



# Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*)

AEWA European Goose Management Platform

**AEWA EGMP Programme No. 3**



AEWA European Goose Management Platform

**Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the  
Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the  
Barnacle Goose**

*Branta leucopsis*

*AEWA EGMP Programme No. 3*

**December 2021**

*Lifespan of Plan*

**6 years (2021 – 2026)**

*Prepared by*

**Aarhus University/AEWA European Goose Management Platform Data Centre,  
Rubicon Foundation and UNEP/AEWA Secretariat**

**Adopting Frameworks:**

Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG)

**Organisations leading on the preparation of the plan:**

Aarhus University/AEWA European Goose Management Platform Data Centre, Rubicon Foundation and UNEP/AEWA Secretariat

**Compiled by:** Szabolcs Nagy<sup>1</sup>, Henning Heldbjerg<sup>2</sup>, Gitte Høj Jensen<sup>2</sup>, Fred Johnson<sup>2</sup>, Jesper Madsen<sup>2</sup>, Ole Therkildsen<sup>2</sup>, Eva Meyers<sup>3</sup> and Sergey Dereliev<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rubicon Foundation

<sup>2</sup> EGMP Data Centre, Aarhus University, Department of Bioscience

<sup>3</sup> UNEP/AEWA Secretariat

**Date of adoption: 22 June 2021**

**Lifespan and Review of the Plan:** The lifespan of this Adaptive Flyway Management Plan (AFMP) is 6 years (2021-2026). It should be reviewed every 6 years (first revision in 2026). An emergency review will be undertaken if there is a significant change to the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose before the next scheduled review.

**Milestones in the preparation of the Plan:**

A process for the development of the AFMP for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose was formally adopted by the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG) at the EGM IWG4 in June 2019 in Perth, UK.

The first draft of this document was presented for consultation to EGM IWG and adopted at the EGM IWG5 held in June 2020 in an online conference format.

The second and final draft of the document was circulated for review to the Barnacle Goose Task Force (Russia/Germany & Netherlands population) and submitted to the EGM IWG6. Including the new sections and updates as well as the amendments requested at the meeting, the final draft was adopted at the EGM IWG6 held remotely in June 2021.

**AEWA European Goose Management Platform (EGMP):**

Please send any additional information or comments regarding this document to the AEWA European Goose Management Platform Coordinator, Eva Meyers ([eva.meyers@un.org](mailto:eva.meyers@un.org))

**Photo cover:** © Nina Mikander

**Recommended citation:**

Nagy S., Heldbjerg H., Jensen G.H., Johnson F.A., Madsen J., Therkildsen O., Meyers E., Dereliev S., (Compilers). AEWA EGMP (2021) *Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose (Branta leucopsis)*. AEWA EGMP Programme No. 3. Bonn, Germany.

**Disclaimer:** The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP/AEWA concerning the legal status of any State, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of their frontiers and boundaries.





## Table of Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations	6
Introduction	7
1. Definitions of Management Units (MUs)	11
2. Definitions of Favourable Reference Values (FRVs)	12
3. Cumulative impact of derogation and legal hunting	16
4. Monitoring indicators and programmes	18
5. Protocols for the iterative phase	19
Annex 1. Population-specific workplans	23
Annex 2. Box 1 of the ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose	23
Annex 3. Population Models	46
Appendix A Different priors for the CV of the derogation offtake	78
Appendix B Differential vulnerability to derogation offtake of juveniles	81
Appendix C Different coefficients of variation for observation errors	83
Appendix D Bias in reported derogation offtake	91
Appendix E IPM data input file	94
Appendix E R/JAGS code	96
Annex 4. Impact Models	105
Annex 5. Indicator factsheets	107
Annex 6. Protocols for the iterative phase	115

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

AEWA	Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds
AFMP	Adaptive Flyway Management Programme
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
EC	European Commission
EGM IWG	European Goose Management International Working Group
EGM IWG4 / IWG5/ IWG6	The 4 <sup>th</sup> / 5 <sup>th</sup> / 6 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the EGM IWG
EGMP	(AEWA) European Goose Management Platform
FCS	Favourable Conservation Status
FRH	Favourable Reference Habitat (in sense of ‘habitat for the species’ DG Environment, 2017)
FRP	Favourable Reference Population
FRR	Favourable Reference Range
ISSMP	International Single Species Management Plan (Jensen <i>et al.</i> , 2018)
MOP	Meeting of the Parties
MU	Management Unit

## Introduction

The International Single Species Management Plan (ISSMP) for the Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis* (Jensen et al., 2018) was developed according to Paragraph 4.3.4 of the AEWA's Annex 3. This provides for developing ISSMPs for populations which cause significant damage, in particular, to crops and fisheries. In addition, it responds to AEWA Resolution 6.4, which requested the establishment of a multispecies goose management platform and process to address the sustainable use of goose populations and to provide for the resolution of human-goose conflicts, targeting as a matter of priority Barnacle and Greylag Geese.

The ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose was adopted at the 7<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of the Parties to AEWA (MOP7), 4-8 December 2018 in Durban, South Africa. The ISSMP provides a mandate for developing population-specific Adaptive Flyway Management Programmes (AFMP) for each population of the Barnacle Goose, recognising that there are regional differences in migratory behaviour and the human-wildlife conflicts involved in some population. This AFMP shall be formally adopted by the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG) and then reviewed periodically.

A process for the development of the AFMP for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose was formally adopted by the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG) at the EGM IWG4 in June 2019 in Perth, UK ([document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.12/Rev.1](#)) and a first draft (pending the missing sections to be developed) of the AFMP was submitted to the EGM IWG5 and adopted in June 2020 as document [AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18](#).

In addition, document AEWA/EGMIWG/5.12 was provided as an overview and roadmap for the finalization of the pending BG AFMP sections and for the implementation of the AFMP for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose in the next 6 years until 2026.

During the intersessional period and ahead of the 6th Meeting of the EGM IWG (EGM IWG6), the EGMP Data Centre, the Secretariat and the Barnacle Goose Task Force (established at EGM IWG5), developed the missing sections of the BG AFMP.

The draft BG AFMP, including the new sections was circulated for consultation within the Barnacle Goose Task Force on 19 April 2021, providing members of the Task Force an opportunity to comment on the newly added sections and initiate a national consultation process.

This is the final version of the document adopted at EGM IWG6 and including all additions/updates agreed on at the meeting.

Table 1 provides an overview of the sections remaining to be developed under this AFMP in the upcoming years.

**Table 1.** Overview of the AFMP sections remaining to be developed, including the timeline, lead and resources required (and secured).

AFMP sections under development	Timeline	Lead	Resources required
Annex 3: Population model update with data for MU2 and MU3	TBD	EGMP Data Centre and Dutch Research Consortium	TBD  Dutch Research Consortium received EUR 45,000 from the Dutch Government.  Full funding pending.
Annex 4: Impact models	By May 2021  (pending funding)	EGMP Data Centre and Dutch Research Consortium	EUR 150,000 (shared between Greylag Goose and Russian and East Greenland Barnacle Goose over 2 years) as well as Dutch funding  The in-kind contribution of Dutch Research Consortium is EUR 120,000 over 2020-2021 paid for by the Dutch Government.  Full funding pending.

The timeline shown in Table 2 provides an overview of the envisaged process starting from the EGM IWG4 in June 2019 up until 2026, in which various elements of the AFMP can realistically be developed and delivered subject to the availability of resources.

The purpose of this AFMP is to establish an agreement amongst Range States of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose on the implementation of those activities in the Barnacle Goose ISSMP that require coordination at the population and/or Management Unit (MU) level. Specifically, this AFMP addresses the following issues:

- 1) Definition of MUs (Chapter 1);
- 2) Definition of Favourable Reference Values (FRVs) for the population and its MUs (Chapter 2);
- 3) Provide a consolidated assessment of damages and risks caused by this population of Barnacle Goose (Annexes 2 and 4);
- 4) Establish protocols to assess the cumulative impact of all offtake including both derogations and legal hunting, where allowed (Chapter 3);
- 5) Establish indicators (Chapter 4 and Annex 5).

The implementation of further activities of the Barnacle Goose ISSMP is elaborated in the population-specific workplans. Annex 1 provides guidance on developing such workplans.

It should be noted, however, that Range States remain responsible for national planning and implementation within the framework of the ISSMP including their derogation measures under the provisions of Articles 9 of the Birds Directive and the Bern Convention.

This AFMP covers the period of 2020 – 2026.



**Table 2.** Overview of the next steps and timeline for the finalisation and the implementation of the AFMP

Process	EGM IWG4 June 2019	EGM IWG5 June 2020	EGM IWG6 June 2021	EGM IWG7 June 2022	EGM IWG8 June 2023	EGM IWG9 June 2024	EGM IWG10 June 2025	EGM IWG11 June 2026
AFMP development	AFMP process agreed	1st Draft AFMP ready for adoption	Review and adopt complete AFMP, including missing sections					Evaluation and revision AFMP
	MUs agreed	FRVs agreed	FRVs finalised					
			Population model (IPM) expanded to MUs 2 and 3					
			Pilot impact model developed for 2 countries	Impact model expanded to 3 countries				
AFMP implementation		Annual workplans developed	Review annual workplans	Review annual workplans	Review annual workplans	Review annual workplans	Review annual workplans	Review annual workplans
Indicators		Collection of data for indicators starts	Collection of data for indicators	Collection of data for indicators	Collection of data for indicators	Collection of data for indicators	Collection of data for indicators	Collection of data for indicators
							Reporting on all indicators	

Management of offtake / coordination of derogations				Evaluation of potential bias in offtake completed				
				Assessment and prediction of the cumulative impact of offtake			Assessment and prediction of the cumulative impact of offtake	
				Systematic monitoring programme in place				
			January counts	January counts	January counts	January counts	January counts	January counts
		July counts in countries with existing schemes	Roll-out July counts in each Range States of MUs 2 and 3			July counts in MUs 2 and 3		
			Reporting offtake for 2020/2021	Reporting offtake For derogation per month	Reporting offtake For derogation per month	Reporting offtake For derogation per month	Reporting offtake For derogation per month	Reporting offtake For derogation per month
			Crippling rate monitoring	Crippling rate monitoring	Crippling rate monitoring	Crippling rate monitoring	Crippling rate monitoring	Crippling rate monitoring


## 1. Definitions of Management Units (MUs)

Management unit definitions were agreed at the EGM IWG4 in June 2019 (see document Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/4.15<sup>1</sup>). Accordingly, three management units are recognised, all wintering in the same range in the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Denmark and south Sweden<sup>2</sup>:

**MU1:** The arctic Russian breeding population (migratory).

**MU2:** The temperate Baltic breeding population (migratory).

**MU3:** The temperate North Sea breeding population, breeding in the Netherlands, Germany and south-west Denmark (considered sedentary)



**Figure 1.** Agreed management units of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of Barnacle Goose.

<sup>1</sup>[https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/meeting\\_files/documents/AEWA\\_EGM\\_IWG\\_4\\_15\\_Def\\_BG\\_MUs.pdf](https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/meeting_files/documents/AEWA_EGM_IWG_4_15_Def_BG_MUs.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Norway and Belgium were removed from MU2 and MU3, respectively, because these countries do not recognise their breeding populations as naturally occurring ones.

## 2. Definitions of Favourable Reference Values (FRVs)

Following EGM IWG4, a revised document setting out the principles of defining FRVs for the Barnacle Goose was circulated on 7 October 2019. This version was revised based on written feedback from Range States and a workshop held with the European Commission (EC) and EU Member States on 31 January 2020 in Brussels. A final version of the document was circulated to the EGM IWG on 24 March 2020 ([AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.11](https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/meeting_files/information_documents/AEWA_EGM_IWG5_Inf_5_11_FRVs_BG.pdf)<sup>3</sup>).

### Favourable Reference Populations (FRPs)

The FRP is proposed to be set at the Agreement Value (i.e. around the year 2000) level, i.e. **380,000 individuals for the entire wintering population**. This represents the situation when the population has exceeded the carrying capacity of the staging areas in the Baltic (Eichhorn *et al.*, 2009).

The Favourable Reference Populations for the breeding season in the **Baltic and North Sea MUs (MU2 and MU3)** were to be defined by each Range State that recognises the Barnacle Goose as a naturally occurring breeding species. If a Range State has not communicated any values to the AEWA Secretariat or it has not notified it that species is not a naturally occurring breeding species in its territory, the best single value, or if it was not given, the geometric mean of the minimum and maximum population estimates from the country's EU Birds Directive Article 12 report for the 2013 – 2018 period were taken as breeding FRPs<sup>4</sup>. The FRP for MU1 is 113,000 pairs, for each **MU2 and MU3 it is 12,000 pairs** and for the whole population is 137,000 pairs (Table 3).

---

<sup>3</sup>[https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/meeting\\_files/information\\_documents/AEWA\\_EGM\\_IWG5\\_Inf\\_5\\_11\\_FRVs\\_BG.pdf](https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/meeting_files/information_documents/AEWA_EGM_IWG5_Inf_5_11_FRVs_BG.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> If a Member State has reported the population size as a range of a minimum and maximum population estimate, the geometric mean of these values is used to produce a single FRP value.

