



# ***Event Report***

**EPPA National Workshop on Implementation of the EU Zoos  
Directive**

**11-12 May 2022**

**Hybrid event**

**In Skopje, North Macedonia**

**And by live video conference**



This Project is funded by the European Union

**NIRAS** **umweltbundesamt<sup>U</sup>**

The project implemented by the Consortium of NIRAS (lead)  
and Umweltbundesamt GmbH

## 1 The event

EPPA's National Workshop on the Implementation of the EU Zoos Directive for North Macedonia took place on the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> of May 2022 in a hybrid format (in Skopje and via live video conference). The workshop was organized in cooperation with TAIEX, and under the EPPA project work programme, namely activity 5.3.2 "Assistance on establishing permitting systems". The aim of the workshop was to strengthen the capacities of North Macedonia to improve the implementation of the Council Directive 1999/22/EC of 29 March 1999 (Zoos Directive) relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos.

The participants came from the relevant North Macedonian authorities and institutions involved in the Zoos Directive transposition and implementation, namely the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, the Ministry of Finance and Customs Administration, the State Environmental Inspectorate, the Food and Veterinary Agency, the Bitola Zoo, the Zoo Skopje, Skopje University, the Skopje City Council, the Macedonian Ecological Society, the Natural History Museum Skopje, and the Public Communal Enterprise ISAR. Details are available in the list of participants. The EU Delegation in North Macedonia was also present, together with DG ENV and EPPA project experts.

The speakers represented a mixture of the experiences of EU Member States and of North Macedonia. EU Member States were represented as follows: Zagreb Zoo (Croatia), Warsaw Zoo (Poland), Antwerp Zoo Center for Research and Conservation (Belgium), University of Southern Denmark, Odisee University of Applied Sciences (Belgium), Charles University (Czech Republic), European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA), Ministry of Agriculture of Hungary (biodiversity/CITES department), Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests (Portugal), and the Food Safety Agency of Bulgaria. North Macedonia experiences were shared by the Bitola Zoo, Skopje Zoo, and the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (nature department). Details are available in the agenda; the presentations can be downloaded in both the TAIEX website and in the EPPA project website.

The workshop's main outputs were:

- Strengthened national capacity of North Macedonia to effectively transpose and implement the Zoos Directive.
- Review of the state of the art on the transposition and implementation of the Zoos Directive in North Macedonia.
- Shared best implementation practices and knowledge of the Zoos Directive by EU Member States and relevant European associations, from both the perspective of competent authorities and zoos.
- Awareness raised on the available resources to practitioners to improve zoo management and compliance according to the Zoos Directive.
- Awareness raised on the role of inspections and enforcement in enhancing zoos capacity to comply with the legal framework.

## 2 Proceedings and conclusions

The workshop started with a look at the state of the art in terms of the Zoos Directive's transposition and implementation in North Macedonia, presented by Mr. Aleksandar Janevski. His introduction was complemented by Mr. Kristijan Stamenov and Mr. Marijan Nalovski, who presented Skopje and Bitola zoos current measures to align with the Directive. After a discussion on the major needs of the country in terms of Zoos Directive implementation and capacities, the workshop advanced to the sharing of knowledge and experience by EU Member States experts, a first contribution to support North Macedonia in its efforts.

Mr. João Loureiro presented the Portuguese experience with the implementation of the Directive. The Directive was transposed through several legal acts passed in 2003/2004 and in 2012, where a Ethics and Zoological Parks Committee was established, as well as provisions for licensing, education and scientific activities, and the attribution of legal competences. In 2021, the legal framework was amended to mandate the Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests to become the competent authority to implement the Directive. This legislation interacts with other national regulatory frameworks, for instance the Birds and Habitats, invasive alien species and wildlife trade.



The legislation includes criteria for the evaluation of educational and scientific activities, including animal welfare, soft and hard infrastructure for educational purposes, staff-training required, activity reports and inclusion of native species in educational programmes. Such educational and scientific activities can take place in situ (in the natural habitat) or ex situ (in a zoo). The competent authority also cooperates with several zoos in the country to keep specimens seized under CITES regulations. Inspection has a key role in encouraging the development of best practices. For this, it is essential that guidance and training is provided to inspectors to carry out effective inspections.

