



# Public Consultation Submissions & Responses

Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection (Amendment) Regulations, 2019

March 2019

Environment & Resources Authority



## CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

Ref No.	Name of Stakeholder / Date	Comments Received	Response / Remarks
1	Eman Calleja 07/03/2019	<p>I welcome the many changes made to strengthen these regulations, including the list of species added. Enforcement will be an issue since it will not be easy to link damage to these small species to someone such that you can take someone to court.</p>	<p>The proposed changes are to be read in conjunction with the Environment Protection Act (Cap. 549) and related regulations, which also provide for additional compliance tools, including permitting, assessment, administrative fines and other related aspects, particularly noting that the investigation of criminal liability is not always straightforward. Indeed, ERA has increased its compliance and enforcement personnel and shall continue to do so, to enable a better response to possible infringements. Moreover, on the ground prevention is also of essence. In this regard, ERA is engaged in increasing CEPA initiatives on protected species and the related restrictions in place. Such initiatives aim to both inform the public as well as educate them on the need for protection.</p>
		<p>With regards to the management of protected areas through management agreements, I think that ERA needs to add a clause that allows the use of approved management plans and restoration plans to serve as environmental permits in their own right. In other words, entities that are tasked with managing these sites should be allowed to freely manage these sites by following the approved management plan and restoration plan, under the supervision of ERA. As things stand, the requirement of complex environmental permits to carry out even menial tasks like remove an alien species which is not even protected by law is time consuming and taking the managers away from the field and keeping them on a computer in an office, more</p>	<p>The matter is noted, and being considered in relation to selected issues to be addressed through compliance tools like general binding rules and environmental authorisation processes. However, one of the aim of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44) is the transposition of the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) and the Birds Directive (Directive 2009/147/EC) (partially), as well as include provisions necessary for the implementation of the related multilateral environmental agreements. In accordance to the Habitats Directive, derogations from the provisions on</p>

		<p>than is necessary to allow the efficient day-to-day management of a reserve.</p>	<p>the protection of species shall only be allowed when there be no satisfactory alternative, the activity is not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of species at a favourable conservation status and for the other motives specified under Art. 16 of the Directive. Derogations therefore, may only be granted on a case-by-case basis and blanket permits are not allowed. Permits moreover, allow additional safeguards for the protection of species or sites through the conditions laid thereunder as well as allow the competent authority the flexibility to amend, suspend or revoke such authorisations, if deemed necessary.</p>
		<p>Such management agreements should cover longer-term periods of 4-5 years, to take into consideration the time-scale required for environmental and habitat change. This is particularly important for two reasons; Firstly, it is very difficult to find good, hard-working and technical people who are willing to work full-time in the field, come rain or shine, often without facilities such as toilets or a room for shelter on site. Excessive bureaucracy targeted at those actively trying to bring an improvement in the conservation status of an Annex I habitat or site, is counterproductive. Having a longer term environmental permit through an approved management plan would allow these people the leeway to focus on bringing improvements to these sites and spending more time in the field. Secondly, this would allow ERA to focus more on overseeing other sites where a lot of the damage is taking place such as those sites that are under leases by third parties. This includes the entire cliffs from Benghisja to Gnejna and several sites in Gozo. These leases should be terminated and their management could be shifted to NGOs or other third parties, binding them to management agreements ensuring they ensure an improvement of the conservation status of the habitats and species found within them.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It should be noted that the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44) do include possibilities in relation to management agreements with third parties, and indeed both Environment and Resources Authority (ERA) and Ministry for the Environment, Sustainable Development and Climate Change (MESDC) have entered into such agreements.</p>

