. Rodrigues (2005): Bat Migrations in Europe: A Review of Banding Data and Literature. Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt 28.
- Jaberg, C. & A. Guisan (2001): Modelling the distribution of bats in relation to landscape structure in a temperate mountain environment. - Journal of Applied Ecology 38, 1169-1181.
- Johnson, G.D., W.P. Erickson, M.D. Strickland, M.F. Shepherd & D.A. Shepherd (2000): Avian monitoring studies at the Buffalo Ridge, Minnesota Wind Resource Area: Results of a 4-year study. Unpublished report for the Northern States Power Company, Minnesota: 262 pp.
- Johnson, G.D., W.P. Erickson, M.D. Strickland, M.F. Shepherd & D.A. Shepherd (2003): Mortality of bats at a Large-scale wind power development at Buffalo Ridge, Minnesota. – Am. Midl. Nat.150: 332-342.
- Johnson, G.D. & M.D. Strickland (2004): An assessment of potential collision mortality of migrating indiana bats (*Myotis sodalis*) and Virginia big-eared bats (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus*) traversing between caves. Technical report prepared for NedPower Mount Storm by WEST, Inc.

- Laanetu, N. & M. Masing (2004) Bats near Hanko. Eptesicus 2. Electronic newsletter on boreal bats. <http://www.hot.ee/eptesicus/eptesicus2.htm>
- Petersons, G. (1990): Die Flughautfledermaus, *Pipistrellus nathusii* (Keyserling u. Blasius, 1839), in Lettland: Vorkommen, Phänologie und Migration. - *Nyctalus* 3: 81-98.
- Petit, E. & F. Mayer (2000): A population genetic analysis of migration: the case of the noctule bat (*Nyctalus noctula*). – *Molecular Ecology* 9: 683-690.
- Phillips, J.F. (1994): The effect of a wind farm on the upland breeding bird communities of Bryn Tili, Mid-Wales: 1993-1994. – RSPB, The Welsh Office, Bryn Aderyn, The Bank, Newtown, Powys.
- Rahmel, U., L. Bach, R. Brinkmann, C. Dense, H. Limpens, G. Mäscher, M. Reichenbach & A. Roschen (1999): Windkraftplanung und Fledermäuse. Konfliktfelder und Hinweise zur Erfassungsmethodik. – *Bremer Beiträge für Naturkunde und Naturschutz*, Band 4: 155-161.
- Rahmel, U., Bach, L., Brinkmann, R., Limpens, H. & A. Roschen (2004): Windenergieanlagen und Fledermäuse – Hinweise zur Erfassungsmethodik und zu planetarischen Aspekten - *Bremer Beiträge für Naturkunde und Naturschutz* Band 7: 265-271.
- Reichenbach, M. (2002): Auswirkungen von Windenergieanlagen auf Vögel – Ausmaß und planerische Bewältigung. – Diss. an der TU Berlin: 207 pp.
- Russ, J.M., A.M. Hutson, W.I. Montgomery, P.A. Racey & J.R. Speakman (2001): The status of Nathusius' pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus nathusii* Keyserling and Blasius 1839) in the British Isles. - *J. Zool. Lond* 254:91-100.
- Russ, J.M., M. Briffa & W.I. Montgomery (2003): Seasonal patterns in activity and habitat use by bats (*Pipistrellus* spp. and *Nyctalus leisleri*) in Northern Ireland, determined using a driven transect. – *J. Zool. Lond.* 259: 289-299.
- Sattler, T. & F. Bontadina (2006) : L'évaluation écologique de deux secteurs d'installations éoliens en France sur la base de la diversité et l'activité des chauves-souris. Unpubl. report : 41 pp.
- Trapp, H., D. Fabian, F. Förster & O. Zinke (2002): Fledermausverluste in einem Windpark der Oberlausitz. – *Naturschutzarbeit in Sachsen* 44: 53-56.
- Traxler, A., S. Wegleitner & H. Jaklitsch (2004): Vogelschlag, Meideverhalten & Habitatnutzung an bestehenden Windkraftanlagen Prellenkirchen – Obersdorf – Steinberg/Prinzendorf.- unpubl. report for WWS Ökoenergie, EVN Naturkraft, WEB Windenergie, IG Windkraft und Amt der Niederrösterreichischen Landesregierung: 107 pp.
- Walter, G. H. Matthes & M. Joost (2004): Fledermausnachweise bei Offshore-Untersuchungen im Bereich von Nord- und Ostsee. – *Natur- und Umweltschutz (Zeitschrift Mellumrat)* 3(2): 8-12.
- Winkelmann, J.E. (1989): Vogels e het windpark nabij Urk (NOP): aanvarings slachtoffers en versterking van pleisterende eenden, ganzen en zwanen. – RIN-rapport 89/15: 169 pp.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ingmar Ahlén, Robert Brinkmann, Colin Catto, Herman Limpens, Barry Nicholls, Ivo Niermann, Paul Racey, Christine Rumble, Linda Smith and Dean Waters for their valuable comments and contributions to this document.