Mr. João Loureiro also reflected on the articulation between the Zoos Directive and the CITES regulations. Zoos and aquariums, exhibiting a wide a variety of animals, are often involved in international movements of and trade in wild and captive bred animals, many of which are protected under CITES. CITES calls on zoos and aquariums to better support the CITES trade regulation regime and to join the fight against illegal trade in wildlife. As such, it is important that there is coordination between the national entities, and between EU Member States, responsible for the implementation of CITES and the Zoos Directive. A second point of contact is the role of zoos as end sites for confiscate specimens, following the guidelines of the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums, should human care or returning to the wild be deemed a viable option. In this case issues of animal welfare, proper facilities, cooperation between authorities, etc., can all be bottlenecks. The Portuguese competent authority has agreements with 10 institutions throughout the country for the disposal of seized exotic species. Therefore, zoos and aquariums continue to play a vital role in serving as rescue centers for wildlife that has been intercepted in illegal trade. The pressure on rescue centers have been increasing as the scale of illegal trade has grown, along with the response, which is seeing many more seizures. Clear protocols between zoos and aquariums serving as rescue centers and enforcement authorities is very important in this regard.

However, prevention and conservation should take the lead in order to avoid the need for disposal. It is also critically important for zoos and aquariums to involve themselves more deeply in in situ conservation and to engage with and support local communities living amongst wildlife, especially for communities from where your animals are, or have historically been, sourced. Ensuring local communities derive a benefit from wildlife is critical to combatting poaching and smuggling at source.

Mr. Levente Kőrösi presented the Hungarian experience with the implementation of the Directive. Hungarian zoo legislation was passed in 2001, establishing the rules for the establishment, operation and maintenance of zoos, as well as minimum requirements for housing conditions. The implementation of the provisions is carried out by the regional Nature Conservation Offices and the State Veterinary and Phytosanitary Services. According to Hungarian legislation zoos serve primarily for nature protection, animal welfare and education; they are not allowed to have a commercial purpose.

Operating licenses include visiting rules, animal health plans, list of species and feeding programmes, certification on financial viability, among others. A set of special rules is applied to rescued specimens, quarantines, protected species and dangerous animals. The licenses can be withdrawn in case of non-compliance, but license amendments, temporary suspensions or partial closures are also possible. The licensing authority controls adherence to the license terms.

In terms of conservation, zoos have ex situ breeding programmes for indigenous species, which eventually result in release into the wild. Zoos also have a role in receiving seized specimens, with attempts made to reintroduce them in their natural habitats, in public education, and in the implementation of the invasive species regulation.

Ms. Myfanwy Griffith discussed the Zoos Directive requirements regarding article 3, which mandates obligatory measures for public education and awareness, animal care, prevent escapes and pests, and keeping records; and optional measures for research, training, exchange of information, captive breeding, repopulation or reintroduction of species into the wild. Regarding the optional measures, there are several practitioner resources available: EAZA documents<sup>1</sup>, the Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research<sup>2</sup>, the European Professional Zookeeper Qualification Framework<sup>3</sup>, and EU level good

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.eaza.net/about-us/eazadocuments/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.izar.org/izar>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.zookeepers.eu/>



practice collections<sup>4</sup>. Optional measures should be quantifiable and can be direct and/or indirect contributions to the conservation of species.

Regarding the obligatory measures, there are also resources available to support practitioners. In addition to those already identified above, WAZA has information on education strategies<sup>5</sup>, and EAZA offers guidance on animal welfare standards and preventing the escape of animals in order to avoid possible ecological threats<sup>6</sup>. The EU Zoos Directive Good Practices Document<sup>7</sup> also includes information on record keeping.

Ms. Dominika Formanová presented the Czech experience with the implementation of the Directive. The situation is two-sided. In the one hand there are 15 traditional zoos active in the Czech Republic, all of them under public ownership and management. The smallest of them had 130 000 visitors in 2019, while the largest had 1 500 000 visitors in the same year. The zoos also have conservation and education missions, and they make information publicly available through annual reports, media attention, etc. Since the 1990s, new private facilities started emerging, which include private zoos, minizoo, farms, etc. In general, they have little information about their activities available, they are small and financially dependent on admission fees and private resources, and in general do not have capacity for education and conservation activities. There are currently 13 such private entities.

