Research Networking Programme – EURAPMON Research and monitoring *for* and *with* raptors in Europe INAUGURAL WORKSHOP

FINAL REPORT TO ESF

SUMMARY

The objectives of this Inaugural Workshop were to build understanding and awareness of EURAPMON and engage participants in EURAPMON programme planning. The purpose was to build ownership of the programme, and to bring to bear on the programme the body of scientific and technical knowledge and experience of the 50+ participants.

The *Opening Session* of the workshop provided a historical review of the development of the programme, and an overview of the programme rationale, aim, objectives, expected outputs and benefits, activities and early challenges. Six *Working Sessions* addressed scientific and technical considerations in relation to six of the eight work packages (WP) of EURAPMON, namely: WP2 Comprehensive inventory of existing monitoring activities; WP3 Identification of user needs; WP4 Prioritisation; WP5 Setting best practice; WP6 Capacity-building; and WP7 Establishing a web-based database, reporting and analysis. The *Closing Session* pulled together conclusions from the working sessions and recommended next steps for each WP, a press conference and poster session.

The workshop was very successful in meeting its objectives. The shared interests, warm local hospitality and beautiful natural setting of the Riserva dello Zingaro helped generate an energy and enthusiasm which bodes well for the programme. The 50+ participants gained a common understanding of EURAPMON, and were actively engaged in break-out and plenary discussions through the working sessions. These discussions elaborated a wide range of scientific and technical considerations, and recommended next steps in relation to each WP. The workshop report captures theses discussions and recommendations. Ownership of the programme should consequently be considerably broadened and deepened. The scientific and technical knowledge of the participants will be brought to bear directly on the programme, as the findings of the workshop will inform Steering Committee deliberations on work planning and resource allocation.

OVERVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC CONTENT AND DISCUSSION

The objectives of this Inaugural Workshop were to build understanding and awareness of EURAPMON and engage participants in EURAPMON programme planning. The purpose was to build ownership of the programme, and to bring to bear on the programme the body of scientific and technical knowledge and experience of the 50+ participants.

The *Opening Session* of the workshop provided background on EURAPMON. Paola Movalli, EURAPMON Coordinator, presented a historical review of the development of the programme, from its conception in 2005 to its inauguration in May 2010. Guy Duke, EURAPMON Chair, presented an overview of the programme,

The workshop then addressed scientific and technical considerations in relation to six of the eight work packages (WP) of EURAPMON, namely:

- WP2: Comprehensive inventory of existing monitoring activities
- WP3: Identification of user needs
- WP4: Prioritisation
- WP5: Setting best practice
- WP6: Capacity-building
- WP7: Establishing a web-based database, reporting and analysis

These six work packages were separately addressed in six consecutive *Working Sessions*. Each session started with three opening presentations. The EURAPMON Chair provided context for the discussion: a recap of the relevant programme objective, anticipated outcome, and indicative activities, and any related discussion in the Steering Committee related to the work package. The session Co-Chairs (one representing the R&M *for* raptors community, and the other the R&M *with* raptors community) enlarged upon relevant scientific and technical considerations. Each Co-Chair then posed a set of 'key questions' to be addressed by the participants; these were then discussed in either breakout groups or in plenary, with key points being recorded.

In the *Closing Session* (Saturday morning), the Working Session Co-Chairs provided concluding remarks on the discussions of each session, and proposed next steps. The workshop closed with a press conference. A small poster session was held following the closing plenary to permit participants to showcase and share their own research and monitoring work.

WP2: Comprehensive inventory of existing monitoring activities

Discussions on this WP achieved consensus on the need for a mainly web-based, questionnaire approach to the inventory, online and in downloadable format, and in multiple languages, with clear objectives to incentivise respondents. A matrix structure to the questionnaire was supported, with mostly closed questions to facilitate response rates and collation and analysis of responses. The content of the questionnaire should not be too complex, effective in terms of user needs, and realistic in terms of the extent and type of data to be collated; metadata, not raw data, a focus on national level data, and covering both diurnal and nocturnal raptors and owls). Appropriate target audiences were identified and the importance of providing feedback to respondents was highlighted.