**Table 3.** Breeding FRP values for the three management units

Country	Breeding FRP (in pairs)	Notes	Wintering FRP (in individuals based on Koffijberg <i>et al.</i> , 2020)
<b>Russia</b>	112,927	Calculated as 380,000/2.78 – (FRPs MU2 & MU3)	
<b>MU1 total</b>	<b>112,927</b>		<b>n.a.</b>
<b>Denmark</b>	2,000	FRP reported by the government	
<b>Estonia</b>	89	National BD Art. 12 report <sup>5</sup>	
<b>Finland</b>	7,000	FRP reported by the government	
<b>Norway</b>	n.a.	It is not recognised by the government as a naturally occurring breeding species.	
<b>Sweden</b>	2,900	FRP reported by the government	41
<b>MU2 total</b>	<b>11,989</b>		<b>n.a.</b>
<b>Belgium</b>	n.a.	It is not recognised by the government as a naturally occurring breeding species.	555
<b>Germany</b>	775	Source: National BD Art. 12 report <sup>6</sup>	83,471
<b>Netherlands</b>	11,000	FRP reported by the government	284,686
<b>MU3 total</b>	<b>11,775</b>		
<b>Population total</b>	<b>136,691</b>		<b>380,000</b>

**Keys:** n.a.: not applicable

It is proposed to allocate the FRP for the wintering season amongst the countries according to the distribution of wintering numbers in 2000 based on Koffijberg *et al.* (2020) because that reflects the situation when AEWA came into force (Table 1). However, it is recognised that the winter distribution of the population is likely to change as winters are getting milder. Therefore, the assessment of the wintering FRP should focus on the population as a whole. The non-breeding FRPs per MU are not presented because it is only possible to count the entire population in winter when individuals from different MUs mix.

### Favourable Reference Range (FRR)

<sup>5</sup>[http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run\\_conversion?file=ee/eu/art12/envxa2bfg/EE\\_birds\\_reports\\_20191018-140734.xml&conv=612&source=remote#A045-C\\_B](http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run_conversion?file=ee/eu/art12/envxa2bfg/EE_birds_reports_20191018-140734.xml&conv=612&source=remote#A045-C_B)

<sup>6</sup>[http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run\\_conversion?file=de/eu/art12/envxztrqw/DE\\_birds\\_reports.xml&conv=612&source=remote#A045-C\\_W](http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run_conversion?file=de/eu/art12/envxztrqw/DE_birds_reports.xml&conv=612&source=remote#A045-C_W)



The FRRs for both the breeding and the non-breeding seasons were to be set by the Range States based on the distribution in the 2013-2018 reporting period using the range method (DG Environment, 2017, pp. 125-128). This period is used to establish the FRRs because of the CMS definition of the FRR<sup>7</sup> and available EU guidance (DG Environment, 2013, p. 15, 2017, p. 48).

Unless reported otherwise, the distribution area from the country's EU Birds Directive Article 12 report for the 2013 – 2018 period, is used as the FRR for the breeding season. It should be noted that this is different from the range method agreed to be used on 31 January 2020 at the meeting with the EC and EU Member States. Unfortunately, the EU Article 12 reporting collect information only on breeding distribution although the range definition of CMS<sup>8</sup> includes the entire annual cycle of a species and the guidance for FRR takes a similar approach (DG Environment, 2017, pp. 165-166). Therefore, it is only possible to establish the FRR for the non-breeding season based on additional reporting by the Range States. The available range information is summarised in Table 4.

The FRR for the **breeding season** for MU1 is set at 95,000 km<sup>2</sup>, for MU2 at 139,300 km<sup>2</sup>, for MU3 at 41,500 km<sup>2</sup> and for the whole population at 228,000 km<sup>2</sup> after rounding.

For the **non-breeding season**, it was not possible to define the FRR because several Range States did not provide this information.

---

<sup>7</sup> “the range of the migratory species is neither currently being reduced, nor is likely to be reduced” (see Article I.c.(2) of the CMS Convention Text).

<sup>8</sup> "Range" means all the areas of land or water that a migratory species inhabits, stays in temporarily, crosses or overflies at any time on its normal migration route” (see Article I.f of the CMS Convention Text).

**Table 4.** FRR values for the three management units

Country	Breeding FRR (in km <sup>2</sup> )	Non-breeding FRR (in km <sup>2</sup> )	Notes
<b>Russia</b>	95,000	Not provided	The breeding FRR is estimated based on EBBA2 (50 x 50 km grid). The non-breeding FRR for moulting and staging areas is still to be estimated.
<b>MU1 total</b>	<b>95,000</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	
<b>Denmark</b>	1,800	36,700	FRRs reported by the government. However, these are distribution areas and not range.
<b>Estonia</b>	1,500	Not provided	Source: Distribution area in national BD Art. 12 report <sup>2</sup>
<b>Finland</b>	48,500	Not provided	According to Finland, it is not feasible to assess the non-breeding FRR for passage birds because it is highly variable.
<b>Norway</b>	introduced	n.a.	It is not recognised as a naturally occurring breeding species by the government.
<b>Sweden</b>	87,500	13,900	FRRs reported by the government.
<b>MU2 total</b>	<b>139,300</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	
<b>Belgium</b>	introduced	25,500	It is not recognised as a naturally occurring breeding species by the government. The non-breeding FRRs reported by the government
<b>Germany</b>	4,228	Not provided	Source: Distribution area in national BD Art. 12 report <sup>5</sup>
<b>Netherlands</b>	37,621	38,011	FRRs reported by the government
<b>MU3 total</b>	<b>41,489</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	
<b>Population total</b>	<b>227,889</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	

**Keys:**

n.a.: not applicable

**Favourable Reference Habitat (FRH)**

Assessment of FRH follows the same approach as the habitat for the species in the framework of reporting under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive (DG Environment, 2017, pp. 136-141), i.e. Range States were requested to qualitatively assess whether the extent and quality of the habitat is sufficient for the long-term survival of the population.

Estonia and Germany have not reported on the extent and quality of the habitat. In all other countries, there is sufficient habitat to sustain the FRP. As the FRP is much smaller than the current population size, it can be

deduced from this that there is sufficient habitat to support the FRP if there is sufficient habitat to support the current population size.

### 3. Cumulative impact of derogation and legal hunting

Actions 4.2 of the ISSMP requires to “asses periodically, and report to the AEWA EGM IWG, the cumulative impact of derogations (as well as hunting in Range States in which derogation is not required) on the development of the population, the likelihood of serious damage to agriculture and risk to air safety and to other flora and fauna (including the Arctic ecosystems), and the non-lethal measures taken to prevent damage/risk, as well as the effectiveness of these. If necessary, coordinate the derogation measures between Range States to avoid risk to the population and to enhance the effectiveness of the measures”.

Consequently, the ISSMP does not define any target size for the population or any of its management units. It remains the sole responsibility of the individual Range States to take or not to take derogation measures in full compliance with the provisions of Articles 9 of the EU Birds Directive and of the Bern Convention.


Based on the above, the role of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose is not to maintain the population at a certain target level, but to prevent that the population or any of its MUs decline below the FRP. Thus, the FRPs represent the lower limits of the legally acceptable population sizes but not targets for population reduction. Monitoring of the population size and harvest, predictive modelling of the cumulative impact of national derogation measures and hunting (where it is legally allowed) will be used to inform national decision-making to ensure this.

It follows from this logic that monitoring, assessment and, especially, coordination amongst the Range States is less important when both the population and all of its MUs are well above the FRP. However, these activities become increasingly important when the actual population size is approaching the FRPs either at the population or at the level of any of the MUs. Therefore, a tiered system of coordination is recommended (Table 5). 200% of the FRP of the population or any of its MUs is proposed to trigger the tighter coordination of offtake amongst the Range States<sup>9</sup>.

**Table 5.** Monitoring, assessment and offtake coordination depending on the status of the population

Actual size of the population and its MUs	Measures
> 200% of the FRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of population size, offtake under derogation and hunting;</li> <li>Prediction of population development.</li> </ul>
< 200% of the FRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of population size, offtake under derogation and hunting;</li> <li>Prediction of population development;</li> <li>Coordination of offtake under derogation and hunting;</li> <li>Taking coordinated conservation measures, if necessary.</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> 200% of the FRP has been selected as a threshold to trigger coordination of offtake based on the precautionary principle as, everything else being equal, the closer the population is to the FRP the higher the risk that the population drops below the FRP if derogation and/or hunting is excessive or because of other reasons (such as increased predation). Such an ample buffer is also needed because breeding population estimates in many countries of MUs 2 and 3 are only updated once in every 6 years. Consequently, the population models need to make predictions for longer intervals ahead, which increases their uncertainty. In addition, everything else being equal, the higher the actual population size is compared to the FRP, the more time is available to diagnose the causes of decline and to take conservation actions, if necessary, to maintain the population above the FRP.



**Figure 2.** Conceptual representation of the management concept for Barnacle Goose. The bold red line represents the FRP of the population. This marks the minimum size of the population to be considered in FCS. The dashed orange line represents 200% of the FRP. This marks the threshold below which coordinating of offtake amongst Range States should start. (A) The development of the wintering population of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population based on Koffijberg *et al.* (2020), (B) Development of the breeding populations in MUs2 and MU3. Sources for different time periods in panel (B) are for 1990: Heath *et al.* (2000), for 2000: BirdLife International (2004), for 2012: BirdLife International (2015), for 2018: EU Member States Birds Directive Article 12 reports for the period of 2013 – 2018. (No reliable long-term time series are available for the breeding numbers in MU1).

Currently, the population size is more than 3.5-times larger than the FRP at the level of the whole flyway population.

An Integrated Population Model is being developed for the Russian MU (MU1) by the Dutch working group on Barnacle Goose (Baveco *et al.* 2020 in Annex 3 of this AFMP). This suggests that the population growth might be levelling off at around 1 million bird, but more data is needed for a definitive conclusion. Results also indicate that current reproduction and juvenile survival rates are relatively low due to natural causes and

possibly due to the unknown level of offtake in Russia. This implies that there is some risk of population decrease in the near future even with low rates of derogation offtakes. However, the actual population size in this MU is likely to be still more than 4-times larger than the FRP.

However, the actual population sizes at MU level are below 200% of the respective FRPs both in case of MU2<sup>10</sup> and of MU3 (Table 6 and Figure 2). Therefore, it will be necessary to start assessing the cumulative effect of offtake immediately based on (post-)breeding season counts and collection of reliable data on offtake. In MU2, it will be necessary to start coordinating off-take measures in order to avoid that the population size declines below the FRP. Similar coordination of offtake will be not necessary for derogations concerning breeding birds in MU3 because these are sedentary birds, the FRPs are defined at national level and the majority of birds breed in the Netherlands (Figure 2). However, coordination will be necessary concerning derogation measures that might affect birds from MU2.

**Table 6.** Actual population sizes in relation to the respective FRPs

MU	FRP (in pairs)	Actuals (in pairs)	Actuals / FRP
MU1 <sup>11</sup>	105,165	451,215	429%
MU2	12,000	14,500	121%
MU3	12,000	19,563	163%
Population (in individuals)	380,000	1,300,00 – 1,400,000	355%

#### 4. Monitoring indicators and programmes

Monitoring indicators are designed to measure the progress towards the fundamental objectives of the ISSMP (Jensen et al., 2018, pp. 17-18). Indicators are presented in Table 7 for each Fundamental Objective. For each indicator, the rationale, the definition of the indicator and the indicator protocol is presented in Annex 5.

<sup>10</sup> In MU2, this is mainly because most Range States have not reported any FRP and therefore the Current Values (2013-2018) was taken as the FRP value.

<sup>11</sup> The actual number of potential breeding pairs is calculated from the geometric mean of the 1,300,000 – 1,400,000 individuals winter population estimate of Koffijberg *et al.*, (2020), divided by a factor of 2.78 and deducted the sum of the current breeding population estimates the EU Member States reported to the EU Birds Directive Article 12 process.



**Table 7.** Indicators for fundamental objectives of the ISSMP (Jensen et al., 2018)


Fundamental objective	Related indicators	Deadlines for reporting
I. Maintain the population at a satisfactory level	I.1 Population size compared to the Favourable Reference Population (FRP)	Annually by 1 April (see also Chapter 5)
	I.2 Range extent compared to Favourable Reference Range (FRR)	31 Dec. 2025
II. Minimize agricultural damage and conflicts	II.1 Relative change in damage payments	31 Dec. 2025
III. Minimize the risk to air safety	III.1 Number of birdstrikes with aircrafts caused by Barnacle Goose	31 Dec. 2025
	III.2 Number of Barnacle Geese passing over commercial airports	31 Dec. 2025
IV. Minimize the risk to other flora and fauna	IV.1 Area of natural habitat or habitat of threatened species negatively affected by Barnacle Goose	31 Dec. 2025
V. Maximise ecosystem services	V.1 Number of people enjoying watching geese	31 Dec. 2025
VI. Minimise costs of goose management	VI.1 Relative change in cost of goose management	31 Dec. 2025

## 5. Protocols for the iterative phase

Management evaluation and adaptation of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose follows four iterative phases running in parallel (Figure 3):

1. A 10/12 year cycle of the ISSMP<sup>12</sup>;
2. Two 6-year cycles of the AFMP, and within the AFMP:
3. Two 3-year cycles assessing if the actual size of the population and its MUs are below the 200% threshold and approaching the FRP;
4. 1-year cycles of monitoring and update of work plans.