The Czech Republic transposed the Directive in 2003, in which it also defined what is a zoo, subject to a license from the Ministry of Environment. The licensing procedure depends on previous inspections from several entities and a final decision by the Ministry. Licenses can be granted indefinitely or conditionally, but they can be withdrawn at any time in case of non-compliance with the various requirements regarding care and management conditions, veterinary care, participation in conservation activities, record keeping, qualified staff, etc.

However, the licensing process itself can be problematic. There have been cases of licensed private zoos associated with known animal smugglers, and where animals had unclear origins. Another case has been that of a private zoo associated with an animal trading company, or that of dubious involvement in conservation and education projects. In sum, the licensing process only works if the legislation is sufficiently detailed and clear and if there is due diligence by the authorities involved. Additionally, the Czech Republic has also seen an increase in illegal zoos – usually temporary places where animals are in captivity and that can be visited by special appointment in exchange for a “donation”. These places have links with animal smugglers or with animal trade and have no conservation or education activities.

Ms. Agnieszka Czujkowska put forward the Warsaw Zoo experience with meeting the requirements of the Directive in terms of animal conditions, population management and staff training. The main objective of animal accommodation is to provide the ideal conditions for preservation. This is achieved through proper enclosures, suitable environments, nutrition, and veterinary care. Animal care is coordinated by a curator, who manages all aspects of management, including record keeping, developing habitat conditions, oversee staff, participating in educational activities, among others. Animal keepers prepare food and feed the animals, handle the animals, keep facilities clean, monitor behaviour and health. Veterinarians have a horizontal role. Apart from veterinary tasks, they also coordinate nutritional programmes, breeding activities, emergency care, among others. A key aspect to accommodation is to ensure financial security, as some of the requirements can be expensive. Knowledge and expertise sharing, as well as training are essential for staff to perform their functions adequately.

Ms. Agnieszka Czujkowska then focused on the issues of record keeping, which means collecting information in a complete, accurate, and logical manner in order to be useful regarding compliance with the other conservation measures as well as with the general objectives of the Zoos Directive. The records also support inspection and licensing, and they are essential for a zoo when planning and executing conservation, education, and veterinary care programmes. Conservation activities depend on good

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/pdf/EU\\_Zoos\\_Directive\\_Good\\_Practices.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/pdf/EU_Zoos_Directive_Good_Practices.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.waza.org/priorities/community-conservation/the-ize-waza-education-strategy/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.eaza.net/conservation/programmes/>

<sup>7</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/pdf/EU\\_Zoos\\_Directive\\_Good\\_Practices.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/pdf/EU_Zoos_Directive_Good_Practices.pdf)



animal records. The Warsaw Zoo uses the ZIMS software<sup>8</sup> for its record keeping. All information about each animal is stored there. Curators are responsible for the accuracy and updating of the data. Poor record keeping hinders improvements in animal management and husbandry and animal welfare might be negatively impacted. Legal citations for incomplete or inaccurate records can lead to costly fines and suspension of permits.

Zoos also need to have measures to prevent escape. The main goal is to avoid threats to indigenous species and prevent outside pests from spreading. Thus, zoos need to have an assessment of species in their collection and the ways in which they may pose a threat to the local ecosystem. This involves knowing the animal and its potential, safe enclosures, and emergency plans.

Ms. Agnieszka Czujkowska presented the best enforcement practices related to the Directive in the EU. In Poland, failure to comply with a zoo license or holding a license that is not in accordance with the Zoos Directive is a legal ground for zoo closure. However, given the potential costs and consequences of closing a zoo, for instance, the need to find solutions for the animals, it is recommended that zoo closures are a last resort measure. Authorities should put emphasis on regular inspections and use them constructively to build zoo capacities and compliance, as well as cooperation with specialized civil society organizations.