WP3: Identification of user needs

Discussion of this WP provided greater clarity on the range of user groups, and on which of these are to be considered key end users (notably end-users at EU level, but also at national level). Potential 'misusers' were also identified. The discussions identified the types of data end users might require (e.g. on various key stressors as regards R&M *with* raptors end-users), though it was recognised that it may be difficult for EURAPMON to capture all relevant data. Suggestions were made as to how to assess user needs, including questionnaires for some user types, structured interviews and/or workshops for others (notably for R&M *with* raptors end-users). The need for good communications with end-users was emphasised. Attention was drawn to risks – including too diverse a list of end-users, overly ambitious data collection, variation in data quality/methods, insufficient human resources to manage the work, and low response rates from end-users – and how to manage these risks. Ideas were also generated on how to effectively and cost-efficiently deliver appropriate products to end users – including charging end-users for products.

WP4: Prioritisation

Discussions on this work package were necessarily preliminary, as the work package will need to build on the outputs of WP2 and WP3 - themselves priorities for EURAPMON. However, the discussion produced useful considerations as to what might be considered further priorities for EURAPMON, including a number of 'easy win' activities. There was consensus on the need for EURAPMON to prioritise activities at European scale, and in particular activities of relevance to EU-level end-users. A number of suggestions for priorities related to making raptor monitoring more fit-for-purpose in relation to key relevant areas of EU policy (e.g. the nature directives, biodiversity policy, chemicals policy, CAP) or to specific pressures on raptors of relevance across the EU (e.g. wind farms, GMOs, changing livestock densities). There was some discussion on whether or not a raptor indicator, or indicators, might be developed as a priority for one or more of these policy areas or pressures. Other possible priorities included: developing speciesspecific activities across the European range of the species concerned; standardisation, where possible and appropriate, of methods, not least to facilitate more powerful analysis at European scale; securing long-term sustainability of the network and of key outputs such as the database; and capacity-building for less advanced countries (which will indeed be addressed under WP6).

WP5: Setting best practice

As regards R&M *for* raptors, discussions on this WP identified a range of potential user groups for guidance on best practice. A preliminary of list of key current sources of

information and guidance was drawn up but will need expansion. Key gaps in information and best practice were suggested, including survey protocols for some species, and for all habitats of each species, and in various languages. A number of priorities for promoting best practice were proposed, including collating existing best practice, developing new protocols for priority species and/or habitats not currently covered, providing a forum for updating of best practice, and survey protocols for ecological impact assessment.

As regards R&M *with* raptors, discussion on this WP again identified key user groups for best practice. SANCO guidelines on pesticide residues analysis, and other guidelines from specimen banks and forensic guidelines from the UK and NL, were mentioned as useful starting points. Alternatives to best practice guidelines include the setting on minimum requirements for data quality. Setting of best practice has to be peer-reviewed. Intercallibration exercises open to EURAPMON participants could be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of methods used.

WP6: Capacity-building

Discussions on this WP first addressed the need to match skills with priorities to build capacity. WP2 can provide a basis for this by identifying where skills exist and where they are lacking. Expertise on rare species might be used to build capacity for monitoring of common species. Resources for capacity-building may be especially lacking in some countries which are a high priority for raptor monitoring and conservation. Funding for European-scale monitoring and monitoring of key indicator species might be subsidised in some countries by EU funding, richer Member States, and/or conservation organisations (e.g. RSPB).

EURAPMON participants are perhaps best placed to lead on capacity building; most already regularly engage in capacity building within their own countries and this could be extended. There is also a major role for volunteers, as well as professional ornithologists/raptor biologists, in helping to build capacity. Existing and new university courses can also be used, and participants from high priority countries with poor capacity should be encouraged through specific programmes/grants. Discussion also highlighted the relevance of raising awareness of conservation problems in order to create the necessary demand for capacity-building. Participants suggested the development of the EURAPMON network will facilitate knowledge transfer and capacity-building. EURAPMON conferences, workshop and exchange visits – and possible summer schools – can all contribute to capacity-building. EURAPMON provides for exchange visits for this purpose. Hawk Mountain in the US also offers relevant courses. Additional funds for capacity-building might be raised through collaborations with other bodies, programmes, and networks.