Table 1 - Studies done in Europe

Study (author, year, area)	time	type of turbines	methods	results	Habitat-types
Ahlén, 2002 and Ahlén, 2003, Sweden	August/September 2002	different	160 turbines (Gotland 66, Öland 39, Blekinge 4, Skane 51) - 1 control / turbine - search area 50m around turbine	- 17 bats (Enil 8, Vmur 1, Nnoc 1, Pnat 5, Ppip 1, Ppyg 1) - 0,1 bats/control - Gotnad 12, Öand 2, Blekinge 2, Skane - distance 3-25m (mean 12m) around turbine half species are resident bats often feed close to blades species found dead are the ones observed hunting close to blades	different, from open with shrubs underneath to farmland (with hedgerows)
Alcalde, 2003, Navarra - Spain and pers.com	1995-2003	height: 40m (older model) and 60-80m blade: 20m (older model) and 34m	around 1000 turbines search area with radius equal to turbine height	50 bats (mainly Hsav (25), Nnoc, Nlas (2), but also Ppip, Pkuh, Ppyg, Eser, Msch) mainly August and September presence of turbines does not change habitat use number of flying bats increase with temperature and decrease with wind intensity bats use mainly areas close to trees	close to hedgerows
Bach, 2002, Lower Saxony, Germany	April 1998- September 2002	1 windfarm, 70 turbines, height 45m, blade diameter 30m	- landscape use of Eser and Ppip - systematicall detector census in the whole parc and the surroundings - 7 time / year - start one year before the turbines were built untill three years afterwards.	- no visible effect of the landscape use of Ppip - no visible negative effect of the use of flight paths of Eser and Ppip - Ppip changed the hunting behaviour close to the turbines and get used to the moving blades - the number of Eser that preferred to forage at hedges without turbines increased during the years - the number of Eser that hunted further away than 100m to turbines increased during the years after all: - Eser seemed to leave the parc after the turbines were built	farmland with many hedgerows 10-100m from turbines
Benzal & Moreno, 2001, Navarra - Spain			4 wind farms with turbines along 12,6km	dead: Ppip, Pkuh, Hsav, Eser, Nnoc Ppip, Pkuh, Hsav, Eser, Nnoc, Tten fly around turbines, although only a few hunt there bats use mainly areas close to trees	
Behr & V. Herversen 2006, Rosskopf, Germany	end of april-mid of october	1 windfarm, 4 turbines, height 98m, blade diameter 70m	2005: April-June every 3 days, july to october every 4 days; estimation of search efficiency	2005: 31 bats (23 Ppip, 4 Nlei, 4 Pindet) =0,18 bat/turbine/night; april to mid of july: 11 bats; mid of july to mid of october 20 bats after curtailment of functioning period, the number of dead bats decreased significantly.	forest in areas with tree blowdowns
Brinkmann 2006, Freiburg, Germany	2004: august-october 2005: april-mid of may and mid of july- mid of october	different; 2004: 16 turbines 69-98m height; 44-80m blade diameter 2005: 8 turbines out of the 16 investigated in 2004	2004: 9-18 controls/ turbine 2005: 12 spring controls/ 18 autumn controls; search area 50m diameter around turbines; estimation of search efficiency; study with heat imaging camera	2004: 35 bats (+ 5 bats at an additional investigated site, Ppip 31 Nlei 7, Vmur 1, Eser 1); 2005: 10 bats (Vmur 1, Ppip 8, Nlei 1) no dead bats in spring	mostly forest, some at forest edges and meadows
Cosson M., 2004 and 2005, France	IBA, Ramsar site, ZPS. Bird study. Mortality checked from July 23 to December 16, 2003 and from January to December 2004	8 turbines N80 height 100m	control done for every turbine on a 1ha area from July to Dec. According to J.E. Winkelman's method 16 control of 8 turbines	40 bats (2003-2004) (Pnat 30, Nnoc 3, P spec. 5, Ppip 2). M=4,74/week (2003) M=3,1-3,6/week (2004) . For 2003-2004, M=20,3 to 23,5 bats/turbine/year	open cultivated polder on one side and oyster beds on the other

Study (author, year, area)	time	type of turbines	methods	results	Habitat-types
Dürr, com. pers., Brandenburg - Germany	2001-2003	Different types	- 2001: 38 turbines (66 controls) 2002: 79 turbines (394 controls) - 2003: 147 turbines (550 controls) - ± unsystematically research between February and December, but mainly in August/September - search area 50m around turbine (mainly!)	36 bats (0,04 bat/control) - mainly Pnat, Ppip, Nnoc - at all types of turbines, mainly 1. & 2. august decade	- different - often close to hedgerows
Endl et al., 2005, Sachsen, Germany	March 2004 - November 2004	16 windfarms, 92 turbines, height 65- 80m, blade diameter 47-80m	- detector census: 5-8 x /year (April- October) - collision control: 5-8 x /year (April- October) (mean 24-day-rhythm) - search area ~ blade diameter around turbine - chicken experiment - search efficiency control by bringing out dead paper bats!	- mean mortality: 1,5 bats / turbine / year (range: 1,1-4,6) - in 2 other wind farms: 1,34 and 4,56 bats / turbine / year - Ppip: higher collision rate close to forest - Nnoc + Pnat: collision also high far from forest	open farmland but mostly very close to forest or hedges (0-150m)
Göbel & Götsche 2005, Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	July/ first half of september	2 windfarms, 4 resp.2 turbines: 65m resp. 60m height; blade diameter 80m	16 resp. 14 controls	4 turbines: 6 bats (Ppip 1, Pnat 2, Mdau 1, Nnoc 1, Mdas 1) 2 turbines: 3 bats (Ppip 1, Nnoc 1, Pnat 1)	different: open (4 turbiens to near hedges (2 turbines)
Grünkorn et al., 2005, Schleswig-Holstein, Germany	September 2004 - mid of November 2004	3 Windfarms, 24 turbines total height 100m; 2 turbines total height 120m	- methodological study - 16 controls (every 5th day) - search area: turbine height - experiments with birds of different size - bird-fall experiments - search efficiency control by bringing out dead birds of different size	- we need to search an area of the total turbine height - area should be searched for small birds/bats in a up and down transects 10m wide for small birds (bat size) (search area 10m each site) - few vegetation cover (<10%): found rate 44 % - high vegetation cover (>30 %): found rate 8 % for small birds (bat size) (search area 5m each site) - high vegetation cover (>30 %): found rate 10 % no dead bat was found	farmland, open arae with few trees, bushes
Haase & Rose, 2004	March-April & August- October 2004	height: 60m, 70m, 89m; blade diameter: 48m; 58,5m; 58,5m	- 3 controls/turbine/month - bat activity per detector in the area around the turbines (ca. 500-1000m around the turbines)	- 2 bats (Nleis 1, Plaurit 1) - 0,06 bats/control - no observed activity of Nleis, Nnoc, and Ppip close to the turbines.	farmland, 50-200m close to hedgerows and forest
Kusenbach, 2004, Thüringen - Germany	25. August - 23. September 2004	Different types (size mostly unknown!)	94 turbines (18 wind farms) - 110 controls (1-3/turbine) - chicken experiment	7 bats (Pnat 3 male/ad., Vmur 2 male/ad., Nnoc 1 female/juv., Chirop. spec. 1) - 0,06 bats/control - 6 of 7 bats found in suspected bat migration corridor. - distance to windturbine: 3-15m - 1 bat with oily substance on the body <u>chicken experiment</u> - 30 % found bach after 1 day - 15% found bach afer 2 days	- 20-100m from hedgerows - sometimes close to forest (3 x 200m) - known bat migration corridors
Latorre & Zueco, 1998, Aragon - Spain				6 bats estimation of number of dead bats: 274,05 bats/year estimation of number of dead bats: 10,15 bats/turbine/year 1998: 6 bats (P spec 5; Tten 1)	