Nevertheless, situations may arise where zoos close temporarily or permanently, and totally or partially. In any of these cases, it is necessary to activate a plan for the animals' care and accommodation. Such a plan may consider the following possibilities: maintaining some animals in the zoo when the appropriate conditions can be met; transfer to other institutions when the appropriate conditions cannot be met or when the zoo is to close permanently; euthanasia, when no appropriate institution for relocation can be found or if animals are sick or injured to such a degree that euthanasia is recommended and legally permitted by the applicable regulations. Therefore, a zoo closure is a multi-stakeholder event involving authorities, the concerned zoo, zoo associations and other zoos, rescue centres and sanctuaries, and NGOs. National financial support for rescue centres and sanctuaries facilitates their work and provides authorities with places where animals can be relocated in case of closure. The EU Zoos Directive Good Practices Document contains additional information on zoos closure protocols.

There's a European Alliance of Rescue Centres and Sanctuaries (EARS, 18 centres) that could be contacted. Zoo closures don't happen quite often as authorities first give the establishment time to improve. However, a clear plan is needed to bring zoos into compliance. If the final closure decision is taken, standardised closure protocols might be useful. It is also important to prevent non-compliant zoos from opening, based on the licencing and inspection obligations. Penalties are often counterproductive, as they render zoos unable to invest and implement the required changes. Germany pointed to the fact that local authorities might not be experienced with zoo closure, and it is often not clear who will have to pay for re-homing the animals. Eurogroup for Animals suggested making the financial liability of the zoo owner part of the licence. They also reminded that a closure protocol is embedded in the licencing system of some Member States. In Italy, a zoo has to sign an agreement with another zoo to take care of animals in case of closure.

Ms. Hilde Vervaecke presented the Flemish (Belgium) practice with zoos regulation development. The minimum standards for zoos were introduced in 1999. The experience of its application led to the discovery of inconsistencies and the subsequent creation of a working group to revise the legislation for mammals. The working group was composed of zoo curators, veterinarians, and scientists. Their evaluation of zoo conditions and possible reforms was based on a method that privileged animal needs, correct problems, and found a compromise between science and practice. This approach is important because best practice guidelines are often based in approaches that worked in specific circumstances but are in fact not based in evidence. In this case, to define what are the needs of an animal, its natural history, behavioural biology, and adaptive potential have to be taken into account. Animal space needs to be functional and qualitatively well-designed, but also animal welfare needs to be scientifically understood and a subject of training for zoo staff.

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://zims.species360.org/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2f>



Ms. Andrea Bračko presented Zagreb Zoo's experience with conservation projects. One of its strong points has been education for conservation, an area in which the zoo invested. Currently, the zoo has 2 education centers staffed by 3 educators. They are assisted by 25 students and 18 volunteers. This resulted in 37 educational programmes, which had by now 1044 sessions and reached 28710 users (2018 data). Additionally, the zoo also cooperates with vocational schools and higher education institutions to provide traineeships. At the community level, the zoo supports the development of green solutions for cities (for which it cooperates with the City of Zagreb), such as biofilters, green roofs, rainwater retention systems, fostering and protecting urban biodiversity, etc., as well as local campaigns of awareness raising regarding urban biodiversity. The zoo also adopted the European Zookeeper Qualification Framework to ensure that its staff is trained and appropriately skilled.

Since 2017, the Zagreb Zoo operates a rescue centre for the treatment and rehabilitation of strictly protected species and other species. Its main objective is to reintroduce the animals to their habitats and thus foster population growth. In just 2 years, the rescue centre admitted close to 3000 specimens. The Zoo also participates in in situ conservation in Lake Cornino and in the Cres Island. Regarding invasive species, the zoo has been involved in the development of a system, and management, for invasive alien species in Croatia, which includes elimination and recovery of specific ecosystems.

The case of the Zagreb Zoo shows that these institutions can be a powerful partner in wider efforts of biodiversity preservation and contribute to policy goals established for instance in the UN Convention on Biological Diversity and the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030.

Mr. Zjef Pereboom presented an example of conservation through a case study of cinereous vultures<sup>9</sup>. Black Vulture is a species of Community Interest, found in Annex I of the Birds Directive, Appendix II of Bern, Bonn Convention and CITES. In addition, Black Vulture is listed Near-threatened Global IUCN Red List Category C1 and SPEC 1 Rare in Europe according to BirdLife International. The species chosen to promote and support the restoration of Black Vulture - Griffon Vulture is also on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Appendix II of Bern, Bonn Convention and CITES.