WP7: Establishing a web-based database, reporting and analysis

As regards the database for R&M *for* raptors, discussions on this WP identified a numbers of possible models for the database. The potential for a collaborative mechanism

involving MEROS (which has the trust of a large raptor monitoring community) and PECBMS (which has the technical capacity to collate and combine national trend data) was particularly interesting, but will require further consideration, as will others. Discussants broadly agreed with the data fields proposed for reporting under Article 12 of the Birds Directive, but suggested some additional fields – such as demographic parameters of productivity and survival, phenology, and effectiveness of conservation measures - that the EURAPMON database might try to address. Discussion also address the need for standardisation and transparency (e.g. clear data audit trails), in relation to data quality. Best practice should be promoted and expanded (to other species and countries) and minimum standards established. Within the database, national data of different qualities can be coded as such, but care is needed to avoid this valuable metadata being overlooked when the data are then combined supra-nationally. The discussion also identified potential obstacles. EURAPMON needs to reach out widely to ensure all relevant raptor data holders are aware of the initiative, assured of its motives, and clear that the database will contain only aggregated national metadata, and not sensitive raw data. There are also technical issues to address, such as the challenges of producing European range maps for species using heterogeneous national data, e.g. distributions mapped at different spatial scales. It was felt that some of these issues could usefully form the basis for a targeted technical workshop in future.

As regards the database for R&M *with* raptors, discussions compiled a list of key 'data' of interest to workshop participants. Lists of incentives and barriers for feeding 'data' into EURAPMON database were also identified. The information on incentives can be used directly in covering letters and fliers to encourage individuals and organisations to feed information into the EURAPMON database. The list of potential barriers can be used to inform the design of the database such that these barriers will not manifest themselves. There was recognition that there may be some reluctance or inertia for participating in the EURAPMON initiative but promoting of the likely benefits and requesting metadata (nature of which have yet to be defined) rather than raw data may offset this. Participants also provided a list of possible organisations that could be approached to collaborate on a database.

ASSESSMENT OF RESULTS AND IMPACT ON FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE FIELD

The workshop was very successful in meeting its objectives. The 50+ participants gained a common understanding of EURAPMON, and were energetically engaged in the discussions through the working sessions. The workshop report captures theses discussions and the views of the participants on key issues for the programme and next steps. Ownership of the programme should consequently be considerably broadened and deepened. The scientific and technical knowledge of the participants will be brought to bear directly on the programme, as the findings of the workshop will inform Steering Committee deliberations on work planning and resource allocation.

The workshop recommended next steps in relation to each of the six work packages addressed. These will inform the deliberations of the EURAPMON Steering Committee (1-2 February 2011) as it considers the programme planning. In this way, the workshop will have a direct impact on the future direction of the field. The recommendations are summarised below.

WP2: Comprehensive inventory of existing monitoring activities

Next steps to advance this WP include: decide on whether to issue single for and with questionnaire, or separate for and with questionnaires; appoint WP leader, deputy and working group (or one each with respect to R&M for and R&M with raptors); develop an introduction to the questionnaire(s); develop draft excel questionnaire(s); design and programme the questionnaire(s) online; design and programme on-line geo-spatial information facility; test-run draft online questionnaire(s); finalise questionnaire(s), introduction and guidance on completing the questionnaire(s) (in various languages if possible); establish internal project information network/organogram; appoint national promoters/information nodes; identify target audiences; disseminate questionnaire(s); manage incoming completed questionnaires (compile data into spreadsheets); provide feedback to respondents.