Study (author, year, area)	time	type of turbines	methods	results	Habitat-types
Lekuona, 2001, Navarra - Spain	March 2000-March 2001	height: 40 m blade diameter: 40 m	1 year search area 50m around each turbine; many times only a small radius, due to vegetation	estimation of number of dead bats: 274,05 bats/year estimation of number of dead bats: 10,15 bats/turbine/year no deaths detected under electric lines 1999: total 7 dead bats (P spec 5, Hsav 1, Tten 1) estimation of death rate in 2 farms: 3,09 and 13,36 bats/turbine	different
Lekuona, 2001 and Petri & Munilla, 2002, Navarra - Spain	March 2000-March 2001	height: 40 m blade diameter: 40 m 10 wind farms; 400 turbines	400 turbines - bird study! 4 parcs: 1 control/week March 2000-March 2001 1 parc: 1 control/week between June 2000-March 2001 search area 50m around turbine; many times only a small radius, due to vegetation	3 bats (Chirop. spec. 1, Ppip 1, Hsav 1) (2 in August, 1 in March) disappearance rate: July - 57% 24h and 70% 48h; November - 67% 24h and 80% 48h average distance (cadavers): 25m detection rate: July 13,2% and 11,6% November estimation of death rate in 2 farms: 3,09 and 13,36 bats/turbine estimation of number of deaths: 749 bats (using Winkelman's index)	different
Schröder, 1997, Lower Saxony, Germany	February & March 1997	47 turbines in different wind farms with different types of turbines	- studying possible ultra sound of turbines with a bat detector (Pettersson D980) - checked frequency window: 14-100 kHz - measurements distances: 20m, 50m, 100m from turbines	- 12 x no ultrasound emission - 5 x few ultra sound emission - 13 x clearly ultra sound emission between 14 - 30 kHz - 13 types of turbines with ultra clearly sound emission but: the same turbine type with and without ultra sound emission	
Trapp et al, 2002, Oberlausitz - Germany				34 bats (Vmur 6, Ppip 3, Pnat 10, Nnoc 12, Nleis 1, Chirop. Spec. 2)	
Traxler et al., 2004, Lower-Austria	September 2003-September 2004	3 Windfarms, 4 turbines height 98m, blade diameter 70m; 2 turbines height 100m, blade diameter 80m	5 turbines, - 1 control / day / turbine - search area 100m around turbine - search efficiency control by bringing out dead birds!	14 bats (11 Nnoc, 2 Pnat, 1 Plaus) - collision rate (according Winkelmann) mean 5,33 bats/turbine/yea (Oberdorf: 0; Prellenkirchen 8,0; Steinberg 5,33 bats/turbine/year) - mean collision at wind speed 5-6 m/sec. - highest collision-rate in August - bats hunting around moving blades in early afternoon	farmland, 50-200m close to hedgerows and forest,

Table 2 - Bats behaviour in relation to windfarms

Species	Hunting close to habitat structures	Migration or long distance movements (>200km)	High flight	Low flight	Max. distance (m) of ultrasonic detection (D980) (data from Barataud)	Max. distance (m) of ultrasonic detection (D240) (* means during hunting) (data from Lothar Bach)	Possibly disturbed by turbine ultrasounds	Attracted by light	Roosting inside nacelle	known loss of hunting habitat	risk of loss of hunting habitat	Known collision	Risk of collision
<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>	X			X	10								
<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>	X			X	5								
<i>Rhinolophus euryale</i>	X			X	5								
<i>Rhinolophus mehelyi</i>													
<i>Rhinolophus blasii</i>													
<i>Myotis myotis</i>		X	X	X	30	20						X	X
<i>Myotis blythii</i>			X	X	?								X
<i>Myotis punicus</i>					?								
<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>	X	X	(in tree tops)	X	30							X	X
<i>Myotis emarginatus</i>	X	?	X	X	15								
<i>Myotis nattereri</i>	X			X	20	15							
<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	X			X	15	20							X
<i>Myotis brandtii</i>	X	X		X		20						X	X
<i>Myotis alcaethoe</i>	X			X	20								
<i>Myotis bechsteinii</i>	X			X	25	15*							
<i>Myotis dasycneme</i>		X		X		30						X	X
<i>Myotis capaccini</i>				X									
<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>		X	X		100	150	X	X	X		X	X	X
<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>		X	X		60-80		X	X	X		X	X	X
<i>Nyctalus lasiopterus</i>		?	X		100		?				X	X	X
<i>Eptesicus nilssonii</i>		X	X			50		X	X			X	X
<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>			X		50		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Vespertilio murinus</i>		X	X			50		X			X	X	X
<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	X	?	X	X	30		?	X	X			X	X
<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	X	?	X	X	?	30	?	X	X			X	X
<i>Pipistrellus kuhlii</i>	X		X	X	30		?	X	X			X	X
<i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>	X	X	X	X	30-40		?	X	X			X	X
<i>Hypsugo savii</i>	X		X	X	40-50		?	X	X			X	X
<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	X			X	30	10*						X	X
<i>Plecotus austriacus</i>	X			X	30	10*						X	X
<i>Plecotus macrobullaris</i>	?			X	30								
<i>Plecotus kolombatovici</i>													
<i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	X			X	30	20							
<i>Miniopterus schreibersii</i>	?	X	X	X	30			X				X	X
<i>Tadarida teniotis</i>			X		150-200		X	X				X	X

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution No. 5.7

Guidelines for the Protection of Overground Roosts, with particular reference to roosts in buildings of cultural heritage importance



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter “the Agreement”),

Recalling Resolution No. 4.9, Element 3 (a) on the protection of roost sites other than underground sites;

Recognising the importance of buildings as roost site for many species of bats, both for hibernation and breeding in different parts of their ranges;

Further recognising that buildings, which contain bat roosts, may also in themselves be of built heritage importance and further recognizing that protection and restoration works may be required for such structures;

Urges the Advisory Committee to complete and publish the guidance document (now in draft form);

Urges Parties and Non-Party Range States to:

1. Establish national databases of important overground roosts;
2. Ensure that the important overground roosts they have identified are fully protected by law and where appropriate, are physically protected against unauthorised entry;
3. Establish a working relationship between the relevant cultural and natural heritage agencies, including, where appropriate, linkage between databases of bat roosts and databases of cultural heritage buildings;
4. Include in future national reports a summary of these interactions;
5. Prepare guidelines for custodians of historical buildings, on the protection of bat roosts;