		In addition to this recommendation, I also look forward to the inclusion of more sites to the Natura 2000 network. There are several sites across Malta that host species and habitats found in the habitats directive. In fact some of the best conserved Annex I habitats are found outside the Natura 2000 network.	The Environment and Resources Authority (ERA) is currently undertaking the necessary assessments for the designation of additional protected areas, as applicable. Moreover, proposals by concerned stakeholders for the listing of protected areas are welcomed by the Authority.
2	Annick Bonello Cassar obo Nature Trust Malta 07/03/2019	If any site which is going to be developed has proof/ evidence through reliable sources and evidence (photographic / video etc) – that Protected species are on a site to be developed (within ODZ/ Development zone – such as gardens/ undeveloped plots), then the developer is obliged to remove and relocate such species under ERA supervision to a suitable site suggested by ERA.	Sites which are to undergo development are reviewed by ERA on a case-by-case basis.
		Data on the species of each site not yet having any protection status must be made public (GIS)	The surveillance and monitoring of the conservation status of habitats and species as included in selected Schedules of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44) is carried out by ERA and through commissioned studies, in line with Article 11 of the Habitats Directive. Such monitoring is not restricted solely to Natura 2000 sites but data is collected both from within and outside the Natura 2000 network. The resulting <a href="#">report</a> is available online, and contains general information, the distribution and range of the species/habitat concerned, estimates of the population size, pressures and threats and conservation status.

		<p>Regular updated list of alien invasive species of plants (not trees) must be made available to public. Adding another list of species which already created havoc in the Mediterranean and not in Malta yet, to avoid their importation and plantation.</p> <p>Existing invasive species in Malta should also be made illegal to cultivate, just like the one in the tree regulations.</p>	<p>Lists of non-native species of concern have been published through various legal instruments. For example, core to <a href="#">Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species</a> is the list of Invasive alien species of Union concern. The list, which is regularly updated, currently comprises of 49 species (including some of the species causing most damage to the EU biodiversity). The IAS Regulation further, provides for a set of restrictions and measures to be taken across the EU in relation to such listed invasive species. The <a href="#">Trees and Woodlands Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.123)</a> on the other hand, includes a list of trees deemed to be detrimental to the Maltese natural environment. The concerned regulations places various restrictions on such species including prohibitions on their propagation, sowing, planting, import, export, transport, sale, exchange or donation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations allows ERA to publish a list of species considered to be invasive or deemed to be invasive to Malta. Through the proposed amendments additional restrictions are to be in place prohibiting their transport, breeding, propagation, sowing, planting, sale or exchange. The concerned list shall be regularly updated by ERA so as to adequately address current or new invasive species, as required. Such list would be published through the Government Gazette and be available online on the ERA website.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Regarding new Regulation 15A: the management agreements will automatically serve as environmental permits enabling the competent organization involved in the management agreement to operate under the supervision of era to carry out the functions of the management plans</p>	<p>The matter is noted, and being considered in relation to selected issues to be addressed through compliance tools like general binding rules and environmental authorisation processes. However, one of the aim of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44) is the transposition of the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) and the Birds Directive (Directive 2009/147/EC) (partially), as well as include provisions necessary for the implementation of the related multilateral environmental agreements. In accordance to the Habitats Directive, derogations from the provisions on the protection of species shall only be allowed when there be no satisfactory alternative, the activity is not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of species at a favourable conservation status and for the other motives specified under Art. 16 of the Directive. Derogations therefore, may only be granted on a case-by-case basis and blanket permits are not allowed. Permits moreover, allow additional safeguards for the protection of species or sites through the conditions laid thereunder as well as allow the competent authority the flexibility to amend, suspend or revoke such authorisations, if deemed necessary.</p>
		<p>Regarding new Regulation 17A: Protection notices should also appear on ERA website / GIS</p>	<p>Noted. The ERA website already provides information and links to the Legal Notices, Government Notices and Conservation Orders issued through the provisions of the Environment Protection Act. ERA shall likewise be publishing any issued protection notice on the Authority's website.</p>