A Status Assessment of Birds in the EU (BirdLife 2014) classifies Black Vulture as "Rare" and SPEC1, despite noting a "Large increase". This increase corresponds to the trend of the species on the Iberian Peninsula and the successful restoration activities in France. In Bulgaria the species is Extinct, listed in Annex II and III of the Biological Diversity Act. The ultimate aim of the project was to establish a nesting population of Black Vultures in Bulgaria, in order to restore the connections between the sub-populations of the species on the Balkans (Greece) and Crimea and to these in the Alps and the Iberian Peninsula, facilitating the re-creation of a much more sustainable Pan-European population. In particular, the project imported and released 60 birds in the Balkan Mountains and the Struma Valley, while improving the nesting conditions and food base and reducing the threats of poisoning and electrocutions.

Ms. Silvia Peeva gave an overview of the activities and challenges of Bulgaria's zoos. The activities include entertainment, keeping and breeding endangered species, education, and research. Most of the Bulgarian zoos were established in the 1950s and 1960s. In those years the materials for housing were chain link fences, cells, and cages. Today, zoo managers want to update them through renovation and modernization to a kind of similar with their natural environment. But all this requires funding, which is never enough. The Sofia Zoo has a scientific and education centre which organizes programmes of environmental education (for instance, summer schools), prepares public information campaigns, cooperates with civil society organizations, and participates in research. Among the research projects it participated in, one can find a project for the conservation of Egyptian vultures, and breeding programmes for polar bears. The Zoo also had success with breeding some of its species ex-situ. The main challenges are the lack of a specific law on zoos; lack of adequate financing; lack of coordination between competent institutions; lack of staff and high turnover of staff making it difficult to retain skilled people; lack of veterinary equipment; outdated infrastructure; and a hostile NGO sector.

In conclusion, the workshop offered a 360 degree perspective on the implementation of the Zoos Directive in several EU Member States, including success stories, lessons learned and best practices, but

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://greenbalkans.org/>



also points of failure that North Macedonia should take into account while developing its governance system for zoos.

### 3 Evaluation

The workshop was evaluated by the participants, post-event, using the TAIEX workshop evaluation tool. The summary table of the evaluation results is presented below.