6. Develop schemes, which encourage the maintenance of bat roosts in buildings of cultural heritage, including, if appropriate, grants to ensure the maintenance of bat roosts during renovation/restoration;
7. Encourage architects and engineers to incorporate a natural heritage element into their training programmes;
8. Ensure that overground roosts are managed in accordance with national nature conservation legislation and taking note of any guidelines adopted by the EUROBATS Agreement.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.8

Establishment of a Standing Committee of the Agreement



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter "the Agreement"),

Noting that through the significant growth of the Agreement the Advisory Committee to the Agreement has become too large to handle both administrative and scientific matters in a cost and work effective manner,

Considering the usefulness of a small permanent advisory body for budgetary and other administrative matters relating to the continuous implementation of the Agreement,

Emphasising the need for transparency in the operation of such a body,

1. Decides to establish a Standing Committee of the Meeting of the Parties, which, on behalf of the Meeting of the Parties, and within the policy agreed by the Meeting of the Parties, shall:
 - (a) Carry out, between one meeting of the Meeting of the Parties and the next, such interim activities as may be necessary to execute the decisions of the Meeting;
 - (b) Monitor the execution of the Secretariat's budget;
 - (c) Oversee the implementation of policy by the Secretariat;
 - (d) Provide guidance and advice to the Secretariat on the implementation of the Agreement, on the preparation of meetings, and on any other matters brought to it by the Secretariat;
 - (e) Represent, where appropriate, the interests of the Meeting of the Parties, vis à vis the Government of the host country of the Secretariat's headquarters, UNEP and other international organisations for consideration of matters relating to the Agreement and its Secretariat;

- (f) Perform any other function as may be entrusted to it by the Meeting of the Parties; and
 - (g) Submit through its Chair at each ordinary meeting of the Meeting of the Parties a report on its work since the previous ordinary meeting, including any recommendations concerning its role and effective operation;
 - (h) Make recommendations, as appropriate, for consideration at the next meeting of the Meeting of the Parties.
2. Determines the following principles for the functioning of the Standing Committee;
- (a) The Committee shall consist of no more than seven Parties, and shall include a representative from the Depository Government, the Host Government of the Secretariat and five elected members, who shall be nominated by each Meeting of the Parties, with due regard to geographical distribution;
 - (b) Parties who are not members of the Standing Committee may attend meetings, and may otherwise participate in discussions by whatever means conducted, but may not vote;
 - (c) The Committee may invite any body or organisation it considers relevant to the discharge of its functions to attend meetings, in their entirety or for particular items, as observers;
 - (d) The Committee shall establish its own rules of procedure, which shall be approved by at least a two-thirds majority of the Parties;
 - (e) The Secretary for the Committee shall be provided by the Secretariat of the Agreement.
3. Directs the Secretariat to:
- (a) Inform all Parties of the date and venue of Standing Committee meetings and of other deliberations, and to ensure the circulation of all the working documents to all Parties at the same time as they are circulated to the Standing Committee for their consideration;
 - (b) Endeavour, to the extent possible, to obtain external funding for the reasonable and justifiable travel expenses of elected members from Parties

with economies in transition, and for not more than one representative of such a Party at any one meeting of the Standing Committee;

(c) Refund to the Chairman of the Standing Committee, upon request, all reasonable and justifiable travel expenses for travel undertaken on behalf of the Meeting of the Parties or on behalf of the Secretariat.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.9

Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee



Recalling the Resolution on the establishment of an Advisory Committee adopted at the first Session of the Meeting of Parties (Bristol, July 1995);

Recalling further Resolution 4.13 on the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee;

Considering the continuing usefulness of an Advisory Committee to the arrangement of meetings and the continuing implementation of the Agreement;

Recognising the value of the attendance of representatives of non-Party Range-States at Advisory Committee meetings;

Commending the Advisory Committee for its activities to further develop the objectives of the Agreement during its past triennial period;

1. *Repeals* Resolution 4.13;
2. *Adopts* the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee attached as Annex 1; and
3. *Resolves* to review the Terms of Reference, in the light of their effectiveness, at its sixth Session.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Annex 1 to Resolution 5.9

Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee



1. The Committee shall provide expert advice and information to the Secretariat and the Parties on the conservation and management of bats and on other matters in relation to the running of the Agreement, having regard to the need not to duplicate the work of other international bodies and the desirability of drawing on their expertise.
2. Each Party shall be entitled to appoint one member of the Advisory Committee.
3. The Advisory Committee shall elect a Chairperson, and establish and review its own Rules of Procedure, as it deems appropriate.
4. Each Committee member may be accompanied by advisers, and the Committee may invite other experts to attend its meetings.
5. The Committee may instruct the Secretariat to invite representatives of Non-Party Range-States to the meeting.
6. The Committee may establish working groups, to work either between meetings of the Committee or during Committee meetings themselves.
7. The Committee will perform the tasks allocated to it in Resolutions at any Session of the Meeting of Parties in an effort to pursue the obligations at Article III. The Committee should continue to seek to ensure the dissemination of information and co-operation between Parties is maximised to achieve these objectives.
8. The Committee may, with the assistance of the Secretariat, develop proposals and draft resolutions on the implementation of the Agreement (excluding amendments to the text of the Agreement). The Committee may then present these proposals and draft resolutions to the subsequent Session of the Meeting of Parties through the Secretariat.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution No. 5.10

Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan
(2007- 2010)



The Meeting of Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter "the Agreement");

Referring to the commitments by the Parties to the conservation of bats in accordance with the Agreement, especially the fundamental obligations placed upon Parties in Article III;

Recognising the value to the conservation of bats of the Action Plan for 2003 – 06, established by Resolution No. 9 on the Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan, and agreed at the 4th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Noting the efforts of Parties, as outlined in their National Implementation Reports, and of the Advisory Committee as well as the Secretariat to the Agreement to carry out the above plans and the progress achieved;

Recognising the continuous need to prioritise actions;

Acknowledging the work being carried out in the framework of the EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EC), in particular the establishment of the Natura 2000 Network and in the framework of the Bern Convention, in particular the establishment of the Emerald Network;

Emphasising the importance of Resolution 4.4 on Bat Conservation and Sustainable Forest Management as well as the further development of appropriate guidelines;

Decides to establish the Action Plan for 2006 – 2010 as appended at Annex 1 and notes that this Action Plan supercedes the Action Plan made under Resolution 9 at the 4th Session of the Meeting of Parties;

Requests Parties to report to each Meeting of the Advisory Committee on the measures taken to implement the Action Plan.