		Regarding Regulation 24: The following exception for collection of flora is suggested: unless for seed banks/ propagation for ecological restoration and other such purposes. after ERA permit is granted.	This provision for such collection after an ERA permit is already contemplated and included in the provisions of Regulations 43 and 44 of the principal regulations, i.e. the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44)
		Regarding Regulation 28 (6): Removal should be done under supervision of ERA personnel to ensure this is done. Compliance certificate to be issued by ERA after 2 site visits over a year to ensure invasive species has been eradicated.	Removal orders may contain any condition that ERA deems appropriate for the proper removal of the concerned invasive alien species, including compliance guarantees. ERA could adopt different methodologies to ensure compliance. Currently, the proposed legislation allows ERA the discretion to adopt the appropriate measures in accordance to the necessities of the case. Specifying in the principal regulations the surveillance guarantees to be adopted would reduce the flexibility of such orders.
		Regarding Regulation 31 (1): The following exception is suggested: unless as an attempt to save such species if endangered (through natural/ anthropogenic dangers)	This provision for such consideration, after an ERA permit, is already contemplated and included in the provisions of Regulations 43 and 44 of the principal regulations, i.e. the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44)
3	Stephen Mifsud 08/03/2019	These are my comments in regards the amendment in caption from the view of a taxonomist and one who has years of experience botanising the local natural habitats. Taxonomic comments follow latest published research in plant taxonomy. Many comments are not critical, but writing them to provide a more accurate taxonomic output. I would also suggest to protect orchid species that are fully confirmed with images or herbarium specimens qualified by experts, or else seen in the past by experts. I am in the opinion that there are some listed species based only on old records, which have never been confirmed in the last 40 years.	Comment noted. Since the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations, 2006 (S.L. 549.44) adopt the precautionary principle, also noting that many reportedly extinct species have been found in Malta even after more than 50-100 years marked as 'missing'.
		<i>Barlia robertiana</i> -> Use the taxon <i>Himantoglossum robertianum</i> and <i>Barlia</i> as synonym	Comment noted and addressed, also in line with Delforge (2016).

		<i>Neotinea commutata</i> -> Use the taxon <i>Neotina tridentata</i> s.l. (which include <i>commutata</i> ) [p.s. this has never been confirmed except mentioned in old records, to my knowledge]	This species has been included in Schedule VI of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations in view of old records on the species in line with the precautionary principle
		<i>Neotinea tridentata</i> -> <i>N tridentata</i> s.l. including <i>N. tridentateas.</i> (+synonyms) and <i>N. commutata</i> (+synonyms)	This species has been included in Schedule VI of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations in view of old records on the species in line with the precautionary principle.
		<i>Neottia nidus-avis</i> -> never confirmed (?)	This species has been included in Schedule VI of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations in view of old records on the species in line with the precautionary principle
		<i>Neotinea conica</i> -> Does not exist in Malta (distribution is northwest Europe)	The taxonomic name <i>Neotinea conica</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016), earlier records from Malta and the precautionary principle.
		<i>Ophrys bertolonii</i> -> <i>O. bertolonii</i> s.l. including <i>O. explanata</i> (+synonyms) and <i>O. bertolonii</i> s.s. (+synonyms) {and <i>O. romolinii</i> (+synonyms)} although the latter has doubtful distinction.	The taxonomic name <i>O. bertolonii</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016)
		<i>Ophrys explanata</i> -> include with <i>O. bertolonii</i> s.l. (see above)	The taxonomic name <i>O. explanata</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016)
		<i>Ophrys fuciflora</i> s -> This is a large complex of orchids and I suggest a more specific approach on recent observations from Malta (i.e. <i>calliantha/oxyrhynchos</i> ), although no objection to be kept – just to be more precise.	Comment has been noted.
		<i>Ophrys garganica</i> -> <i>O. passionis</i> s. l. including <i>O. garganica</i> (+synonyms) <i>O. passionis</i> s.s.(+synonyms)	The taxonomic name <i>O. garganica</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
		<i>Ophrys galbra</i> -> a taxonomic exaggeration. While it may be kept it is suggested to use the broad taxon <i>O. lutea</i> s.l. and add including <i>O. glabra</i> (+synonyms) – see below under <i>O. lutea</i> s.l	The taxonomic name <i>O. glabra</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).