<sup>12</sup> The lifespan of the ISSMP is 10 years. However, it might be logical for the EGM IWG to recommend to the AEWA MOP to extend it to 12 years to include two 6-year-long AFMPs.



**Figure 3.** Flow chart of the four iterative phases of the AFMP

### 10/12 year cycle of the ISSMP

The 10/12 year cycle of the ISSMP encompasses evaluation and adaptation related to

- Goals;
- Objectives (Fundamental, Means and Process);
- Alternative actions related to objectives.

### 6-year cycle of the AFMP

The 6-year cycle of the AFMP encompasses evaluation and adaptation related to:

- Management Units (Chapter 1);
- FRVs (Chapter 2);
- Box 1 (Annex 2);
- Population models (Annex 3);

- Impact models (Annex 4);
- Cumulative impact of derogation and legal hunting (Chapter 3);
- Protocol for the iterative phases (Chapter 5);
- The range of and methods for indicators and programs (Chapter 6, Annex 6);
- The state of indicators and evaluation towards achieving objectives (Chapter 4, Annex 5).

The AFMP is evaluated and adapted next time in 2026 by the EGM IWG.

### 3-year cycles within the AFMP

The 3-year cycle within the AFMP encompasses:

- Assessing whether the population size and its MUs are below the 200% threshold and approaching the FRP;
- Coordination of offtake under derogation and hunting if the population and any of its MUs is below the 200% threshold and approaching the FRP;
- Taking coordinated conservation measures, if necessary;
- Increase understanding of population dynamics;
- Refine models of population dynamics.

### 1-year cycles within the AFMP

The annual cycle within the AFMP encompasses:

- Monitoring of indicators related to population models;
- Update and report on work plans for the Task Force, Data Centre, AEWA Secretariat and Range States (Annex 1);

### Indicators/monitoring related to objectives and population models

To be able to assess whether the population size at MU level is below the 200% threshold and approaching the FRP, a coordinated and systematic monitoring program must be established and maintained. The monitoring program for the long-term data need and the specific activities are listed below (see also IPM report; Annex 3). The activities shall start at the time indicated below in parenthesis and thereafter continued and take place each year.

1. An evaluation of potential bias in reported offtake in each range state (between 2020-2022).
2. Development and implementation of a coordinated and systematic monitoring program including development of detailed monitoring protocols for the long-term data need (between 2020-2022)
3. Monitoring of:
  - a. Midwinter counts for each Range State (from January 2021 onwards)
  - b. Summer counts per Range States in MU2 and MU3 + proportions of young and older birds (July 2020<sup>13</sup>, 2021 and 2024) + development of protocol to convert summer counts to breeding pairs (2020-2022)
  - c. Offtake (harvest + derogation) per Range State (from season 2020/21 onwards) and for derogation per month (from season 2022/2023 onwards). Article 9 reporting to the European Commission will be used for EU member state annual totals.
  - d. Crippling rate for the same periods as offtake (from season 2020/2021 onwards)

---

<sup>13</sup> Only in countries with existing schemes.

Based on this information, it will be possible to assess whether the population size and its MUs are below the 200% threshold and approaching the FRP at the EGM IWG meeting in 2023.

Monitoring data is to be submitted to the EGMP Data Centre on an annual basis, and no later than 1 April each year. During the assessment and potential coordination of offtake in 2023 and onwards, up-to-date data have to be available, hence the assessment in 2023, will make use of data up to and including the season 2022/2023. This also means that all existing data up to 2022/2023, which is not already submitted to the Data Centre, should be submitted before the assessment in 2021.

Progress on monitoring activities are reported in the annual EGMP Population Status and Assessment Report.

## References

**BirdLife International. (2004).** Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation status. Cambridge, UK: BirdLife International. (BirdLife Conservation Series No. 12).

**BirdLife International. (2015).** European Red List of Birds. Retrieved from <http://datazone.birdlife.org/info/euroredlist>

**DG Environment. (2013).** Great cormorant: Applying derogations under Article 9 of the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC(pp. 22).

**DG Environment. (2017).** Reporting under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive: Explanatory notes and guidelines for the period 2013-2018. In (pp. 188). Brussels: European Commission.

**Eichhorn, G., Drent, R. H., Stahl, J., Leito, A., & Alerstam, T. (2009).** Skipping the Baltic: the emergence of a dichotomy of alternative spring migration strategies in Russian barnacle geese. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 78(1), 63-72.

**Heath, M., Borggreve, C., & Peet, N. (2000).** *European Bird Populations: Estimates and Trends*. Cambridge, UK: BirdLife International/European Bird Census Council. (BirdLife Conservation Series No. 10).


**Jensen, G. H., Madsen, J., Nagy, S., & Lewis, M. (2018).** *AEWA International Single Species Management Plan for the Barnacle Goose (Branta leucopsis): Russia/Germany & Netherlands population, East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population, Svalbard/South-west Scotland population*. AEWa Technical Series No. 70. Bonn, Germany.

**Koffijberg, K., Clausen, P., Devos, K., Haas, F., Isaksen, K., Hjeldberg, H., . . . Wahl, J. (2020).** *Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population status report*. AEWa/EGMIWG/5.17. Bonn: UNEP/AEWa Secretariat.

## Annex 1. Population-specific workplans

According to the ISSMP for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose, the AFMPs set out annual workplans for the ISSMP actions relevant for the population/management unit. At the current stage, due to the limited data available on the population size and offtake, its harvest cannot be managed at MU-level. In addition, most management actions will be overlapping. Therefore, it is proposed to establish one workplan for both management units. As the role of the workplan is to guide the implementation of the ISSMP, the prioritisation and timescale agreed in the ISSMP provides a framework for the work planning process. The ISSMP prioritises actions as Essential, High and Medium priority and assigns timescales to actions as follows: *Immediate*: launched within the next year, *Short*: launched within the next 3 years, *Medium*: launched within the next 5 years, *Long*: launched within the next >5 years, *Ongoing*: currently being implemented and should continue, *Rolling*: to be implemented perpetually. In essence, this timescale system can be seen as a mechanism to stagger the implementation of actions taking into account both their dependencies and urgencies (Figure 4).

The timescale in combination with the priorities set in the ISSMP can be used to phase the implementation of actions. Thus, the most important would be to implement Essential actions that have an Immediate timing, followed by High priority with Immediate timing, etc.




**Figure 4.** Timescale for the implementation of the ISSMP for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose.

Implementation of the ISSMP requires work by different entities. Some actions should be done at national level as part of national workplans.

To facilitate coordination amongst Range States and to develop these specific workplans, population-specific Task Forces for the Barnacle Goose were established at EGM IWG5 ([AEWA/EGMIWG/5.23](#)).

In addition, the coordination of cross/cutting tasks have been taken up by a cross/cutting TF (e.g. the Agriculture Task Force) and through coordination amongst the EGMP Task Force coordinators during joint meetings.



**Figure 5.** Entities contributing the implementation of the implementation of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose ISSMP and would need to develop annual workplans.

Each EGM IWG entity contributing to the implementation of the ISSMP for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of Barnacle Goose uses a common structure to produce its own workplan. This structure includes the ISSMP actions relevant for the time period (i.e. 2020/2021 between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the EGM IWG), their priority and timescale as defined in the ISSMP, list of activities to be implemented by the entity (e.g. a Range State, the Russian Barnacle Goose Task Force, Data Centre and the relevant cross-cutting Task Forces). It is recommended that in the initial period, the EGM IWG entities focus on implementing the activities that have a timescale of Immediate or Short and focus first on the Essential ones followed by High and then by the Medium priorities as capacity allows.

The online workplans are periodically updated and the up to date version is available at:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1M64HWxzVagM9W0mG8iMMeVYS3\\_-M44W6QsHvvUonST8/edit#gid=1472654637](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1M64HWxzVagM9W0mG8iMMeVYS3_-M44W6QsHvvUonST8/edit#gid=1472654637)

## Annex 2. Box 1 of the ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose - Population Analysis Concerning Damage and Site Protection

### Summary

- The Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population is significantly increasing on the long-term and short-term, albeit recent data show a levelling-off in growth rates.
- There are limited knowledge and data on the actual costs of crop damage in most range states but increasing costs correlated to the number of Barnacle Geese during winter in the Netherlands.
- Due to a high variation between the views from the different range states, there is high degree of uncertainty towards what methods that have an effect to prevent damage and only very limited conclusions can be drawn at this stage.
- To increase the understanding, range states will need to discuss and prioritize research projects and to conduct focused and coordinated studies.
- There is a need for a coordinated<sup>14</sup> derogation with a consistent approach at MU level flyway level.
- Barnacle goose was one of the goose species most frequently reported to have been involved in birdstrikes.
- Many airports expect an increase in problems associated with the presence of geese in the future.
- Airports situated along the migration route of the population more often experience problems with barnacle geese.

### Aim

The International Single Species Management Plans (ISSMP) for the Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis* (Jensen et al. 2018) and Greylag Goose *Anser anser* (Powolny et al. 2018) and the related population-specific Adaptive Flyway Management Programs (AFMP) aim to establish an agreement amongst Range States on the strategic goals and objectives of the conservation and management of the species and more specifically each of the populations and management units.

The ISSMP requires the use of a more detailed analysis concerning damage and site protection, as set out in Box 1 of the ISSMP with the purpose to share information on the effectiveness of the measures to prevent damage and to assist Range States in assessing the need for derogations from the provisions of Article 5 of the Birds Directive and in coordinating<sup>15</sup> the implementation of their derogation schemes.

At the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG 4; Perth, Scotland 18-20 June 2019), the EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline and content of the AFMP and took note of the proposed timelines and steps, as well as data and resources needed.

---

<sup>14</sup> As agreed at EGM IWG6, “coordination” in this context does not mean that Range States will be expected to de facto coordinate their use of derogations under the EGMP. EU Member States, in particular, maintain their full rights to make use of derogations as provided under the EU Birds Directive. The exact process and its implementation will be further discussed and defined within the Task Force.

<sup>15</sup> See footnote No. 15 above.



This text aims at reporting the obtained information in a transparent way, providing a baseline for the future work.

## Box 1

The ISSMP envisages the use of more detailed analysis of data on damage to agriculture and risk to air safety and to other flora and fauna as set out in Box 1 (Fig. 6) and the following action to improve consistency in states' decision-making regarding derogations and the consistency of their justifications: "Create a toolbox for decisions in relation to determining significant damage (including metrics, benchmarking, verification, monitoring, various management techniques to prevent damage, compensation)."

Similar processes were proposed for the two species, Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose.

## Timeline

During spring 2020, the EGMP Range States to the Barnacle and Greylag Goose responded to a detailed questionnaire with several sheets in an excel file for each of the two species. The requests on air safety issues were kept separately, since other national instances were expected to be better capable of replying to these questions. Due to problems at airports, because of the crises following the Covid-19 pandemic, the reporting on these issues was performed over a longer period, covering 2020 and spring 2021. The process was reported at the EGMP IWG5 meeting in 2020 and the final results should be reported by spring 2021 and presented for EGMP IWG6 in June 2021.

The issues are reported separately, first showing a section related to agricultural damages followed by a section related to air safety matters.

## Agricultural damages

### Methods

A questionnaire was developed and sent to each range state of the population, one questionnaire for each population (Table 8). These questionnaires were structured to correspond to each of the numbers in Box 1 and

**Figure 6.** Box 1 was included in the International Single Species Management Plans (ISSMP) for the Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis* (Jensen et al. 2018).

#### Box 1. Information needed in each AFMP concerning damage and site protection

Care must be taken to ensure that the management actions recommended by AFMPs are not inconsistent with the legal obligations prescribed by relevant international instruments. The AFMPs have the potential to, *inter alia*, assist Range States in assessing the need for derogations from the provisions of Article 5 of the Birds Directive (and, to the extent that they are relevant, the protections prescribed by the Bern Convention and AEWA) and in coordinating the implementation of their derogation schemes. Each AFMP should therefore contain information that is relevant for assessing the need for derogations at Range State level. This should include:

- i. Characterization of the spatial and temporal extent and trends of damage to agriculture and of risks to air safety as well as to other flora and fauna that can be attributed to the population/MU in question, including predicted future changes in these;
- ii. Description of the methods applied in the past assessments for each country and recommendations for the development of future guidelines for assessments;
- iii. Description of the methods applied or tested to prevent damages and to reduce risks, their effectiveness and sufficiency to tackle the problem;
- iv. Understanding of the link between population level and damages or risk.

Each AFMP shall also contain information on habitat conservation measures, including designation of Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under Article 4 of the Birds Directive:

- i. List of SPAs and other protected areas designated for the Barnacle Goose;
- ii. Management of the species and the damage inside and outside SPAs;
- iii. Tackling damage prevention inside and outside SPAs (accommodation areas, derogations, etc.).

the respondents were requested to fill in as detailed information as possible. This resulted in a high variation in the level of new information reflecting the large difference in activities related to the various aspects across countries.