Annex1

PRIORITIES FOR BAT CONSERVATION FOR THE PERIOD 2007 - 2010

Parties to the Agreement should consider taking forward the following actions to enhance the conservation status of bats. The Advisory Committee shall review the success that each Party or Range State has in achieving each goal, and will seek to disseminate examples of good practice between Parties and Range States.

1. Legal Requirements

(a) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Resolution No. 8, Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan, Annex A, 1

- Parties should continue to take measures to fully implement Article III (1) of the Agreement.

(b) The Advisory Committee should establish an Intersessional Working Group to review the implementation of the Agreement and relevant Resolutions and assess setting up a system to review requests for advice concerning the implementation addressed to the Secretariat from MoP5 onwards.

2. Population Survey and Monitoring

(a) With reference to Doc.EUROBATS.MoP2.5, Resolution No. 2, Consistent Monitoring Methodologies, and Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 3 - 6.

- Parties should continue to collate data on the implementation of Resolution 2, review the methods used and the species covered. Species listed under Resolution 2 include *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, *Myotis myotis*, *Myotis blythii*, *Myotis bechsteinii*, *Myotis capaccinii*, *Eptesicus serotinus*, *Eptesicus nilssonii*, *Nyctalus noctula* and *Miniopterus schreibersii*.

- In recognition of the importance of monitoring in implementing the European Action Plans for *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum* and *Myotis dasycneme*, these two species should be added to the above list.

(b) With reference to Doc.EUROBATS.MoP2.5, Resolution No. 2, Consistent Monitoring Methodologies and Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 3 - 6.

- Parties should share information on experience gained in using the methods outlined in Resolution 2, with the intention of building a comprehensive dataset to be reviewed in detail in due course.

- The importance of long-term monitoring at a pan-European level to build up good datasets on species distribution and population trends should be recognised and emphasised.
- The importance of international information exchange and co-operation in developing monitoring strategies should be promoted by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee should produce guidelines on monitoring methodologies by AC12, drawing on the experience of Parties with national or regional monitoring schemes.

(c) With reference to Doc.EUROBATS.MoP2.6AnnexAfin and AnnexIfin, Resolution No. 3, Transboundary Programme: Species Proposals, and Doc.EUROBATS.MoP2.8AnnexAfin, Resolution No. 5, Geographical Scope of the Agreement.

- The work on collating information on European species migration routes has been completed by the Advisory Committee with the publication of the Atlas on *Bat Migrations in Europe*. The Advisory Committee should consider the recommendations for further work made in the Atlas and adopt them if appropriate.

(d) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 8 and EUROBATS.AC.10.Record.Annex2, 21.

- The current work being carried out on autecological studies of the Priority List of species (*Rhinolophus euryale*, *Myotis capaccinii* and *Miniopterus schreibersii*, according to EUROBATS.AC4.Report.Annex C) should be updated by the Advisory Committee in accordance with Resolution 4.12, and should be made public.
- Parties should support autecological studies on the Priority List of species:
 - ◆ Investigating roost choice according to the microclimate of roosts (temperature, humidity) through the seasons (being aware that electronic devices often produce ultrasounds);
 - ◆ Identifying foraging areas (using radiotelemetry or other suitable techniques) and diet (faecal analyses);
 - ◆ Studying population structure, including metapopulation structuring (using genetic analyses, morphometrics or echolocation calls) and dispersal (flight paths when commuting from the roost to the foraging areas and when moving between seasonal roosts).

(e) With reference to Doc.EUROBATS.MoP4.10.Rev.2, Resolution No. 4.4, Bat Conservation and Sustainable Forest Management.

- The Advisory Committee shall complete the development of guidelines for sustainable forestry practices in accordance with bat conservation.
 - Parties should promote the identification and classification of bat species and communities, which are typical of certain Forest Types for Biodiversity Assessments (FTBAs).
 - The Advisory Committee shall develop a proposal for the use of bats as indicators for sustainable land use practices, including woodland ecosystems, and the conservation status of biodiversity in Europe.
- (c) Parties should assess the status of their national bat fauna with reference to the 2010 target to significantly reduce or even stop the loss of biodiversity by the year 2010. Assessment results shall be included into the National Report to the 6th Session of the Meeting of the Parties.

3. Roosts

(a) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 12 and 13.

- Information on methods used to protect roost sites other than underground sites should be gathered by the Advisory Committee, with roost sites in buildings that are part of the cultural heritage as a priority. Good practice guidance developed by the group should be completed and adopted by Parties.

(b) With reference to Doc.EUROBATS.MoP2.7.AnnexI fin, Resolution No. 4, Transboundary Programme: Habitat Proposals, Element 2: Bats Habitats.

- The list of important underground sites for bats should be reviewed and updated by 2010.

4. Foraging Habitats

(a) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 16.

- Parties should carry out surveys to identify critical feeding areas close to maternity colonies of national and international significance. Information on the methods used should continue to be gathered by the Advisory Committee and should be disseminated to Parties by 2010.

(b) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, various.

- Parties shall take the conservation of bat habitats into consideration in all cases of land management and development especially when foraging areas or linear features associated with roosts are affected. The Advisory Committee should

continue to prepare general guidance for the use of Parties for this purpose by 2010. National guidelines for this purpose shall be drafted.

5. Promoting Public Awareness of Bats and their Conservation and Providing Advice

(a) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 19.

- Parties should continue efforts to raise public awareness and improve education.

(b) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 20.

- Parties should continue to produce guidance and assess new ways of working, such as producing public attitude surveys and identifying important groups that need to be influenced by bat conservation.
- Parties are invited to send a copy of any leaflet they produce to the Secretariat.

6. Pesticides

(a) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 22, Article III, paragraph 8 of the Agreement and Resolution 4.5.

- Parties should remain aware of the potential dangers of timber treatment chemicals to bats, especially if new products are introduced.

(b) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 23.

- The impact of anti-parasitic drugs for livestock on bat populations should continue to be reviewed by the Advisory Committee with the intention of producing a report by MoP6.

7. International co-operation

(a) With reference to Inf.EUROBATS.MoP2.14fin, Annex A, 24, Resolution 4.12 and Resolution 4.7.