WP3: Identification of user needs

Next steps to advance this WP include: appoint WP leader, deputy and working group; develop key questions; expand provisional list of target end-users; assign user-groups among WP working group; decide appropriate method to approach each end-user group; develop presentation materials for meetings; assess what data EURAPMON may be able to deliver in relation to each user group; publicise the assessment to facilitate participation; issue questionnaire, convene meetings with selected user groups as necessary; chase responses; maintain regular feedback among working group and with respondents; collate and analyse response.

WP4: Prioritisation

While it is premature to recommend specific priorities for EURAPMON, a number of recommendations can be drawn from the discussion. These include: ensuring that WP3 (assessment of user needs) explores the needs of officials developing, implementing and monitoring relevant EU policies (nature directives, biodiversity policy, chemicals policy, CAP, etc) and dealing with specific issues of relevance to raptors (GMOs, wind farms, stocking densities, etc.) in order that EURAPMON may identify priorities in these areas; exploring, with EC, EEA etc., the utility of otherwise of one or more raptor indicators; ensuring that WP2 (inventory of existing monitoring) asks relevant questions on methodologies (allowing an assessment of needs and priorities for standardisation) and on species-specific activities which might be prioritised at EU scale; and developing, as a priority, from the outset, EURAPMON thinking on long-term sustainability for the network and key outputs.

WP5: Setting best practice

Next steps to advance this WP include: use the inventory questionnaire to seek details of monitoring schemes including species covered, key contacts and written protocols; use the results to review reporting arrangements across Europe and identify common themes and gaps; compile existing best practice protocols (survey, data management and analysis, reporting) and make these available online via a best-practice section of the EURAPMON website (to include an introduction to best-practice, information for different species, general sections on survey techniques and data analysis and designing surveys for novel situations e.g. environmental impact assessment etc. - ideally provide downloadable copies of written material or links to other websites); invite applications for exchange visits to share best practice and establish priorities for allocating funds; and review proposed actions against the availability of resources for developing WP5, identify opportunities to seek in-kind contributions or further resources as appropriate; identify priorities for translation of best practice protocols (key material and languages); consider providing an online forum for discussion of best practice and notification of new techniques; consider producing a field guide to raptor survey and monitoring in Europe e.g. identify experts to synthesise information and write accounts for priority species, survey techniques; consider specific requirements for best practice guidance for analysis of raptor data; and consider opportunities for and feasibility of developing a European raptor index or indices.

WP6: Capacity-building

Next steps to advance this WP include: identify key skills, who has them and where they are held (from WP2); identify where key skills are lacking; identify where key resources are held; identify where resources are lacking; identify what funds are available for supra-national programmes; identify indicator species to address priorities for building capacity; identify existing programmes that help build capacity; identify key conservation projects (issues/threats) to be addressed; identify where expertise lies – existing databases that can be used to build capacity; identify fundraising possibilities for capacity building

activities; identify programmes proving training opportunities; establish EURAPMON short visit grant programme and link with host institutions/organisations; establish links with institutions/organisations holding workshops that help build capacity; develop contact with media, educational bodies, landowners etc to define the needed actions for capacity building and feasibility; prepare a schedule of planned actions and responsible persons to ensure useful results.

WP7: Establishing a web-based database, reporting and analysis

Next steps to advance this WP as regards R&M *for* raptors include: decide whether to focus database design around reporting requirements for Birds Directive (and Birds in Europe 3), or be more general and wide-ranging; use session outcomes to draft outline specification for database (i.e. key fields required, likely outputs needed by priority users); use draft specification to discuss database needs with organisations hosting similar databases, to explore potential to collaborate (use lists from break-out groups to guide who to approach); and inform wider raptor community about plans to develop database (in partnership with others) to raise awareness and allay fears about sensitive data, etc.

Next steps to advance this WP as regards R&M *with* raptors include: appoint WP leader, deputy and working group for WP7; draft programme of WP activity and milestones for 2011; post profiles for individuals from the workshop on EURAPMON website; explore potential links with other organisations in developing database and where there may be overlaps with existing databases – use list generated from breakout groups to help guide who might be approached; define scope of pressures to be included in database; define type of data that will be accepted and nature of downloadable outputs; and generate key data and information into a spreadsheet that has cross links – i.e. searchable by various 'filters' – needs link with WP2 and WP3 outputs.