## Results and discussion

The results are presented and discussed following the order in Box 1.

The reporting rate varied considerably between countries and issues (Table 8).

**Table 8.** Overview of provided information by each range state. The information in the upper row refers to the numbers in Box 1.

Country	ia Damages to agriculture	ib Risks to other flora and fauna	ii a Methods agricultural damages	ii b Methods impacts on flora and fauna	iii Methods to prevent damages and to reduce risks	iv-b Monitoring data, breeding period	iv-w Monitoring data, winter	SPA ii-iii SPAs
BE	X			X	X	X	X	
DE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DK		X			X	X	X	X
FI	X		X	X	X	X	X	
NL	X		X		X	X	X	X
NO	X		X		X	X	X	
SE	X				X		X	X


Latvia reported that this questionnaire was considered irrelevant since there was no breeding pairs and a negligible winter population.

(i) Characterization of the spatial and temporal extent and trends of damage to agriculture and of risks to other flora and fauna that can be attributed to the population/MU in question, including predicted future changes in these;

Belgium and the Netherlands reported to the request on spatial and temporal extent and trends of damage to agriculture for both the breeding and winter periods. Finland reported for the breeding period and Sweden for one year in the breeding period. Germany reported for the winter period.

During summer, the estimated annual costs in the Netherlands are varying between c. 0.3-0.7 m Euro (yield loss) with no significant trend and significantly increasing in Finland to 1.15 m Euro in 2018 (compensation paid) (Fig. 7). The damage in Finland is not related to breeding birds but is caused by large flocks of foraging migratory geese in late May. Belgium reported annual estimated yield loss to zero.

During winter, significant increases were found in Germany (subsidy paid) as high as 7 m Euro in 2016-2018 and the Netherlands (yield loss) to 5.3-6.0 m Euro during 2016-2018 (Fig. 7). The corresponding value was much lower in Belgium with c. 13,000 Euro in 2018 (yield loss). For the Netherlands it should be noted that yield loss in terms of compensation paid (Euro) also involves general increases in price level (as amount of compensation is connected to market prices), which also show an increasing trend in time (and partly explain the correlation between compensation payment and goose numbers in winter).



**Figure 7.** Estimated annual damages (in Euro) by Barnacle Geese during summer 2010-2018 (upper graph) and winter 2009-2018 (lower graph). Note that for Germany this also included subsidies (besides compensation payments).

With regard to damages to other flora and fauna, Denmark reported that the grazing of swards by Barnacle Geese in saltmarshes/meadows might have an impact to breeding meadow birds (waders and Eiders *Somateria mollissima* at Saltholm (unpublished), whereas Madsen et al. (2019) could not detect any negative effect of very intense goose grazing on the field occupancy by waders on the island of Mandø in the Danish part of the Wadden Sea, including Redshank and Black-tailed Godwit, which are known to favour longer vegetation. Also studies in the Netherlands have not found significant impact from goose grazing on meadow birds (e.g. Roodbergen et al. 2019).

(ii) A description of the methods applied in the past assessments for each country and recommendations for the development of future guidelines for assessments;

Four countries, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, reported on this matter. Belgium, Finland and Netherlands reported on the compensation practises. In all countries, compensation will only be paid if the farmer asks for it and the damage is determined by field experts. In the Netherlands, damage in accommodation areas is estimated without the farmer applying for it. Germany described ongoing activities and studies (Table 9).

**Table 9.** Details on applied methods and studies to estimate compensation to agricultural damages caused by Barnacle Goose in the responding countries.

Country	Assessment and studies
Netherlands	Farmers notify the governmental body BIJ12 of crop damage. BIJ12 sends an appraiser to the fields to determine the extent of damage. Based on these measurements and crop values agricultural damage is calculated. Dependent on the location, time of year and species, 80-95% of crop damage is remunerated by the provincial government to farmers, on the provision (outside accommodation areas) that scaring was taken place. <a href="https://www.bij12.nl/wp-content/uploads/meten-is-weten-april-2001.pdf">https://www.bij12.nl/wp-content/uploads/meten-is-weten-april-2001.pdf</a> . The precise rules and conditions may vary between the 12 provinces and sometimes have also changed from year to year (affecting volume of compensation payments as well). <a href="https://www.bij12.nl/wp-content/uploads/meten-is-weten-april-2001.pdf">https://www.bij12.nl/wp-content/uploads/meten-is-weten-april-2001.pdf</a>
Belgium	Damage compensation schemes: only when farmers ask for compensation themselves - field visits with agricultural expert to estimate the amount of damage on the crops are undertaken. When mixed damage with other species no difference is made between the amount of damage caused by the individual species as this 1) is very hard to estimate afterwards and 2) doesn't make any difference to the compensation paid. Guidance to estimate damages are described by the Flemish Government (2009).
Germany	Unpublished study on the annual assessments of goose grazing intensity on state-owned dykes in order to set rent-rates for maintenance-grazing for sheep. Ongoing projects on estimations of yield loss by comparison of grazed and ungrazed sites and on evaluation of agri-environmental schemes.
Finland	The damages to be compensated are assessed by an independent expert. Amount of subsidies for crop damages are assessed by using prices of crops as described in a regulation by Finnish food authority: <a href="https://www.finlex.fi/fi/viranomaiset/normi/440002/45069">https://www.finlex.fi/fi/viranomaiset/normi/440002/45069</a> ).

Two suggestions for future actions were mentioned. Belgium noticed that since Barnacle Goose damage is mostly occurring in mixed flocks with other wintering goose species, no clear amount can be attributed only to the Barnacle Goose. In order to attribute the right amount of damage to the right species, it could be an idea to set up methods on how to distinguish and estimate the amount per species. However, this effort may be quite disproportional when the total amount of compensation paid is very low. The Netherlands suggested that using remote sensing techniques to automatically determine damage and not be dependent on farmers' willingness to notify and claim damage would improve the quality. There is no compensation scheme for goose grazing damages in Denmark.

(iii) Description of the methods applied or tested to prevent damages and to reduce risks, their effectiveness and sufficiency to tackle the problem;

The range states were requested to describe nine different predefined (formulated in broad terms without details) and one 'other' method applied or tested to prevent damages and asked to score the effect of these (Table 10).

Seven countries responded to the questions about the applied methods to prevent damages and the effect of these (Table 10). The effect was scored at local and national level. In many cases, the effect was scored higher at local than at national scale and there was a much higher variation in the scores between countries than between applied methods making it impossible to make any generalisations.

**Table 10.** Overview of methods applied or tested to prevent damages by Barnacle Geese and the effect of these in the different range states and the mean of all. Scores are provided for local and national effect (local/national). The scores represent: 1: The measure does not mitigate the problem, 2: The measure could possibly help to mitigate the problem and 3: The measure mitigates the problem. NA: Not applicable. For Norway (NO), it relates to the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population (Oslofjord).

<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>SW</b>	<b>FI</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>DE</b>	<b>BE</b>	<b>NL</b>	<b>Mean Local/National</b>
Control of land use / site protection		3/3						3.0/3.0
Damage compensation payments		3/3	1/NA				3/3	2.3/3.0
Derogation shooting for scaring	3/2	3/3		2/1	2/2		2/2	2.4/2.0
Egg destruction	1/1	3/NA			2/NA		1/1	1.8/1.0
Fencing	2/2	3/NA						2.5/2.0
Population control							2/2	2.0/2.0
Sacrificial crops		3/3						3.0/3.0
Scaring	1/1	3/3	2/NA	2/1	3/NA	2/2	1/1	2.0/1.6
Subsidy schemes to allow geese					3/3		2/1	2.5/2.0
<b>Flora/fauna</b>								
Egg destruction						3/2		3.0/2.0
Population control						3/3		3.0/3.0
Scaring				2/2				2.0/2.0

Population control is only reported from the Netherlands, the country with the highest number of killed Barnacle Geese by derogation and with the majority culled during the breeding period (see AEWA EGMP Data Centre (2021) for more information). Finland also commented that the following actions were applied or tested but the effectiveness still not scored: Chasing off by approaching and use of drone, preventing to settle by using balloons and preventing to settle by using hawk-shaped kites.

In general, there are very different views on how effective the different applied methods are and there is no obvious solution found what works across the countries.


#### (iv) Understanding of the link between population level and damages or risk.

#### **Breeding birds**

Several countries reported on the Barnacle Goose breeding populations. The number of breeding pairs were reported from Denmark (Saltholm, 1991-2015: 1-4,521 pairs), Finland (2017-2019: 6,000-8,000), Netherlands (1973-2015: 0-22,000), Germany (mean 2012-2016: 750-800), Norway (2 counties, Indre Oslofjord, Oslo (Buskerud 2001-2017: 0-27; Oslo/Akershus 2005-2017: 154-389)). See also Fig. 8.

The number of Barnacle Geese during the breeding season were reported from Belgium (several regions, 2010-2018: 129-971), Netherlands (2005-2015: 25,000-62,000) and Norway (several regions, 2017-2019: 2,176-3,160), see also AEWA EGMP


Data Centre (2021) for more recent data.



**Figure 8.** Number of breeding pairs of Barnacle Goose from regions/countries with a longer period of reported numbers.

### Wintering birds


The winter flyway population has increased significantly at long-term as well as at short term but recently some levelling off has become apparent (Fig. 9; see more details in Koffijberg et al. 2020 and AEWA EGMP Data Centre 2021).



**Figure 9.** Trend in wintering numbers of Barnacle Geese in the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population 1981-2018. Red dots represent annual totals in January; the bold line the calculated trend along with lower and upper 95% ci for the trend (from Koffijberg et al. 2020).

### Link damage-population

There is very limited data to describe the relationship between population level and the damages to agriculture. However, the Netherlands provide information comparing these two parameters, in winter and summer (Fig. 10). This indicates a positive correlation at national level between the number of wintering Barnacle Geese and the compensation paid for damages to agriculture during winter, while there is no obvious correlation based admittedly few data points during summer. The more countries and the longer time series, the better we can describe and understand this relation. On the other hand several studies have shown that the relationship between goose abundance and goose damage is far from straightforward and likely also involves several other aspects, such as e.g. weather conditions and socio-economic factors (review by Fox et al. 2017).



**Figure 10.** Relationship between the numbers of Barnacle Geese in the Netherlands and the compensation paid for the damage they cause for the years with available data (breeding season during 2012-2018 (upper graph) and January 2010-2018 (lower graph)).

- (i) List of SPAs and other protected areas designated for the Barnacle Goose;

The updated list of the Natura 2000 data - the European network of protected sites is found at <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/natura-11>

(ii) Management of the species and the damage inside and outside SPA;

SPA related (ii) and (iii) are treated together and described below under point (iii).

(iii) Tackling damage prevention inside and outside SPAs (accommodation areas, derogations, etc.)

SPA related (ii) and (iii) were treated together. Replies were received from Denmark, Germany and Sweden, (Table 11). The replies show that the management of the species varies between the range states.

**Table 11.** Overview on how replying range states manage the Barnacle Goose inside and outside the SPAs and the way they tackle the damage prevention inside and outside the SPAs. No/yes refer to whether the measure is applied or not.

Type	Measure	Denmark	Germany <sup>3</sup>	Sweden	Netherlands
Management (ii)	Specific habitat restoration activities – roosts	NO	NO	NO	NO
Management (ii)	Specific habitat restoration activities - foraging areas	NO	YES	YES	NO
Management (ii)	Reducing recreational disturbance (non-hunting)	YES <sup>1</sup>	NO	YES	NO
Management (ii)	Hunting-free zones	YES <sup>1</sup>	Partly	YES	YES
Management (ii)	Hunting on the species allowed	NO	NO	YES	NO
Damage prevention (iii)	Population control	NO	NO	NO	NO
Damage prevention (iii)	Egg destruction	NO	NO	NO	YES
Damage prevention (iii)	Derogation shooting for scaring	Inside and outside SPAs <sup>2</sup>	NO	YES	YES <sup>4</sup>
Damage prevention (iii)	Scaring	Outside SPAs	YES	YES	Outside SPAs
Damage prevention (iii)	Control of land use / site protection	YES <sup>1</sup>	YES	YES	YES
Damage prevention (iii)	Damage compensation payments	NO	Partly	YES	YES
Damage prevention (iii)	Subsidy schemes to allow geese	NO	YES	YES	YES
Damage prevention (iii)	Sacrificial crops	NO	NO	YES	NO
Damage prevention (iii)	Fencing	NO	NO	YES	YES

The following comments to the replies are relevant:

Denmark:

<sup>1</sup> Applied in SPA Vidåen, Tøndermarsken og Saltvandssøen (DK009X060); Protected area provides attractive feeding areas to reduce damage on adjacent farmland

<sup>2</sup> Except during spring (only outside SPAs)

Germany:

<sup>3</sup> There are minor differences in the scores for two reported regions, Schleswig-Holsten and Lower Saxony.

The Netherlands:

<sup>4</sup> Locally specific agreements to avoid disturbance at night-roosts

## Air safety

This section addresses issues related to geese and air safety. Although this document concerns the Russian/Baltic population of barnacle geese, we have included all relevant information received from airports regardless of the goose species in question. In many cases, the information provided by the airports even concerns unidentified goose species, but due to the similarities between the different species with regard to their potential impact on air safety and their response to different management actions, we consider the information useful irrespectively of the species in question.