			Nr Responses	Expert Score	Yes / Excellent	No / Good	Partially / Satisfactory	
81854	Workshop - participant - A. Questions	1. Was the workshop carried out according to the agenda?	19	-	19 (100%)	-	-	
		2. Was the programme well structured?	19	-	18 (95%)	-	1 (5%)	
		3. Were the key issues related to the topics addressed?	19	-	19 (100%)	-	-	
		4. Did the workshop enable you to improve your knowledge?	19	-	17 (89%)	-	2 (11%)	
		5. Was enough time allowed for questions and discussions?	19	-	17 (89%)	-	2 (11%)	
		7. Do you expect any follow-up based on the results of the workshop (new legislation, new administrative approach, etc.)?	19	-	19 (100%)	-	-	
		8. Do you think that further TAIEX - IPA, ENI assistance is needed (workshop, expert mission, study visit, assessment mission) on the topic of this workshop?	19	-	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	-	
		Workshop - participant - B. Expert ratings	Mr. De Bastos Laureiro, Joao Jose - Speaker MS	19	96.85%	16 (84%)	3 (16%)	-
	Mr. Korosi, Levente - Speaker MS		19	94.73%	16 (84%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	
	Mr. Trpeski, Vlatko - Speaker CC		19	89.47%	12 (63%)	6 (32%)	1 (5%)	
	Mr. Nalowski, Marjan - Speaker CC		19	92.1%	13 (68%)	6 (32%)	-	
Mr. Pereboom, Jeffrey - Speaker MS	19		92.1%	15 (79%)	3 (16%)	-		
Mr. Stamenov, Kristijan - Speaker CC	19		89.47%	13 (68%)	5 (26%)	-		
Ms. Brčko, Andrea - Speaker MS	19		89.47%	14 (74%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)		
Ms. Conde, Dalla - Speaker MS	19		93.42%	16 (84%)	2 (11%)	-		
Ms. Czujkowska, Agnieszka - Speaker MS	19		96.85%	16 (84%)	3 (16%)	-		
Ms. Formanová, Dominika - Speaker MS	19		94.73%	16 (84%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)		
81854	Workshop - participant - B. Expert ratings	Ms. Griffith, Mylanwy - Speaker MS	19	92.1%	14 (74%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	
		Ms. Pava, Silvia - Speaker MS	19	84.21%	10 (53%)	7 (37%)	1 (5%)	
		Ms. Vervaecke, Hilde - Speaker MS	19	92.1%	14 (74%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	
		Workshop - participant - C. Logistic Ratings	1. Conference venue	17	-	17 (100%)	-	-
			2. Interpretation	17	-	16 (94%)	-	1 (6%)
			3. Hotel	16	-	16 (100%)	-	-
			4. Flight	7	-	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	-
			5. Catering	15	-	15 (100%)	-	-
	6. Was the communication leading up to the event satisfactory?		16	-	16 (100%)	-	-	
	7. Was the pre-event test useful?		10	-	10 (100%)	-	-	
	8. Did you find the virtual event platform easily accessible?		10	-	10 (100%)	-	-	
9. Was the platform user-friendly?	10		-	10 (100%)	-	-		
10. Did the host provide adequate instructions during the event, on the use of the platform and in problem solving?	12		-	12 (100%)	-	-		
11. Was the IT support provided adequate?	14	-	14 (100%)	-	-			
81854	Workshop - speaker - A. Questions	1. Did you receive all the information necessary for the preparation of your contribution?	7	-	7 (100%)	-	-	
		2. Has the overall aim of the workshop been achieved?	7	-	7 (100%)	-	-	
		3. Was the agenda well structured?	7	-	5 (71%)	-	2 (29%)	
		4. Were the participants present throughout the scheduled workshop?	7	-	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	
		5. Was the beneficiary represented by the appropriate participants?	7	-	7 (100%)	-	-	
		6. Did the participants actively take part in the discussions?	7	-	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	-	
		7. Do you expect that the beneficiary will undertake follow-up based on the results of the workshop (new legislation, new administrative approach etc.)?	7	-	4 (57%)	-	-	
		8. Do you think that the beneficiary needs further TAIEX - IPA, ENI assistance (workshop, expert mission, study visit, assessment mission) on the topic of this workshop?	7	-	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	-	
	Workshop - speaker - C. Logistic Ratings	1. Conference venue	2	-	2 (100%)	-	-	
		2. Interpretation	2	-	1 (50%)	-	1 (50%)	
		3. Hotel	2	-	2 (100%)	-	-	
4. Flight		2	-	-	-	2 (100%)		
5. Catering		2	-	2 (100%)	-	-		
81854	Workshop - speaker - C. Logistic Ratings	6. Was the communication leading up to the event satisfactory?	6	-	6 (100%)	-	-	
		7. Was the pre-event test useful?	6	-	6 (100%)	-	-	
		8. Did you find the virtual event platform easily accessible?	6	-	6 (100%)	-	-	
		9. Was the platform user-friendly?	6	-	6 (100%)	-	-	
		10. Did the host provide adequate instructions during the event, on the use of the platform and in problem solving?	6	-	6 (100%)	-	-	
		11. Was the IT support provided adequate?	6	-	6 (100%)	-	-	
	Workshop - speaker - D. Comments	As online presenter I did not see the public in the room on location. There were few if any discussions. Joining online made difficult to answer questions about those in the room. I was not in the end session where the event was summarised. This makes it hard to say if the event achieved all the organizers wanted and/or if further workshop is needed from their point of view. The programme contained lots of information from a good range of speakers and sources that should help authorities develop legislation. Less frontal presentation is needed. The workshop would have been more interactive. Participants should have been involved more through practical examples, solving of situations, case studies etc. Many thanks to Alexander-IT colleague who was very kind helper to all of us. Really good event, like all of the TAIEX workshops. Good luck to all and many health.						



## Endnotes

---

\* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSC 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

## Annexes

---

Annex 1: Agenda (provided as a separate document)

Annex 2: List of Participants (provided as a separate document)

Annex 3: Presentations (provided as a separate document)



This Project is funded by the European Union

**NIRAS**

**umweltbundesamt**<sup>®</sup>

The project implemented by the Consortium of NIRAS (lead) and  
Umweltbundesamt GmbH



This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the Niras IC Sp. z o.o. and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.