	<i>Ophrys grandiflora</i> -> <i>O. tenthredinifera</i> s.l. including <i>O. grandiflora</i> (+ synonyms) and <i>O. tenthredinifera</i> s.s. (+synonyms)	The taxonomic name <i>O. grandiflora</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
	<i>Ophrys hospitalis</i> -> <i>Ophrys mesaritica</i> and <i>Ophrys hospitalis</i> are the same species. Taxonomists currently accept <i>O. mesaritica</i> (only delforge uses that taxon) – ideally under the taxon <i>O. iricolor</i> subsp. <i>mesaritica</i> .	The taxonomic name <i>O. hospitalis</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2012, 2016).
	<i>Ophrys lojaconoi</i> -> <i>O. iricolor</i> subsp. <i>lojocanoi</i> (some taxonomists demote it to var. or indistinct)	The taxonomic name <i>O. lojaconoi</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016) and records from Malta.
	<i>Ophrys lucifera</i> -> distribution more north (Tuscany endemic), does not exist in Malta.	The taxonomic name <i>O. lucifera</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
	<i>Ophrys lutea</i> s.str. -> <i>O. lutea</i> s.l. including <i>O. lutea</i> s.s. (+ synonyms), <i>O. phryganae</i> (+ synonyms), <i>O. sicula</i> (+ synonms) and maybe <i>O. glabra</i> (+ synonyms).	<i>O. lutea</i> s. str. is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016) and earlier records from Malta.
	<i>Ophrys mesaritica</i> -> <i>O. iricolor</i> subsp. <i>mesaritica</i>	The taxonomic name <i>O. mesaritica</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
	<i>Ophrys pallida</i> -> Unlikely to be present in Malta (never confirmed), very distinct species, Sicilian endemic.	The species <i>O. pallida</i> is retained on the basis of records in the Maltese flora and the precautionary principle.
	<i>Ophrys passionis</i> s.l. -> <i>O. passionis</i> s.s. (+ synonyms) and <i>O. garganica</i> (+ synonyms).	The taxonomic name <i>O. passionis</i> s.l. is retained in view of the unclear taxonomic status of this species in Malta.
	<i>O. phryganae</i> -> put within <i>O. lutea</i> s.l. (using the infraspecific taxon <i>O. l. subsp. phryganae</i> )	The taxonomic name <i>O. phryganae</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
	<i>Ophrys romolinii</i> -> put within <i>O. bertolonii</i> s.l. but many classifications do not consider this species distinct or very doubtful.	The taxonomic name <i>O. romolinii</i> is retained on the basis of Soca (2001)
	<i>Ophrys sicula</i> -> put with <i>O. lutea</i> s.l. (although this is very distinct and species ranking is better)	The taxonomic name <i>O. sicula</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016)
	<i>Ophrys tenthredinifera</i> s.s. -> <i>O. tenthredinefera</i> s.l. including <i>O. tenthredinifera</i> s.s. (+ synonyms) and <i>O. grandiflora</i> (+ synonyms).	The taxonomic name <i>O. tenthredinifera</i> s.str. is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).