## Conclusions

- Barnacle Goose was one of the goose species most frequently reported to have been involved in birdstrikes.
- In recent years, resources allocated to the management and control of goose populations have remained stable at most airports.
- Airports use various methods to monitor, manage and control geese at the airport premises.
- Not only the geese at the airports, but also those that nest and/or forage in the vicinity of the airports in the Netherlands, are controlled via several programs.
- No universal solution to deter geese is available at present.
- Ten out of fourteen airports have seen an increase in goose abundance and / or the number of goose crossing the airports over the past five years.
- In some cases, the growth in goose populations has been accompanied by a corresponding increase in the need for management actions.
- In Copenhagen airport the growth in goose numbers was accompanied by an increase in frequency of strikes with geese, particularly Barnacle Geese and Greylag Geese.
- Many airports expect an increase in problems associated with the presence of geese in the future.



## Introduction

Birdstrikes constitute a risk to aviation safety throughout the world. In particular, geese constitute a hazard to aircrafts because of their size and flocking behavior. Often birdstrikes with geese result in significant damage to the aircrafts, which in some cases may be fatal. In NW-Europe, goose populations have increased dramatically over the past few decades leading to growing concern about the risk that these populations pose to air safety.

The European Goose Management Platform (EGMP) under the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement (AEWA/UNEP), aims to provide the mechanisms for a structured, coordinated and inclusive decision-making and implementation process for the sustainable use and management of goose populations in Europe, with the objective of maintaining them at a favourable conservation status, while taking into account concerns of relevant stakeholders and the pertinent legislative frameworks and regulations. One of these stakeholders is the aviation industry.

We therefore asked relevant airports to identify the scale of the risk that particularly Barnacle and Greylag Geese, but also other goose species, pose to aircraft safety by sharing data with the EGMP Data Centre at Aarhus University, Denmark. We requested observational data on goose presence, birdstrike data concerning the individual species and a description of procedures to mitigate and prevent the problem. In Germany, this task was coordinated by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit. The data from Switzerland were included in the analysis although Switzerland is not part of EGMP nor a range state. In addition, we received information from Copenhagen Airport, Avinor, Norway and Ministry of Infrastructure, the Netherlands.

Unfortunately, part of our survey was launched when the COVID-19 pandemic had brought airports around the world to a halt in the second quarter of 2020. We believe this was the reason why relatively few airports responded to our request. Although we fully acknowledge the huge impact from COVID-19 on aviation industry, we must also admit that for this reason the conclusions, which can be made on the basis of the survey are relatively few and should be used with caution.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the airports for their contributions to this analysis. In particular, we wish to thank Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit, Avinor, the airports in the Netherlands and Copenhagen Airport.

## Results

### Survey conducted by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit

Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit collected information from the following ten airports:

Hamburg Airport (HAM)

Düsseldorf Airport (DUS)

Zürich Airport (ZRH)

Dresden Airport (DRS)

Karlsruhe/Baden-Baden Airport (FKB)

Dortmund (DTM)

Stuttgart Airport (STR)

Bremen (BRE)

Frankfurt Airport (FRAU)

Berlin Airport

## Monitoring

All airports indicated that there were nearby areas suitable for breeding, foraging or roosting geese. Monitoring data was obtained by inspection according to ICAO/EASA regulations, except at ZRH, where monitoring was carried out by an ornithological institute. In addition to inspection, data was obtained from local contact persons at DUS, whereas HAM use data from an ornithological institute and OAG. BER was the only airport using radar to monitor bird flight activity.

## Assessment of trends

Six of the ten airports (HAM, DUS, ZRH, STR, BRE, FAR) reported that the abundance of geese has increased over the past five years, whereas the abundance has been stable at the remainder of the airports.

Four airports reported the presence of new goose species in the area. These were DUS (Canada Goose, Egyptian goose), ZRH (Egyptian goose, rarely Canada Goose), FKB (Taiga Bean Goose) and BRE (Canada Goose, Egyptian Goose). Egyptian Goose is regarded as an alien species in the EU.

Six airports (HAM, ZRH, STR, BRE, FRA, Berlin) indicated that problems associated with the presence of geese are expected to increase in the future. Three of the airports (DUS, FKB, DTM) did not expect such problems. DRS did not provide information about this issue.

## Impact on air traffic

ZRH and BRE were the only airports to indicate that birdstrikes involving geese had occurred, whereas HAM, FKB, STR and FRA reported that the presence of geese had affected air traffic in some way (change or closure of runway, delays or abortion of take-off).

## Bird control

*On the airport premises* All airport indicated the use of scaring at their premises. The most commonly used scaring methods were shooting (9 airports) and pyrotechnics (9 airports), whereas laser (7 airports), acoustics (4 airports) and falconry (4 airports) were used to a minor extent (Tab. 12).

**Table 12.** Overview of the different scaring methods used at airport premises. Information collected by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit.

Airport/Method	Pyrotechnics	Acoustics	Laser	Shooting for scaring	Other
HAM	X		X	X	Falconry
DUS	X	X		X	Biological techniques
ZRH*				X	
DRS	X		X	X	
FKB	X	X	X	X	Falconry, fox
DTM	X	X	X	X	
STR	X	X			
BRE	X		X	X	Dog, falconry
FRA	X		X	X	
Berlin	X		X	X	Falconry, dog

\*No dispersal needed.

*Outside the airport premises*

Eight airports indicated that bird control took place outside their premises. Egg removal or treatment (4 airports) was the most commonly used technique, whereas hunting (3 airports), modified land use (3 airports) and nest removal (2 airports) was used to a lesser extent (Tab. 13).

**Table 13.** Overview of different management methods used outside airport premises. Information collected by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit.

Airport/Method	Nest removal	Egg removal	Hunting	Land use	Other
HAM					
DUS		X			
ZRH			X <sup>1</sup>		
DRS					
FKB	X	X	X	X <sup>2</sup>	
DTM		(X) <sup>3</sup>			
STR	X	X			
BRE			X <sup>4</sup>		Dog, pyrotechnics
FRA				X <sup>5</sup>	
Berlin				X <sup>6</sup>	

<sup>1</sup>Egyptian Goose, <sup>2</sup>Management with mowing plan, <sup>3</sup>Puncture and exchange of goose eggs in city parks,

<sup>4</sup>Egyptian and Greylag Goose, <sup>5</sup>Optimization of recultivation of gravel pits, <sup>6</sup>Change of crops, especially no maize in the vicinity of the airport, different tillage after maize harvest, (deep) plowing of crop residues.

**Effectiveness of bird control methods**

Eight airports indicated the degree to which their use of various scaring and management methods had proven successful (Tab. 14). The effectiveness of similar actions showed great variation between airports, emphasizing that no universal solutions to control birds at airports is available at present. Pyrotechnics, shooting, biological techniques, land use/habitat management, egg removal, dispersal and the use of dogs were all methods that were reported to have “good” effect. However, pyrotechnics, laser and egg removal were also reported to have “no” effect, which was also the case for the use of ribbons.


**Table 14.** Overview of the effect of different management methods. Information collected by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit.

Airport/Method	Pyrotechnics	Laser	Shooting	Falconry	Biological techniques	Land use/habitat management	Egg removal, etc.	Hunting	Dispersal	Ribbons	Nest removal	Dog
HAM	No effect	Little effect	Some effect	Some effect	Some effect							
DUS		Little effect	Some effect		Some effect		No effect					
ZRH												
DRS												
FKB						Little effect	Little effect	Little effect	Some effect		Little effect	
DTM	Some effect						Some effect					
STR							Little effect				Little effect	
BRE	Little effect		Some effect									Some effect
FRA	Some effect	Little effect	Some effect			Little effect						
Berlin						Some effect				No effect		

No effect	Little effect	Some effect	Good effect
-----------	---------------	-------------	-------------

### Number of birdstrikes involving geese


Altogether, 21 birdstrikes involving geese (and swans) were reported to have occurred during the period from 2014-2019 (Fig 11). Most of these involved unspecified geese and swans (13), whereas Greylag Goose was involved in four birdstrikes. Egyptian Goose and Canada Goose were involved in two birdstrikes each. There was no clear trend in the number of birdstrikes over the time period.



**Figure 11.** The number of birdstrikes involving geese in German (9) and Swiss (1) airports from 2014-2019. Data collected by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit.


### Copenhagen Airport

Copenhagen Airport has provided information about birdstrikes involving geese during the period from 1996-2016 (Fig. 12). Altogether, 17 birdstrikes involving geese occurred during the time period. Most of these involved Barnacle Goose (9), whereas Greylag Goose was involved in 6 birdstrikes.



**Figure 12.** The number of birdstrikes involving geese at Copenhagen Airport from 1996-2016. Data courtesy of Copenhagen Airport.


The apparent increase in birdstrikes involving geese coincided with a marked increase in the number of migrating geese at the airport (Fig. 13). These were mainly Barnacle and Greylag Geese, whereas White-fronted and Canada Geese occur in small numbers.



**Figure. 13.** The number of goose observations at Copenhagen Airport from 2004-2016. Data courtesy of Copenhagen Airport (from Bradbeer et al. 2017).


## Norwegian airports

Data from 13 Norwegian airports provided by Avinor showed a marked increase in the number of geese shot as part of their flight safety management scheme (Fig. 14). In 2013 a single goose was shot, whereas in 2018 this number had increased to 42 geese. The vast majority of geese shot were Greylag Geese.




**Figure 14.** The total number of geese in general and specifically Greylag Geese shot at 13 Norwegian airports from 2013-2018. Data courtesy of Avinor.

During the same time period there was a marked increase in the total number of occasions where geese were registered at the airports (Fig. 15). However, the numbers showed great variation between airports and in 2018 and 2019 Stavanger Airport, situated in the southwestern part of Norway, accounted for more than half of the goose observations.



**Figure 15.** The total number of occasions where geese were observed at 10 Norwegian airports from 2013-2018. No geese were observed at the remainder of the airports. Data courtesy of Avinor.

The increased presence of geese at the majority of the 13 airports was accompanied by a concomitant increase in the number of management actions taken to scare off geese ( $R^2=0.99$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ) (Fig. 16). In 2013 and 2014, no actions were reported, whereas in 2018 and 2019, actions were taken to scare off geese on 64 and 58 occasions, respectively. Through the period, blank shots were the most commonly used scaring method. No information about the extent to which the scaring was successful or the effectiveness of the range of scaring methods used is available.



**Figure 16.** The number of different management actions taken towards geese at 13 Norwegian airports from 2013-2019. Data courtesy of Avinor.

### Birdstrikes involving geese in Norway

Since 2017, Avinor has registered three incidents involving geese (Tab. 15).

**Table 15.** Birdstrikes at Norwegian airports involving geese.

Date	Airport	Species
14.06.2017	Tromsø Airport	Greylag Goose*
29.06.2018	Svalbard Airport	Barnacle Goose*
29.04.2019	Bergen Airport	Greylag Goose

\*Species identification uncertain.

### EGMP survey 2020/21

In 2020/21 we received information from the following five airports about goose related impacts on their operations:

Eindhoven Airport (EHEH), Netherlands

Esbjerg Airport (EBJ), Denmark

Hamburg Airport (HAM), Germany

Helsinki Airport (HEL), Finland

Tallinn Airport (EETN), Estonia

We also received comprehensive comments from the Ministry of Infrastructure, the Netherlands.

### Birdstrikes involving geese

Within the EGMP survey, Helsinki Airport was the only airport where birdstrikes involving geese had occurred. From 2010-2020 the airport registered four incidents (Tab. 16).


**Table 16.** Birdstrikes involving geese at Helsinki Airport from 2010-2020.

Date	Time	Goose species	Flock size	Number struck	Aircraft	Phase of flight
28.08.2013	15:53	Unidentified	Unknown	2	B737	Take-off
20.09.2013	04:04	Unidentified	Unknown	1	A319	Take-off
28.10.2013	00:00	Unidentified	Unknown	2	B737	Approach
03.10.2019	04:45	Canada Goose	10	2	E190	Take-off

### Goose control at airports in the Netherlands

Due to effective grassland management, there were close to zero geese foraging at the airports in the Netherlands. If present, geese were easily deterred using pyrotechnics, distress calls and laser.

The collisions with geese involved mostly geese that were passing the airports while commuting between their roosts and foraging areas (Fig. 17).



**Figure 17.** Number of collisions with geese at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol 2005 – Q1 of 2021. The blue bars indicate the numbers of birdstrikes involving geese both on and off the airport. The red bars are the birdstrikes that occurred on the airport, i.e. within the airport boundaries. It should be noted that air traffic was reduced in 2020 and 2021 due to the Covid-19 pandemic.



Rotterdam-The Hague Airport has reported strikes with geese as well. One strike with a Canada goose in 2014 and one strike with two Egyptian geese in 2017. Maastricht-Aachen Airport, Lelystad Airport and Groningen Airport Eelde have not reported goose strikes in recent years.