- Parties should co-operate in undertaking the actions outlined above. Parties and Range States should work co-operatively towards increasing bat expertise and knowledge in their countries and internationally.

(b) With reference to Doc.EUROBATS.MoP4.10.

The Secretariat, assisted by the Advisory Committee shall approach the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) with the aims of introducing bat conservation aspects to the activities and measures under the MCPFE, especially the development of indicators for sustainable forestry, and the appointment of EUROBATS as an observer to the MCPFE. This work should be completed by MoP6.

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.11

Geographical Scope of the Agreement



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter “the Agreement”),

Recalling the Geographical scope of the Agreement defined in Resolution 2.5;

Noting that the Agreement recognises that bats may migrate to and from beyond the designated geographical scope of the Agreement;

Recalling that the 5th Meeting of the Advisory Committee instructed Secretariat in co-operation with experts of the Advisory Committee, to further analyse which countries would be covered by the species listed under the Agreement;

Recognising that migration distances of 300-500 km are recorded for many European bat species and that a small number of species regularly travel much longer distances¹;

Considering the 45 bat species currently recognised as occurring in Europe to which the Agreement applies and the occurrence of those species in range states with a significant part of their territory within 500km of the boundary of the Agreement area;

Noting that six of these extralimital territories include at least 20 bat species occurring in the Agreement area;

Recognising current efforts within the Convention on Migratory Species to develop bats Agreements in other parts of the world, notably Africa;

Agrees

1. That the existing geographical scope of the Agreement is confirmed. This is defined as “the Western Palaeartic region, excluding North Africa and Iceland, with the

Eastern boundary drawn at Turkey and the Caucasus countries, and the Southern boundary being the south coast of the continent of Europe, with the addition of the Mediterranean states (Cyprus and Malta), the islands belonging to mainland European states, with the exception of the Canary islands, Madeira and the Azores”;

2. That the Secretariat should make contact with range states with territories within 500 km of the boundary to the Agreement area with a view to developing collaboration with and participation of such states towards the conservation of bats that might share territories;
3. That the data in the attached appendices (Annex 1 and Annex 2) outlining the distribution and status of the European species be kept up-to-date;
4. That the secretariat prepares clarification of the proposed status of such collaborating range states (e.g. the IWG established to investigate this matter recommends that such range states be welcomed as observers, that they should place no financial burden on the Agreement unless in an exceptional circumstance, that individual range states may be subject to a more formal relationship (e.g. MoU) if identified as important to the success of the Agreement);
5. That the situation should be reviewed if further bat Agreements be developed and where there is the opportunity to arrange that the geographical scope of such Agreement(s) can meet that of EUROBATS, or to ensure that there is no overlap of geographical scope.

¹Hutterer, R., Ivanova, T., Meyer-Cords, C. & Rodrigues, L. 2005. *Bat Migrations in Europe; A review of banding data and literature*. Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt 28. 176pp. BfN, Bonn.

Annex 1: Occurrence and Red List Categories of Bats in EUROBATS Range States

Summary by the EUROBATS Intersessional Working Group on Bat Conservation and Forestry Practices 2001-2003, with updates from AC10, AC11 and subsequently								
Red List categories are in accordance with national Red Lists								
x = species recorded, but not included in a national Red List								
Countries	Species:							
	<i>R. aeg</i>	<i>T. nud</i>	<i>R. bla</i>	<i>R. eur</i>	<i>R. fer</i>	<i>R. hip</i>	<i>R. meh</i>	<i>B. bar</i>
Albania			?	in decline	EN	at risk		
Andorra					?	x		x
Armenia				Red Book	x	x	Red Book	x
Austria					CR	VU		VU
Azerbaijan			x	x	x	x	x	x
Belarus						?		III
Belgium					RE	RE		x
Bosnia-Herzegovina			x	x	x			
Bulgaria			VU	VU	VU	LC	VU	DD
Croatia			VU	VU	NT	NT	RE	DD
Cyprus	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Czech Republic					CR	VU		VU
Denmark								R
Estonia								
Finland								
France				VU	VU	VU	EN	VU
Georgia				VU	LR/cd	VU	VU	VU
Germany					CR	CR		CR
Gibraltar						?		
Greece			x	x	x	x	x	x
Holy See								
Hungary				x	x	x		x
Italy			RE	x	x	x	x	x
Ireland						E		x
Latvia								x
Liechtenstein					x	EX		x
Lithuania								Red List
Luxembourg					CR	CR		EX
Macedonia FYR			?	in decline	EN	at risk	?	Red List
Malta					RE	x		
Moldova						x	x	CR
Monaco								
The Netherlands					RE	RE		Susceptible
Norway								DM
Poland					LR	LR		x
Portugal				CR	VU	VU	CR	DD
Romania			NT	VU	NT	VU	DD	VU
Russian Federation				x	III	III	II	TBA
San Marino				x	x	x		
Serbia & Montenegro			NT	NT	LC	NT	EN	VU
Slovak Republic				VU	EN	LR:cd		LR:cd
Slovenia			EX	EN	EN	EN		VU
Spain				x	x	x	x	x
Sweden								EN
Switzerland					x	x		x
Turkey		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ukraine				x	Red Book	Red Book		Red Book
United Kingdom					E	E		R

Countries	Species:							
	<i>B.leu</i>	<i>E. bot</i>	<i>E. nil</i>	<i>E. ser</i>	<i>H. sav</i>	<i>M. alc</i>	<i>M. aur</i>	<i>M. bec</i>
Albania				V	in decline			R
Andorra				x	x			
Armenia	Red book			x	x			
Austria			LC	VU	EN			VU
Azerbaijan	x	LR	LR	LR	x		x	x
Belarus			III	x				
Belgium			x	LRlc				CR
Bosnia-Herzegovina				x	x			
Bulgaria			DD	LC	LC		x	DD
Croatia			x	x	LC		x	VU
Cyprus				x	x			
Czech Republic			LR	x				LR EN
Denmark								EN
Estonia			x					
Finland			x					
France			R	VU	VU	x		VU
Georgia			x	x	x			x
Germany			EN	LRnt		x		VU
Gibraltar								
Greece		x		x	x	x	x	x
Holy See								
Hungary			x	x	x	x		x
Italy			x	x	x		x	x
Ireland								
Latvia			x	x				
Liechtenstein			x	x				x
Lithuania			Red List	Red List				
Luxembourg			DD	VU				EN
Macedonia FYR				V	x		x	
Malta				x	x			
Moldova				LR/lc	Rare		x	CR
Monaco					x			
The Netherlands				LR				Susceptible
Norway			x					
Poland			R	x				VU
Portugal				LC	DD			EN
Romania			DD	LC	x			VU
Russian Federation	x		x	x	x		x	TBA
San Marino				x	x			x
Serbia & Montenegro				LC	DD		DD	NT
Slovak Republic			LR:lc	DD	x	x		LR:lc
Slovenia			VU	x	x			EN
Spain				x	x			x
Sweden			x	x				CR
Switzerland			x	x	x	x		x
Turkey		x		x	x		x	x
Ukraine			x	x	Red Book			Red Book
United Kingdom				V				R