European Science Foundation Research Networking Programme

EURAPMON

Research and monitoring for and with raptors in Europe

INAUGURAL WORKSHOP

PROGRAMME

Riserva Naturale Orientata dello Zingaro, Castellammare del Golfo - Scopello, Sicilia, ITALIA Thursday 7 to Saturday 9 October 2010

FINAL 02/10/2010

Time	Session	Торіс	Speaker
PRE-WORKSH	IOP: WEDNESDAY 6 OCT	OBER - AGRITURISMO TENUTE PLAIA	
18:00-19:00	Co-chairs planning session (Session co-chairs only)	
19:00-22:00	Registration		
	, logica al chi		
20:00-22:00	Buffet dinner		
WORKSHOP D	DAY 1 - THURSDAY 7 OCT	OBER - VISITOR CENTRE, RISERVA DELLO ZINGARO	
09:20 09:45	Transfer Assitutions Tenute D	aia ta Saanalla arwara	
08:30-08:45 08:45-09:00	Transfer Agriturismo Tenute Pla Transfer Scopello square (all ot	her hotels) to entrance, Riserva dello Zingaro	
09:00-09:30	Walk to the visitor centre		
09:30-11:00	Opening session (Chair: Guy		
09:30-09:40		Welcome	Duke
09:40-19:55 09:55-10:10	+	Welcome Welcome	Representative Comune Representative Riserva
10:10-10:40		EURAPMON overview	Duke/Movalli
10:40-11:00		Workshop objectives, programme, methods	Duke
11:00-11:30	refreshments		
	EURAPMON OBJECTIVE 2	: CONSENSUS ON PRIORITIES	
11:30-13:30	Working Session 1: WP2 Inve	entory of existing R&M (Co-chairs: Andras Kovacs, Gloria Pereira)	
11:30-11:40		Overview of the work package	Duke
11:40-11:55		Considerations and key questions (R&M for raptors)	Kovacs
11:55-12:10		Considerations and key questions (R&M with raptors)	Pereira
12:10-12:50 12:50-13:20		Break-out on key questions (2 groups R&M for raptors, 2 groups R&M with) Report to plenary	Departeuro
13:20-13:30		Wrap-up	Rapporteurs Co-chairs
10.20 10.00			
13:30-14:30	lunch		
14:30-16:30 14:30-14:40	Working Session 2: WP3 Use	r needs (Co-Chairs: John Lusby, Nico van den Brink) Overview of work package	Duke
14:40-14:55		Considerations and key questions (R&M for raptors)	Lusby
14:55-15:10	1	Considerations and key questions (R&M with raptors)	Van den Brink
15:10-15:50		Break-out on key questions (2 groups R&M for raptors, 2 groups R&M with)	
15:50-16:20		Report to plenary	Rapporteurs
16:20-16:30		Wrap-up	Co-chairs
16:30-17:00	refreshments		
17:00-18:30	Working Session 3: WP4 Prio	rities (Co-chairs: Guy Duke, Richard Shore)	
17:00-17:10		Overview of work package	Duke
17:10-17:25 17:25-17:40	1	Considerations and key questions (R&M for raptors) Considerations and key questions (R&M with raptors)	Duke Shore
17:25-17:40	+	Plenary discussion	SHULE
18:10-18:20	1	Wrap-up	Co-chairs
18:20-18:30		Close of Day 1/House-keeping	Duke
18:30-19:00	Wolk to recence entrance		
19:00-19:15	Walk to reserve entrance Transfer to Scopello square		
19:15-19:30	Transfer Scopello square to Tel	nute Plaia	
19:30-20:30	Co-chairs planning session (Session co-chairs only)	
19:30-20:30 20:30-23:00	Co-chairs planning session (Welcome dinner - Ristorante	•	