### General impact on air traffic from the presence of geese

The airports in the Netherlands, Finland (Helsinki) and Germany (Hamburg) indicated that the presence of geese had an impact on air traffic. Depending on wind conditions, hundreds of thousands of geese pass over Helsinki airport during seasonal migration in spring and autumn. In the Netherlands, large flocks of geese passed over the airports commuting between their roosts and foraging areas. This caused delayed take-offs, go-arounds and the use of alternative runways (if available). At Hamburg Airport, alternative runways were used to reduce the risk of birdstrikes with Greylag Geese in March/April and late September.

### Actions taken towards geese on airport premises


At Esbjerg and Tallinn Airports no actions towards geese were needed.

The development in the use of shotgun, various distress calls and bioacoustics from 2000-2018 at Eindhoven Airport is shown in Fig. 18. The number of actions taken towards geese peaked in 2007 and there was a tendency for actions to be necessary on a more regular basis from late 2000s, although the number of actions were at a relatively low level. It should be noted that on some occasions both distress calls and shotguns were used towards the same flock.



**Figure 18.** The number of different management actions taken towards geese at Eindhoven Airport from 2000-2018. Data courtesy of Eindhoven Airport.

Most actions were targeted towards Canada Geese (16), Greylag Geese (9) and Egyptian Geese (8) (Fig. 19). Altogether, shotgun was the most commonly used scaring method. In addition to scaring, habitat management was used at airport premises to keep grassland unattractive to geese. This was practiced at all airports in the Netherlands, resulting in no geese foraging on the grasslands adjacent to the runways and taxiways.



**Figure 19.** The species at which different management actions were targeted at Eindhoven Airport. Data courtesy of Eindhoven Airport.

Helsinki Airport maintains a zero tolerance towards geese on their premises and shooting was practiced to keep geese off premises. In addition, the airport maintains a grassland management scheme to keep premises unattractive to geese. As a result, no geese were feeding on airport premises.

For information about actions taken towards geese at Hamburg Airport see “Survey conducted by Verband für biologische Flugsicherheit” above.

### Actions taken towards geese in the vicinity of the airport

In the Netherlands, the number of geese in the vicinity of airports are being monitored. If needed, action is taken to either decrease the number of geese (which also reduce agricultural damage as well), or to alter the flight path of the geese commuting between roosts and foraging areas. This is done in close cooperation with the landowners and hunting associations.

The emergency landing of a Boeing 737 after striking 9 Canada geese in 2010 at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol (<https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/nl/page/1358/noodlanding-na-vogelaanvaring-6-juni-2010>) prompted the Civil Aviation Authority of the Netherlands to develop a Covenant for the vicinity of Schiphol, including all stakeholders: Pilot Association, CAA, Province, Municipality, Airport, Airlines, Farmers and Nature Protection organizations. The covenant focuses on 4 items for which approximately 1.5 M Euro is budgeted per year:

1. Monitoring: each week, all geese in the Schiphol vicinity are monitored.
2. Foraging: farmers are encouraged to grow crops that are unattractive for geese. Farmers that still grow wheat and barley receive a financial compensation to plough the fields shortly after harvesting in order to make the harvest lost grains unavailable for the geese.
3. Landscape planning: new developments in the landscape, like water bodies and swamps, are only allowed when assessed not being attractive to geese.
4. Detection: trials are initiated to detect geese approaching the airport in order to delay departing aircraft.

Reduction; the number of geese in the vicinity of Schiphol is controlled by regular hunting and culling moulting geese with CO<sub>2</sub>.

(<https://www.icao.int/Meetings/wildlife/Can%20Airports%20do%20it%20Alone/ALBERT%20DE%20HOO%20N%20WSHRS%202017.pdf>) At Eindhoven Airport it is not permitted to perform such actions, whereas at Hamburg Airport no resources for bird control outside the airport were allocated. In the vicinity of Helsinki

Airport farmers are not allowed to establish pastures. At Esbjerg and Tallinn Airport no such actions are considered necessary.

### Monitoring techniques

All the airports reported that visual counting was part of the monitoring of geese and other bird species. Hamburg Airport, Tallinn and Esbjerg indicated that birds were monitored according to ICAO/EASA standards. Only Eindhoven Airport uses both radar to monitor birds; Eindhoven used thermal cameras as well (Tab. 17).

**Table 17.** The use of different monitoring techniques at six airports.

Method/Airport	HAM	EETN	EBJ	HEL	EHEH	AMS
Inspection (ICAO/EASA)	X	X	X		X	X
Visual counts	X	X	X	X	X	X
Radar					X	X
Thermal					X	

### The development of goose abundance on and around airport premises 2009-2019

There was no clear pattern in the development of goose abundance experienced by the airports, although at Hamburg Airport both Pink-footed and Greylag Goose have been increasing. Barnacle Goose was reported to have increased at Helsinki Airport. This was probably a result of the airport being situated on the seasonal migration corridor of the Russian/Baltic population (Tab. 18).

**Table 18.** The development in the goose abundance experienced at five airports from 2009-2019.

Species/Airport	HAM	EETN	EBJ	HEL	EHEH
Pink-footed Goose	Increasing	Not relevant	Stable	Unknown	Not relevant
Barnacle Goose	Stable	Stable	Stable	Increasing	Not relevant
Greylag Goose	Increasing	Not relevant	Stable	Stable	Stable*/increasing

\*Stable since 2011.

### Resource use 2009-2019

Only Helsinki Airport indicated that resources, e.g. man hours, deterrents, land management, surveillance, etc., directed towards geese had increased during 2009-2019, whereas resource use has been stable at the remainder of the airports (Tab. 19).

**Table 19.** The development in resource use directed towards at five airports from 2009-2019.

Airport/Development	Declining	Stable	Increasing	Unknown
HAM		X		
EETN		X		
EBJ		X		

HEL			X	
EHEH		X		

### Conclusions and perspectives

It is important to notice that this analysis is based on different surveys and various sources of information provided by the airports. Therefore, the different airports have not been asked to provide similar information about all issues concerning geese and flight safety. The rather small number of respondents also means that the results of the survey may not be representative of the general situation experienced at airports throughout the range of the goose populations of concern.

However, the survey showed that geese are present around most airports and as such pose a risk to flight safety. Ten out of 14 airports reported that the abundance of geese has increased over the past five years, whereas the abundance has been stable at the remainder of these airports.

Ten out of 14 airports indicated that problems associated with the presence of geese are to be expected in the future.

Almost all airports reported that actions are taken to reduce the presence of geese on their premises, whereas few airports have developed procedures to reduce the presence of geese in the vicinity of airports with Amsterdam Airport Schiphol having the most advanced procedures. Apparently, shooting (blanks and loaded) and pyrotechnics are the most commonly used techniques, although laser and acoustics are also used to scare off geese. Outside airport premises various methods, e.g. nest or egg removal, grassland management and hunting, are practiced.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of various scaring and management methods showed contradicting results, emphasizing that no universal solution to deter birds is available at present. For example, pyrotechnics, laser and egg removal were reported to have both “no” and “good” effect.

In Norway, there was a close relationship between an increased presence of geese at the airports and the number of management actions taken to scare off geese.

Altogether, birdstrikes involving geese had occurred at least nine airports: These were Tromsø, Bergen, Svalbard, Helsinki, Copenhagen, Bremen, Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Zürich airports. Although in many cases, the goose species involved in a birdstrike remain unidentified, it is clear that most goose species have been involved in birdstrikes in recent years. It seems that Barnacle and Greylag Geese are among the species most frequently involved. This corresponds well with the fact that these populations are amongst the most numerous in NW-Europe.

Helsinki, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Karlsruhe/Baden-Baden Airport, Stuttgart and Frankfurt all reported that the presence of geese affect air traffic causing delayed or aborted take-off, go-arounds and a need to close or change runways.

In Norway, there was a close relationship between the increased presence of geese at the airports and the number of management actions taken to scare off geese. A similar pattern was reported from the airports in the Netherlands, where actions against geese has become more regular in recent years. However, despite the overall growth in goose numbers wintering in NW-Europe, the resources allocated to the management and control of geese have remained stable at most airports, except at Amsterdam and Helsinki airports, where growing populations of summering and migrating geese have caused an increase in the associated costs. Part of these costs goes to the monitoring of geese, which in most cases follows the ICAO/EASA standards, whereas radar is used to a lesser extent.

At Helsinki and Copenhagen Airports it seems that birdstrikes are more likely to occur during periods of peak migration (Bradbeer et al. 2017), which is supported by the fact that both airports are situated on an important migration route of Greylag (only Copenhagen) and Barnacle Geese (both airports).

It is evident that in many airports geese pose a hazard to flight safety. Besides the threat to human life and direct costs of damaging birdstrikes, precautionary measures, i.e. mitigation, management, changes in air operations, bird control, etc., pose a financial cost to airports, airlines and authorities responsible for flight safety. Considering the continued growth in several goose populations, these costs are likely to increase in the future.

In the future, it will be useful to develop and promote structures and standards to facilitate the evaluation and linkage of information between airports concerning the expanding goose populations, their potential impact on air safety and their management in and outside airport premises. In this way, standards and guidelines for best practice may be established meaning that an efficient deployment of management methods can be accelerated to mitigate the risk of goose-aircraft collisions.

## References

**AEWA EGMP (2021)** Population Status and Assessment Report 2021. AEWA EGMP Technical Report No. 19. Bonn, Germany.

**Bradbeer, D.R., Rosenquist, C., Christensen, T.K. et al. 2017.** Crowded skies: Conflicts between expanding goose populations and aviation safety. *Ambio* 46, 290–300.

**Flemish Government 2009.** Decision of the Flemish Government of 3 July 2009 on the compensation of damage by game species and protected species.  
<https://codex.vlaanderen.be/Zoeken/Document.aspx?DID=1018264&param=inhoud>

**Fox A.D., Elmberg J., Tombre I.M. & Hessel R., 2017.** Agriculture and herbivorous waterfowl: A review of the scientific basis for improved management. *Biological Reviews*, 92, 854-877.

**Jensen, G.H., Madsen, J., Nagy, S., Lewis M. (Compilers) 2018.** AEWA International Single Species Management Plan for the Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) - Russia/Germany & Netherlands population, East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population, Svalbard/South-west Scotland population. AEWA Technical Series No. 70. Bonn, Germany.

**Koffijberg K., van Winden E., Clausen P., Nielsen R.D., Devos K., Haas F., Nilsson L., Isaksen K., Heldbjerg H., Madsen J., Lehtinimie T., Toivanen T., Tombre I. & Wahl J. 2020.** Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population status report 1980-2018. Doc AEWA/EGMIWG/5.17.

**Madsen, J. Marcussen, L.K., Knudsen, N., Balsby, T.J.S., and Clausen, K.K. 2019.** Does intensive goose grazing affect breeding waders? *Ecology and Evolution*. 9:14512–14522.

**Roodbergen M., Kleyheeg E., Alefs P. & Teunissen W. 2019.** Effecten van ganzen op weide-vogels in Zuid-Holland. Sovon-rapport 2019/35. Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland, Nijmegen.

### Annex 3. Population Models

**Progress on the development of an integrated population model for Barnacle Geese of the Russian population at MU level is reported in the annual EGMP Population Status and Assessment Report.**

#### **DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED POPULATION MODEL FOR BARNACLE GEESE OF THE RUSSIAN MANAGEMENT UNIT**

*Progress Report prepared by the Dutch working group on Barnacle Goose in collaboration with the EGMP  
Data Centre*

Hans Baveco<sup>16</sup>, Paul W. Goedhart<sup>17</sup>, Kees Koffijberg<sup>18</sup>, Henk van der Jeugd<sup>19</sup>, Lisenka de Vries<sup>20</sup>, Ralph Buij<sup>1</sup>  
& Bart A. Nolet<sup>5,6</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Wageningen Environmental Research, WUR

<sup>17</sup> Wageningen Plant Research (Biometris), WUR

<sup>18</sup> SOVON

<sup>19</sup> Vogeltrekstation, NIOO-KNAW

<sup>20</sup> Animal Ecology, NIOO-KNAW

<sup>6</sup> IBED, UvA

## Summary

An Integrated Population Model was developed for the Russian Barnacle Goose population of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands flyway, with the aims 1) to assess current demographic rates in particular productivity and survival rates (from natural causes and unknown offtake in Russia), 2) to reconstruct the dynamics and assess the current state (size) of the Russian management unit (MU1), correcting for the increasing presence of birds from newly established Baltic and North Sea management units (MU2 and MU3), 3) to assess the offtake rate imposed upon the Russian MU and the other two MUs from derogation shooting in recent years in the Baltic Sea and North Sea regions. The IPM used counts of the total flyway population, observed juvenile proportions, reported derogation killing, and reconstructed summer counts of the Baltic and North Sea MUs. The results from the IPM analysis were used in scenarios of future population dynamics under different derogation offtake rates.

The results suggest that the Russian MU population might be levelling off at around 1 million birds. The stabilization appears only in the IPM results for the recent few years, and more data will be needed to arrive at a definite conclusion. Results also indicate that current reproduction and juvenile survival, due to natural causes and unknown Russian offtake, are relatively low. This implies that even with low derogation offtake rates there is some risk of population decrease in the near future.