		<i>Ophrys vallesiana</i> -> preferably under the taxon <i>O. iricolor</i> subsp. <i>vallesiana</i> .	The taxonomic name <i>O. vallesiana</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
		<i>Ophrys x gaulosana</i> -> <i>Ophrys xgaulosana</i>	Comment has been taken on board.
		<i>Ophrys x tumentia</i> -> <i>Ophrys xtumentia</i>	Comment has been taken on board.
		<i>Serapias orientalis</i> -> Eastern distribution with subsp. <i>siciliensis</i> and subsp. <i>apulica</i> being endemic to Sicily and Apuglia resp. and growing on different soil type. It is highly unlikely to exist in Malta and if recorded, its identification must be confirmed by qualified experts since it is easily mistaken with <i>vomeracea</i> s.s	The species <i>Serapias orientalis</i> has been included in on the basis of a report on endangered orchids in the Maltese Islands submitted to ERA by Edwin Lanfranco (2018).
		For consistency: <i>O. oxyrrhynchos</i> s.l. and include subsp. <i>oxy.</i> s.s. and subsp. <i>calliantha</i>	The taxonomic name <i>O. oxyrrhynchos</i> is retained on the basis of Delforge (2016).
		Formatting example; [using specific ranking] <i>O. bertolonii</i> s. l. (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] - <i>O. bertolonii</i> s.s. (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] - <i>O. explanata</i> (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] - <i>O. romolinii</i> (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] OR [using infraspecific ranking] <i>O. iricolor</i> s. l. (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] - subsp. <i>mesaritica</i> (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] - subsp. <i>lojaconoi</i> (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng] - subsp. <i>vallesiana</i> (synonyms) [Mlt] [Eng]	Comment noted. In general, the taxonomic status employed is that of Delforge (2016).

		<p>Other comments:</p> <p>1. Recently <i>Allium commutatum</i> has been reported to be very rare in Malta (two small populations) and should be protected, there are few other species to be included under strict protection.</p>	<p>Comment has been taken on board and the species has been included in Schedule VI.</p>
		<p>2. A number of wetland and sand dune species are declining rapidly from the Maltese Islands. While most sand dune species are protected, the protected wetland species are limited to very rare species which are barely found anymore, making wetlands currently bare of any protection. As a result I suggest ERA to include some species which although has not been rare in the past, now they are. This is only a general comment but few examples include: <i>Ranunculus bulbosus</i> s.l., <i>Nasturtium officinale</i>, <i>Oenanthe globulosa</i>, <i>Phalaris coerulea</i>, <i>Eleocharis</i> spp., <i>Carex divulsa</i>, <i>Carex otrubae</i>, <i>Cyperus longus</i>, etc.</p> <p>Protecting such species (and other that ERA are competent to add) would automatically protect the best wetland patches left in valleys, currently highly degraded.</p>	<p>Comment has been noted. Relevant species have been included in Schedule III.</p>
4	<p>Greenhouse Malta</p> <p>08/03/2019</p>	<p><b>Regulation 28, Points 6-9</b> (Page 6)</p> <p>Green House welcomes this strong stand on the eradication of invasive species. It is key to tackle these on a national level, rather than in patches of government land, as invasive species know no boundaries.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

		<p><b>Regulation 31 Subregulation (1)</b> (Page 7) There is no definition of what 'serious disturbance' is within the document. This should be specified as some scientific interventions are by nature relatively disturbing, however this is offset by the benefit to local knowledge of a species group.</p>	<p>For further information on the interpretation of the term 'disturbance' reference is to be made to the <a href="#">Guidance document on the strict protection of animal species of Community interest under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC</a>.</p>
		<p><b>Schedule 5, Stage 1 (Page 8)</b> Green House welcomes the sound scientific principles of conservation in place for the assessment of new sites to be designated as protected areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
		<p>For both A and B we suggest the inclusion of the clause for Rarity of habitat / species to be included explicitly, ie. A higher ranking is assigned to species and habitats with high national or global rarity. It is also advisable to specify more clearly the grading/rating system based on such principles (for example, presumably a lower ranking is assigned to sites with high isolation, while a higher ranking is assigned to sites which are larger in area.) This does not come across explicitly to readers without a conservation background. Perhaps an easy solution is to rephrase B (c) with 'Degree of connectivity' rather than 'isolation' and state that all criteria are positively correlated with the site ranking system.</p>	<p>Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) of international importance are designated for the maintenance or restoration at a favourable conservation status of natural habitat types listed in Annex I or a species listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive. The criteria for such designation are laid down in Annex III of the Directive which is faithfully transposed through Schedule IV of S.L. 549.44. Additional information on these criteria are available in the <a href="#">Commission Implementing Decision 2011/484/EU of the 11 July 2011 concerning a site information format for Natura 2000 sites</a>.</p>
		<p>C. It is advisable to specify which threat status this is referring to, whether it's Red list or other classifications.</p>	<p>Comment noted and reference to internationally recognised systems included. Threats are identified using the IUCN classification system.</p>
		<p><b>General note</b> Provisions need to be made for species which are classified as data deficient for the Maltese islands - in absence of data indicating stable population sizes, poorly described or newly discovered species</p>	<p>In accordance with the IUCN classification system species deemed to be data deficient are considered to be in a separate category and do not fall under the threatened category. It is noted that based on the precautionary principle, the absence of sufficient</p>