Countries	Species:						
	<i>M. bly</i>	<i>M .bra</i>	<i>M. cap</i>	<i>M. das</i>	<i>M. dau</i>	<i>M. ema</i>	<i>M. haj</i>
Albania	R		?		NT	x	
Andorra	x				?		
Armenia	x					x	x
Austria	CR	VU	NE		LC	VU	
Azerbaijan		x				VU	
Belarus				III	x		
Belgium		EN		EN	LRlc	CR	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	x		x			x	
Bulgaria	VU	DD	VU		DD	VU	
Croatia	LR	x	EN	DD	x	NT	
Cyprus	x		x			x	
Czech Republic	DD	LR		DD	x	LR	
Denmark		VU		VU	VU		
Estonia		RedList		Red List	x		
Finland		x		x	x		
France	VU	R	VU	EN	NT	VU	
Georgia	x	x			x	VU	
Germany		EN		CR/EN/VU	LRlc	CR	
Gibraltar							
Greece	x		x		x	x	
Holy See							
Hungary	x	x		x	x	x	
Italy	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Ireland					NT		
Latvia		x		x	x		
Liechtenstein					x		
Lithuania		Red List		Red List	LR		
Luxembourg		CR			VU	CR	
Macedonia FYR	R		?		NT	E	
Malta	x						
Moldova	EN			CR	LR/lc		
Monaco					x		
The Netherlands		Susceptible		LR	LR	EN	
Norway		DM			x		
Poland		x		EN	x	EN	
Portugal	CR				LC	DD	
Romania	LC	DD	VU	VU	LC	VU	
Russian Federation	II	x		x	x	II	
San Marino							
Serbia & Montenegro	LC	DD	LC	DD	LC	VU	
Slovak Republic	LR:cd	VU		VU	LR:lc	VU	
Slovenia	EN	Rare	EN		x	EN	
Spain	x				x	x	
Sweden		x		EN	x		
Switzerland	x	x	EX		x	x	
Turkey	x	x	x		x	x	
Ukraine	x	x		Red Book	x	Red Book	
United Kingdom		VU			NT		

Countries	Species:							
	<i>M. myo</i>	<i>M. mys</i>	<i>M. nat</i>	<i>M. nip</i>	<i>M. pun</i>	<i>M. scha</i>	<i>N. las</i>	<i>N. lei</i>
Albania	in decline	V	x					x
Andorra	x		?					x
Armenia		RedBook	x			x		x
Austria	LC	NT	VU					VU
Azerbaijan		LR	LR	x				LR
Belarus	x	x	III				?	III
Belgium	CR	VU	VU					CR
Bosnia-Herzegovina	x	x	x				x	x
Bulgaria	VU	x	x				DD	DD
Croatia	NT	x	x				x	DD
Cyprus			x					
Czech Republic	VU	LR	LR				DD	VU
Denmark		VU	VU					
Estonia		Red List	Red List					
Finland		x	EN					
France	VU	VU	VU		x		R	VU
Georgia		LR	LR	x			x	LR
Germany	VU	VU	VU					CR/EN/VU
Gibraltar	x							
Greece	x	x	x				x	x
Holy See								
Hungary	x	x	x				x	x
Italy	x	x	x		x		x	x
Ireland		V	V					V
Latvia		x	x					x
Liechtenstein	x	x	x					x
Lithuania		?	LR					Red List
Luxembourg	EN	EN	EN					EN
Macedonia FYR	in decline	V	V					V
Malta					x			
Moldova	CR	VU	CR				DD	DD
Monaco								
The Netherlands	EN	LR	VU					LR
Norway		DM	DM					
Poland	x	x	x				x	R
Portugal	VU	DD	VU				DD	DD
Romania	NT	LC	LC				DD	NT
Russian Federation		x	x				III	x
San Marino	x	x	x					
Serbia & Montenegro	LC	LC	NT					LC
Slovak Republic	LR:cd	VU	LR:nt				DD	DD
Slovenia	EN	x	VU				DD	VU
Spain	x	x	x				x	x
Sweden	x	VU	VU					x
Switzerland	x	x	x				x	x
Turkey	x	x	x					x
Ukraine	x	x	Red Book				Red Book	Red Book
United Kingdom	x	V	V					V

Countries	Species:							
	<i>N. noc</i>	<i>O. hem</i>	<i>P. kuh</i>	<i>P. nat</i>	<i>P. pip</i>	<i>P. pyg</i>	<i>P. aur</i>	<i>P. aus</i>
Albania	x		x	x	NT			
Andorra			x		x		x	?
Armenia	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Austria	NE		VU	NE	NT	DD	LC	VU
Azerbaijan	LR		x	LR	LR	x	LR	
Belarus	x			x	x	x	x	x
Belgium	LRlc			VU	LRlc	x	VU	EN
Bosnia-Herzegovina	x		x	x	x		x	x
Bulgaria	LC		DD	DD	LC	x	x	LC
Croatia	x		LC	x	x	x	LC	EN
Cyprus	x		x					x
Czech Republic	x			VU	LR	?	x	LR
Denmark	VU			VU	x	x	VU	
Estonia	Red List			x	Red List		x	
Finland	x			x	x		x	
France	VU		NT	VU	NT	NT(?)	VU	VU
Georgia	LR		x	LR	LR	x	LR	LR
Germany	VU			CR/EN/VU	LRlc	DD	LRnt	EN
Gibraltar					x			
Greece	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Holy See								
Hungary	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Italy	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Ireland					NT	x	NT	
Latvia	x			x	x	x	x	
Liechtenstein	x			x	x		x	
Lithuania	Red List			x	Red List	LR	Red List	
Luxembourg	VU			DD	LRnt		VU	EN
Macedonia FYR	V		?	?	NT			R
Malta	x		x		x			x
Moldova	DD			DD	DD	x	x	LRlc
Monaco			x		x			
The Netherlands	LR			LR	LR		LR	Susceptible
Norway	R			DM		DM	DM	
Poland	x			x	x	x	x	x
Portugal	DD		LC	NE	LC	LC	DD	LC
Romania	LC		x	LC	LC	x	LC	LC
Russian Federation	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
San Marino			x		x		x	
Serbia & Montenegro	LC		LC	LC	LC	DD	NT	LC
Slovak Republic	LR:lc			DD	LR:lc	DD	LR:nt	LRnt
Slovenia	x		x	VU	x	DD	VU	VU
Spain	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Sweden	x			LRnt	x	x	x	x
Switzerland	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Turkey	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ukraine	x		Red Book	x	x	x	x	x
United Kingdom	V			NT	NT	?	NT	R