As systematic bias in reported offtake cannot be excluded, further exploration of the consequences of under- and overreporting on the estimated demographic rates and future population perspectives at MU levels is needed.

## 1. Introduction

In the Flyway Management Plans for Barnacle Goose and other goose species, which are currently being implemented by the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), dynamic population models play an important role in the guidance of optimal management strategies. To be able to apply such models, e.g., in scenario studies with different levels of derogation shooting with the aim of reducing agricultural damage, the current demographic rates of the population need to be known. When monitoring data are scarce or data from different sources need to be combined, an Integrated Population Model (IPM) approach allows one to estimate demographic rates analysing all available data in an integrated way.

The Barnacle Geese of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands flyway belong to either the original and by far largest migratory population breeding in arctic Russia or to one of the new populations established in the past decades in the Baltic and North Sea regions. These populations may have quite different demographic rates. In particular, the survival rates of the Russian population may differ as it experiences (unknown) offtake in Russia in addition to (reported) derogation offtake in the EU. The population may also have lower productivity compared to the recently established populations (Van Der Jeugd et al. 2009, van der Jeugd and Kwak 2017).

Given these possible differences in demographic rates, the development of an IPM treating the entire flyway population as a single entity and assessing the ‘average’ demographic rates, does not seem a good idea, because differences in rates will change the proportional contribution of the different subpopulations to the total population. Scenarios based on the average rates can then be misleading.

Monitoring data for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands flyway concern the total flyway population (January counts) or (combinations of) specific subpopulations (Koffijberg et al. 2020). In this study an IPM is presented that allows to assess the demographic rates specifically for the Russian population, taking into account the presence of birds from the Baltic Sea and North Sea populations in the collected monitoring data sets.

This progress report presents work in progress. It will undergo a thorough scientific peer review in the near future.

## 1.1 Management units

At the 4th meeting of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), 18-20 June 2019 in Perth (Scotland, UK), it was proposed to divide the management of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population into three administratively defined Management Units (MUs) (EGMP 2019). The proposed MUs, all wintering in the same range in the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Denmark and south Sweden, are:

- MU1: The arctic Russian breeding population (migratory).
- MU2: The temperate Baltic breeding population, including the Oslo Fjord breeding population (migratory).
- MU3: The temperate North Sea breeding population, breeding in the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and south-west Denmark (considered sedentary).

This study focusses on MU1, the population breeding in arctic Russian, as the by far largest one, with migratory behaviour that is considered to be of high conservation value. Following an increase in the size of the total flyway population in the wintering areas, derogation killing, aiming at a reduction of agricultural damage, recently increased in several of the range states. All MU populations are affected by derogation offtake, and for each population there will be a certain point where increased offtake rates balance productivity, and population size will stabilize or start to decrease. The migratory MU1 population could be more vulnerable due to additional constraints, e.g., in the breeding period, compared to MU2 and especially MU3 (Van Der Jeugd et al. 2009, van der Jeugd and Kwak 2017).

Due to the migratory behaviour of MU1 birds, their presence spatially overlaps for part of the year with that of birds from the Baltic and North Sea management units. Monitoring data may thus refer to the total flyway population or to specific management units. In the approach taken here we use data specific for the Russian population where possible, and where these are not available we explicitly take into account the presence of birds from Baltic and North Sea MUs.

## 1.2 Integrated population modelling

For the Barnacle Geese of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population there are several sources of monitoring data (Koffijberg et al. 2020). IPMs incorporate all these data into a single analysis (Schaub and Abadi 2011, Kéry and Schaub 2012) to obtain estimates of demographic rates and population sizes. Besides the ability to ‘reconcile’ all data, additional advantages of IPMs include the proper propagation of uncertainty, the ability to handle missing data and to estimate latent variables, and applicability of the approach in an adaptive framework (Johnson et al. 2020). IPMs assume the absence of systematic bias in monitoring data. If such bias exists, it can sometimes be investigated and corrected for in the analysis (Saunders et al. 2019, Johnson et al. 2020).

The aim of the IPM developed for MU1 is threefold:

- Estimating the demographic rates for the Russian MU, in particular the productivity and the survival rates, which incorporate both natural survival and unknown offtake in Russia but exclude derogation in the other range states.
- Reconstructing the dynamics and assessing the current state (size) of the Russian population (MU1), correcting for the increasing presence of birds from newly established Baltic and North Sea populations (MU2 and MU3, respectively).
- Assessing the offtake rate imposed upon the Russian population and the other two populations by derogation shooting in recent years in the Baltic Sea and North Sea regions.



The results obtained from the IPM analysis provide the base for projections of future population development and an impact assessment of derogation efforts.

### 1.3 Baltic and North Sea MU

As a next step in the modelling of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands flyway models will be developed for the Baltic and North Sea MUs, using the insights obtained from the IPM analysis for MU1 and benefiting in particular from the disentanglement of monitoring data with respect to the management units they relate to. It is not clear yet whether for MU2 and MU3 sufficient data will be available (Koffijberg et al. 2020) to allow for the development of useful IPMs. If not, population dynamic models can be constructed based on the more traditional approaches to estimate the individual demographic rates (separately instead of integrated), e.g. as in (Huysentruyt et al. 2020).

## 2. Monitoring data

Monitoring data were obtained from (Koffijberg et al. 2020). Further data processing and analysis outside the IPM, e.g. to extract subsets of data relevant to the Russian population, is described in the following sections.

The IPM developed in the next chapter is based on a post-breeding census at 15 July. A yearly time step then runs from 15 July to 15 July the next year, and will be called a season which is denoted by e.g., 1990/91. The January count of the population occurs halfway the annual time step. Therefore each yearly time step is split into two half-year periods called period *s* or “summer” (15 July to 15 January) and period *w* or “winter” (15 January to 15 July). This enables specification of different survival and offtake rates in the two periods, but requires that e.g. annually reported derogation offtake is divided over the same periods.

### 2.1 Population counts

*Mid-January counts refer to the total flyway population, the sum of MU1, MU2 and MU3.*

In the counts no distinction is made between juveniles and adults. The first count was performed in 1976 in the season 1975/76, while the last count used here is for January 2018, i.e. the season 2017/18. Counts are organised per country. For Germany counts are missing for the first five and the last two seasons. The first five counts in Germany are set to zero since the first available counts in Germany are very low as compared to the total numbers in all other countries (in particular, the Netherlands). For imputation of the last two counts in Germany, which will become available in due time, logistic regression was used to obtain a provisional estimate. The number of counts in Germany was therefore assumed to follow a quasi-binomial distribution with binomial denominator the total population count, and a probability  $\pi$  that a single goose resides in Germany. A smoothing spline with 4 degrees of freedom in Year was fitted to these data. This reveals that from the season 1999/00 onwards the percentage in Germany is more or less constant albeit with considerable variation. This constant percentage was confirmed by a non-significant linear term in time from 1999/00 onwards and also from 2004/05 onwards. It was therefore decided to impute the last two observations in Germany using a constant logistic model from 2004/05 onwards. The estimated constant percentage equals 25.5. The resulting imputed counts are 338,624 and 332,443 for January 2017 and 2018, respectively.

### 2.2 Survival

*Preliminary estimates of total survival, incorporating the impact of derogation offtake in NW Europe and unknown harvest in Russia, are available specifically for MU1.*

De Vries and Van der Jeugd (personal communication) provided preliminary survival rates, obtained from analysis of capture-mark-resighting data submitted to the geese.org portal, for the three different MUs of Barnacle Goose, based on a combination of observations of colour-ringed individuals taken from the geese.org

database, and recoveries of metal-ringed individuals provided by EURING. There are separate survival rates for juveniles and adults, period  $s$  and  $w$ , and also for the periods before and after 15 July 2007, when derogation shooting increased markedly. The estimated rates and associated confidence intervals for the Russian population are given in Table 20. These rates include offtake, both in Russia and in NW Europe. Note that (1) the rates are generally very precise with small confidence intervals especially for adults, (2) the juvenile summer survival rates are lower than the other rates, and (3) the survival rates after 2007 are lower than before 2007 which might reflect the onset of derogation shooting of Barnacle geese in the Baltic and North Sea regions after 2007.

**Table 20.** Estimated total survival rates, including offtake, for the MU1 population categorized by stage, summer/winter and observation period. The standard error (Se) of the estimate and a 95% confidence interval (CI) are given.

Stage	Summer/Winter Season	Period	Estimate	Se	CI left	CI right
Juvenile	Summer	Before 2007, 15 July	0.7438	0.0224	0.6976	0.7852
Juvenile	Winter	Before 2007, 15 July	0.9662	0.0190	0.9012	0.9889
Adult	Summer	Before 2007, 15 July	0.9687	0.0067	0.9526	0.9794
Adult	Winter	Before 2007, 15 July	0.9751	0.0071	0.9566	0.9858
Juvenile	Summer	After 2007, 15 July	0.4871	0.0305	0.4277	0.5468
Juvenile	Winter	After 2007, 15 July	0.8785	0.0405	0.7746	0.9383
Adult	Summer	After 2007, 15 July	0.8906	0.0121	0.8646	0.9122
Adult	Winter	After 2007, 15 July	0.9244	0.0141	0.8917	0.9478

### 2.3 Derogation offtake

*Derogation offtake is reported to the EU annually and per country. Derogation may concern birds from MU1, MU2 and/or MU3. A subset of the data was constructed, excluding the derogation offtake that could not concern MU1 birds. For the Netherlands, this subset was based on more detailed, monthly data.*


The Barnacle Goose is listed as Annex 1 species in the EU Bird Directive. Offtake by derogation in EU countries therefore has to be reported annually to the EU. Data from the EU and national level (Koffijberg et al. 2020) are processed to obtain the derogation offtake per half year periods  $s$  and  $w$  for the Baltic Sea and North Sea regions. No distinction could be made between juveniles and adults.

EU Derogation data were derived from the assessment made for the ISSMP (Jensen et al. 2018), in which national data were assigned to the management units (either all three management units, or a selection, based on the timing of derogation shooting). We divided them over the period  $w$  (Jan 15 - Jul 15) and period  $s$  (Jul 15 - Jan 15) in proportion 3:1, thus assuming that three times as many birds were killed in the first half of the year (when most agricultural damage occurs) as in the second half. Note that the two periods of one calendar year end up in different timesteps of the IPM. Relevant annual data were available from Denmark, Germany and The Netherlands, but missing for Estonia. Available data from Belgium and Sweden mainly (or entirely) covered the local breeding population and were not taken into account.

For the Netherlands from 2013 onwards detailed monthly data were employed. For the Dutch subset of relevant derogation data, the months June, July, August and September were removed as these referred to resident birds (MU3) only. For the remaining months values for all provinces were summed. Values summed over the months

February to May represented derogation offtake in period  $w$ , while values summed over the months October to December yield derogation offtake in period  $s$ . Data for January were divided equally over the two periods, to align with the model timestep.

The derogation subset for the Netherlands represented the North Sea region offtake. Values for Denmark represented derogation offtake in the Baltic Sea region. Values for Germany (up to almost 2000 birds) should be added to the North Sea region offtake, and values for Sweden and Norway (also around 2000) should be added to the Baltic Sea region offtake - not all derogation data were however available at the time of this analysis. Thus, derogation in recent years in both the Baltic and the North Sea region may be up to approximately 2000 birds per calendar year higher than the numbers used in the analysis (Figure 20).




**Figure 20.** Derogation offtake in period  $s$  and  $w$  in Baltic Sea region (left), where it affects MU1 and MU2, and in the North Sea region (right), where it affects MU1, MU2 and MU3.


## 2.4 Proportion of young

Data on the proportion of juveniles were available for the Netherlands, since 1996/97. A selection of the data was made including provinces with migratory birds (MU1 and MU2) and no wintering resident birds (MU3). The data contain thus information on the productivity of MU1 and MU2 together (Koffijberg et al. 2020). With MU2 being less than 10% in size of MU1, we assumed that the observed proportions represent yearly productivity of MU1.

The number of juveniles in groups of Barnacle Geese have been counted on a total of 1153 occasions in September – March for the seasons from 1996/97 and onwards. Very few groups were observed in September, February and March and data for these months were therefore excluded. The juvenile counts have been carried out in the wintering areas where mainly Russian and Baltic birds winter, see (Koffijberg et al. 2020) for details. Observed percentages per season are sometimes very variable and the percentage juveniles seems to decrease somewhat over time (Figure 21). The mean percentages per month from October to January appear to be more or less stable (Figure 22); it is therefore assumed that the percentage juveniles is constant within a season (at least for the period October-January).




**Figure 21.** Boxplot for observed percentages juveniles for each season (October – January); the red line joins the mean percentages that were weighted by the group size. The count just above the x-axis gives the number of counted groups per season.



**Figure 22.** Observed percentage juveniles per season and within season for October, November, December and January (from left to right within season). The red line joins the weighted means of the percentages within each season.

The counts within a season are for different groups and are therefore considered to be independent. The counts of juveniles and group sizes are therefore summed per season.