		<p>should be directly considered as threatened for conservation purposes.</p>	<p>population data/conservation status assessment would not prevent the adequate designation of protected sites for such species/habitats.</p> <p>In relation to newly discovered species, it should be noted that potential endemics are already protected through the provisions of Regulation 26 of the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44). In relation to species with unknown status, the provisions of Regulation 38 of S.L. 549.44 would apply.</p>
		<p><b>Schedule 5, Stage 2 (Page 9)</b> Suggested to include clause (f) Importance of sites for fulfilling life cycles of protected species. This is intended to priorities areas which while not continuously inhabited by protected species, provide a vital part of the life cycle. Examples include ephemeral streams for frog lifecycles, caves for bats etc.</p>	<p>For animal species ranging over a wide area, protected sites to be designated under S.L. 549.44 correspond to places within the natural range of such species that represent the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction (Vide proviso to Regulation 9(1) of S.L. 549.44).</p>
		<p><b>Schedule II Species List</b> <b>ANIMAL AND PLANT SPECIES OF COMMUNITY INTEREST WHOSE CONSERVATION REQUIRES THE DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION</b> Page 10 onwards  We suggest that the species list for Microchiroptera is amended to the following:  <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> <i>Myotis punicus</i> <i>Plecotus gaislerii</i> <i>Hypsugo savii</i> <i>Nyctalus noctula</i></p>	<p>Schedule II directly transposes the species listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive and hence, the species therein cannot be removed without impinging on the correct transposition of the concerned Directive. However, all bat species, including those not reported from Malta, are protected through Annex IV and Schedule V of the Directive and the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44), respectively.</p> <p>It is noted that Habitats Directive requires a co-ordinated effort from all Member States to enable the comparison in relation to Natura 2000 sites, as well as adequate conservation of protected species and</p>

		<p>The existent list only serves to distract and confuse unfamiliar citizens with the current species list and the rare species within it. The proposed list is not a comprehensive list of local resident species however it presents those in smaller numbers, of high conservation value.</p>	<p>habitats. Notwithstanding, that listed protected species are not present in all Member States, Union co-operation is still required from non-range states particularly to control the transport, sale and exchange of protected specimens taken from the wild.</p>
		<p><b>Schedule II Species List</b>  <b>ANIMAL AND PLANT SPECIES OF COMMUNITY INTEREST WHOSE CONSERVATION REQUIRES THE DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION</b></p> <p>Megachiroptera  We suggest that reference to <i>Rousettus aegyptiacus</i> is removed from the legislation as there have been no records of this species in Malta to our knowledge</p>	<p>Although this species is not reported from the Maltese Islands, it is included in the EU Habitats Directive. The implementation of the Directive requires a co-ordinated effort from all Member States to enable the comparison in relation to Natura 2000 sites, as well as adequate conservation of protected species and habitats and the control the transport, sale and exchange of protected specimens taken from the wild throughout the EU.</p>
		<p><b>Schedule III ANIMAL AND PLANT SPECIES OF NATIONAL INTEREST WHOSE CONSERVATION REQUIRES THE DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION</b></p> <p><i>Myotis punicus</i>  <i>Plecotus gaislerii</i>  <i>Hypsugo savii</i></p>	<p>These species are already addressed and protected through the Flora, Fauna and Natural Habitats Protection Regulations (S.L. 549.44) and its Part IV and Schedule V.</p>