Countries	Species:					
	<i>P.kol</i>	<i>P. mac</i>	<i>P. sar</i>	<i>V. mur</i>	<i>M. schr</i>	<i>T. ten</i>
Albania				R	E	?
Andorra						x
Armenia		x		x	Red Book	Red Book
Austria		DD		NE	RE	
Azerbaijan		x		x	x	LR
Belarus				x		
Belgium				x		
Bosnia-Herzegovina		x			x	
Bulgaria				x	VU	DD
Croatia	DD	DD		x	EN	x
Cyprus					x	x
Czech Republic				DD		
Denmark				x		
Estonia				Red List		
Finland				x		
France		x		R	VU	VU
Georgia				x	x	LR
Germany				CR/EN/VU	EX	
Gibraltar					x	x
Greece	x	x		x	x	x
Holy See						
Hungary				x	x	
Italy	x	x	EN	x	x	x
Ireland						
Latvia				x		
Liechtenstein		x		x		
Lithuania				Red List		
Luxembourg				DD		
Macedonia FYR				R	E	?
Malta	x				x	x
Moldova				DD		
Monaco						x
The Netherlands				LR		
Norway				DM		
Poland				x		
Portugal					VU	DD
Romania				LC	NT	
Russian Federation		x		x	I	x
San Marino					x	
Serbia & Montenegro				LC	LC	
Slovak Republic				DD	CR	
Slovenia		x		VU	EN	
Spain					x	x
Sweden				x		
Switzerland		x		x	x	x
Turkey	x	x		x	x	x
Ukraine				x	EX	
United Kingdom						

Annex 2

Bat species recorded from the current geographical scope of Eurobats and their occurrence in range states with territory within 500 km.

Species	Mor	Alg	Tun	Lib	Egy	Isr	Jor	Iraq	Leb	Syr	Iran	Turkm	Kaz
Pteropodidae													
<i>Rousettus aegyptiacus</i>					#	#	#		#	#	#		
Emballonuridae													
<i>Taphozous nudiventris</i>	#	#			#	#	#	#		#	#		
Rhinolophidae													
<i>Rhinolophus blasii</i>	#	#	#			#	#			#	#	#	
<i>Rhinolophus euryale</i>	#	#	#			#	#		#	#	#	#	
<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>	#	#	#			#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
<i>Rhinolophus mehelyi</i>	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#		
Vespertilionidae													
<i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	#												
<i>Barbastella leucomelas</i>					#	#					#	#	#
<i>Eptesicus bottae</i>					#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#
<i>Eptesicus nilssonii</i>											#		#
<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>	#	#	#	#		#		#	#	#	#	#	#
<i>Hypsugo savii</i>	#	#	#			#			#		#	#	#
<i>Myotis alcaethoe</i>													
<i>Myotis aurascens</i>											#	#	#
<i>Myotis bechsteinii</i>											#		
<i>Myotis blythii</i>						#			#	#	#	#	#
<i>Myotis brandtii</i>													#
<i>Myotis capaccinii</i>	#	#	#			#	#	#	#	#	#		
<i>Myotis dasycneme</i>													#
<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>													#
<i>Myotis emarginatus</i>	#	#	#			#	#		#	#	#	#	#
<i>Myotis hajastanicus</i>													
<i>Myotis myotis</i>						#			#	#			
<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	#												
<i>Myotis nattereri</i>	#	#				#	#	#	#	#	?	#	
<i>Myotis nipalensis</i>						#				#	#	#	#
<i>Myotis cf. punicus</i>	#	#	#	#									
<i>Myotis schaubi</i>											#		
<i>Nyctalus azoreum</i>													
<i>Nyctalus lasiopterus</i>	#										#		
<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	#	#		#							#		#
<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>						#			#	#	#	#	#
<i>Otonycteris hemprichii</i>	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#
<i>Pipistrellus kuhlii</i>	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
<i>Pipistrellus maderensis</i>													
<i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>													#
<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	#	#	#			#			#	#	#	#	#
<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>													
<i>Plecotus auritus</i>											#		#
<i>Plecotus austriacus</i>													
<i>Plecotus kolombatovici</i>	#	#	#	#		?				?			
<i>Plecotus macrobullaris</i>										#		#	
<i>Plecotus sardus</i>													
<i>Plecotus teneriffae</i>													
<i>Vespertilio murinus</i>											#	#	#
<i>Miniopterus schreibersii</i>	#	#	#			#	#		#	#	#	#	
Molossidae													
<i>Tadarida teniotis</i>	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Number of species	22	19	16	8	9	23	15	11	16	22	29	21	23

5th Session of the Meeting of Parties

Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4 – 6 September 2006

Resolution 5.12

2008 – Global Year of the Bat



The Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (hereafter "the Agreement"),

Noting with gratitude that the Agreement has gained so much momentum in the 15 years since it was signed;

Recognising the success achieved by the Agreement in promoting bat conservation, combating prejudices commonly held about bats and raising public awareness, particularly through the European Bat Night and similar events;

Acknowledging that bats in other parts of the world also need protection, and

Wishing to encourage countries in other continents to conclude similar Agreements;

Decides:

1. To endorse the proposal of UNEP/CMS to declare the year 2008 "International Year of the Bat";
2. To call upon the Parties to the Agreement to make additional efforts in the year 2008 to promote bat conservation and public awareness of the problems bats are facing;
3. To encourage Non-Party Range States in Europe and elsewhere to initiate, continue and collaborate as appropriate in conservation and public awareness campaigns to help improve the conservation status of all bat species.