The juvenile and group counts discussed so far are for the season 1996/97 and onwards. Before that only raw juvenile percentages are available, with missing values for the seasons 1991/92, 1992/93, 1994/05 and 1995/96. Moreover, for the period 1980/1981 – 1993/94 total group sizes are also available. This implies that only for the seasons 1975/76 – 1979/80 group sizes are missing. For these years the total group size was (arbitrarily) set to the mean of the first 6 years in the period 1980/1981 – 1993/94. Figure 23 displays the resulting total group sizes per season.




**Figure 23.** Total group sizes per season in which the percentage juveniles was determined. The black dots denote years for which the total group size is summed over many individual groups, the red dots denote years for which only total group sizes are available, and the green dots denote the years for which the total group size was set to the mean of the first 6 red dots.

A simple logistic regression on the individual counts for the season 1996/97 and onwards with a factor season resulted in a mean residual deviance of 8.4 indicating that there is quite some overdispersion within seasons relative to the binomial distribution. A beta-binomial distribution for the number of juveniles in a given group size is therefore appropriate. To quantify the amount of overdispersion per season the approach of Johnson et al. (2020) was followed. This amounts to first taking the mean and variance of the observed proportions of Juveniles within each season. The year specific means  $M_t$  and variances  $V_t$  were then used to fit year-specific beta distributions,  $Beta(\alpha_t, \beta_t)$ , for the proportion of Juveniles employing the method of moments, i.e.  $\alpha_t = \omega_t M_t$ ,  $\beta_t = \omega_t (1 - M_t)$  with  $\omega_t = \frac{M_t(1-M_t)}{V_t} - 1$ . Note that  $\omega_t = \alpha_t + \beta_t$ . The estimates are given in Table 21. The estimated yearly parameters of the Beta distribution can then be used to obtain a 95% interval for the proportion of Juveniles as in Figure 24. This again reveals that there is quite some variation in the observed proportions juveniles per season. The interval for 2000/01 is small; this interval is only based on two observed groups.

**Table 21.** Number of observed groups, means and standard deviations of observed proportions Juveniles, estimates of parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\omega = \alpha + \beta$  of the Beta distribution, and lower and upper limits of a 95% interval for the proportion Juveniles based on the fitted Beta distribution.

Season	#Groups	Mean	Sd	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\omega=\alpha+\beta$	Lower	Upper
1996/97	25	0.280	0.123	3.47	8.94	12.40	0.079	0.547
1997/98	40	0.122	0.049	5.40	38.89	44.29	0.044	0.232
1998/99	23	0.181	0.081	3.91	17.66	21.57	0.053	0.365
1999/00	60	0.220	0.112	2.83	9.99	12.82	0.049	0.474
2000/01	2	0.169	0.009	312.01	1535.95	1847.96	0.152	0.186
2001/02	9	0.174	0.065	5.71	27.09	32.80	0.067	0.319
2002/03	29	0.150	0.092	2.09	11.83	13.92	0.022	0.371
2003/04	99	0.116	0.066	2.67	20.25	22.91	0.023	0.272
2004/05	95	0.151	0.086	2.46	13.84	16.30	0.027	0.354

2005/06	77	0.167	0.076	3.83	19.06	22.89	0.048	0.341
2006/07	20	0.111	0.069	2.16	17.30	19.45	0.016	0.279
2007/08	12	0.079	0.053	1.99	23.04	25.03	0.010	0.210
2008/09	34	0.085	0.029	8.10	86.69	94.79	0.038	0.149
2009/10	56	0.138	0.043	8.77	54.86	63.63	0.065	0.232
2010/11	36	0.109	0.036	7.89	64.63	72.52	0.049	0.189
2011/12	38	0.130	0.047	6.70	44.71	51.41	0.054	0.234
2012/13	54	0.132	0.054	5.10	33.37	38.46	0.046	0.255
2013/14	54	0.103	0.033	8.69	75.80	84.48	0.048	0.175
2014/15	85	0.127	0.046	6.46	44.46	50.93	0.051	0.230
2015/16	53	0.101	0.037	6.49	57.65	64.13	0.041	0.185
2016/17	64	0.121	0.038	8.76	63.72	72.49	0.057	0.205
2017/18	59	0.056	0.025	4.85	81.33	86.18	0.018	0.113
2018/19	101	0.111	0.039	7.05	56.47	63.53	0.047	0.198



**Figure 24.** Mean percentages juveniles per season, un-weighted by group size, with 95% intervals according to a Beta distribution obtained by applying the method of moments per season.

## 2.5 Summer counts for the Baltic and North Sea management units


To account in the IPM analysis for the presence of birds from the Baltic and North Sea management units, estimates of the size of the Baltic and North Sea population are required. Data compiled in (Koffijberg et al. 2020) were used to obtain (rough) estimates of MU2 and MU3.

The North Sea MU consist of birds breeding in the Netherlands, Germany and Belgium. The latter two were ignored, because of their relatively small size. For the Dutch population post-breeding summer counts are available from 2005 onwards. The missing data in this time series were linearly interpolated. For the period before 2005 exponential growth was assumed with a high annual growth rate of 46% (Van der Jeugd et al.



2006). The first breeding pair was observed in 1982, therefore for this year the summer count was set at four birds (Figure 25).

The Baltic MU consists of breeding populations in mainly Finland, Denmark and Sweden, i.e. small populations in Estonia, Russia and Norway (Oslo fjord) have not been taken into account. Only for the Finnish population, a longer time series of summer counts is available, starting in 2008. For the preceding years, the same 46% growth rate was assumed as for the Dutch population (Figure 25). Fragmentary data on the breeding populations of Denmark and Sweden suggest that these are roughly of the same size as the Finnish breeding population. Therefore, as a first approximation of the total Baltic summer population size, the Finnish numbers are multiplied by a factor 3.



**Figure 25.** Summer counts for the Netherlands and Finland. Initial exponential growth of the populations is assumed, with 46% annual increase. Open dots are linearly interpolated values.

## 2.6 Implications for future monitoring

Application of the IPM in adaptive management requires the availability of reliable and complete monitoring data. The data for the developed IPM for the Russian Barnacle Goose population include winter population counts for the total flyway population, juvenile counts specific for the Russian population, derogation data for the periods Russian birds are present in the Baltic and North Sea regions, and summer counts for the Baltic and North Sea populations (Table 22). While developing the IPM and preparing the data the model requires, it became clear that

- January counts and data on juvenile proportions were available in sufficient detail - they should continue to be collected in more or less the same way. Care should be taken that juvenile proportions are determined in groups with predominantly birds of MU1.
- Derogation offtake data were not available in sufficient (temporal) resolution. To assign them to appropriate timesteps in the model, and to be able to select offtake occurring in the period the Russian population is present, the number of birds killed under derogation per country needs to be available over shorter time intervals, preferably per month.
- Summer counts were only available for a limited number of years, and not for all Baltic and North Sea states with breeding populations. For the current application, a rough assessment was made of total


population size (in summer) of the Baltic and North Sea MUs. For future applications systematic summer counts are required – such data would also support the development of population dynamic models for the Baltic and North Sea MUs themselves, or a simultaneous IPM analysis for all three MUs (Table 22). Summer counts and juvenile counts may be combined.

**Table 22.** The monitoring data in terms of the management units, as required for the IPM, and additional data that will be required for future models for MU2 and MU3 (last column). <sup>1</sup>regional derogation offtake in the months (and areas, e.g., provinces) MU1 is present in the region (BS: Baltic Sea region; NS: North Sea region). It depends on the regions which of the other MUs can be present at the same time as MU1. <sup>2</sup>all offtake in the months (and areas) MU1 is absent and only the local breeding population is present in the region.

Monitoring data	Current IPM (MU1)	models (MU2 and MU3)
January counts	All (total flyway population)	
Proportion of young	MU1	MU2 and MU3
Derogation offtake Baltic region	BS <sup>1</sup> (MU1 and MU2)	MU2 <sup>2</sup> (=total in BS minus BS <sup>1</sup> )
Derogation offtake North Sea region	NS <sup>1</sup> (MU1, MU2 and MU3)	MU3 <sup>2</sup> (=total in NS minus NS <sup>1</sup> )
Summer counts (post-breeding)	MU2 and MU3	

### 3. Population dynamics

The population dynamic model assumes two stage classes, juveniles  $F$  (fledglings at the start of the timestep) and adults  $A$ , and does not distinguish between females and males. Model definition is based on a post-breeding census in July (Figure 26). Lack of data – in the counts no distinction can be made between sub-adults and adults - motivates the choice for a two-stage model instead of a three-stage model as e.g., described in (Layton-Matthews et al. 2019). Although the IPM can in principle be used to obtain estimates of sub-adults numbers, as a latent variable, this likely does not justify the added complexity of the model.



**Figure 26.** The stage-structured life cycle as represented in the IPM. Juveniles are in the implementation also referred to as Fledglings (F). See text for a definition of the symbols.

The January counts occur halfway the annual time step and we therefore distinguish between survival and harvest rates in the two half-year periods  $s$  and  $w$ . Period  $s$  (July 15 to January 15) and period  $w$  (January 15 to July 15), occasionally referred to as “summer” and “winter”.

The population model deals with the dynamics of the Russian population (MU1) only. To link the model to the monitoring data, the presence of birds of the other MUs needs to be taken into account. We untangle this overlap in management units by using the January counts for the flyway population as a whole and by assuming that for the derogation offtake (the way we defined it, see section 2.3) the offtake in the Baltic Sea region



concerns MU1 and MU2, while in the North Sea region it concerns all three Mus. Derogation offtake *rates* then refer to offtake as a fraction of the total population present in the region. Based on (post-breeding) summer counts of MU2 and MU3 as additional monitoring data (section 2.5), estimates of the total flyway population size and derogation offtake rates can be obtained that take into account the overlap in MUs (see below). The summer counts of MU2 and MU3 are used as deterministic values without error because this simplifies the model considerably.

The population model employs the following symbols:

$t$	timestep, from July 15 to July 15 the next year
$s$	period $s$ (“summer”) (July 15 to January 15)
$w$	period $w$ (“winter”) (January 15 to July 15)
$F$	juvenile stage
$A$	adult stage
$F_t$	number of juveniles (fledglings) at the beginning of timestep $t$
$A_t$	number of adults at the beginning of timestep $t$
$R_t$	reproduction rate (fledglings/adult pair) at $t$ ( $0.5 R_t = \text{fledglings} / \text{adult}$ )
$\theta_{F,s,t}$	natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) of juveniles over period $s$ in timestep $t$
$\theta_{F,w,t}$	natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) of juveniles over period $w$ in timestep $t$
$\theta_{A,s,t}$	natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) of adults over period $s$ in timestep $t$
$\theta_{A,w,t}$	natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) of adults over period $w$ in timestep $t$
$h_{s,t}^B$	derogation offtake rate in Baltic Sea region, in period $s$ , in timestep $t$
$h_{s,t}^N$	derogation offtake rate in North Sea region, in period $s$ , in timestep $t$
$h_{w,t}^B$	derogation offtake rate in Baltic Sea region, in period $w$ , in timestep $t$
$h_{w,t}^N$	derogation offtake rate in North Sea region, in period $w$ , in timestep $t$
$H_{s,t}^B$	derogation offtake in Baltic Sea region, in period $s$ , in timestep $t$
$H_{s,t}^N$	derogation offtake in North Sea region, in period $s$ , in timestep $t$
$H_{w,t}^B$	derogation offtake in Baltic Sea region, in period $w$ , in timestep $t$
$H_{w,t}^N$	derogation offtake in North Sea region, in period $w$ , in timestep $t$
$\rho$	relative sensitivity to derogation offtake of juveniles compared to adults

The correction for the presence of birds from Baltic and North Sea management units requires an additional fixed survival rate  $\theta$  and two timeseries:

$\theta$	(deterministic) natural survival over period $s$ for birds of the Baltic & North Sea MUs
$N_t^B$	(deterministic) number of birds of the Baltic Sea MU in summer count, in timestep $t$
$N_t^N$	(deterministic) number of birds of the North Sea in summer count, in timestep $t$

The total survival is defined as the product of natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) and the fraction of birds not killed by derogation, taking into account the relative sensitivity  $\rho$  to derogation offtake of juveniles compared to adults:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{F,s,t} &= (1 - \rho(h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta_{F,s,t} && \text{total survival of juveniles in period } s \text{ in timestep } t \\ \lambda_{F,w,t} &= (1 - \rho(h_{w,t}^B + h_{w,t}^N)) \theta_{F,w,t} && \text{total survival of juveniles in period } w \text{ in timestep } t \\ \lambda_{A,s,t} &= (1 - (h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta_{A,s,t} && \text{total survival of adults in period } s \text{ in timestep } t \\ \lambda_{A,w,t} &= (1 - (h_{w,t}^B + h_{w,t}^N)) \theta_{A,w,t} && \text{total survival of adults in period } w \text{ in timestep } t\end{aligned}$$

Note that with this formulation derogation offtake occurs simultaneously in both regions, which is equivalent to assuming that the birds of the Russian management unit are, in the period derogation offtake occurs, evenly distributed over the whole Baltic and North Sea area.

The population dynamics of MU1 is, for a single timestep from  $t$  to  $(t+1)$ , defined by:

$$\{A_{t+1} = \lambda_{A,s,t} \lambda_{A,w,t} A_t + \lambda_{F,s,t} \lambda_{F,w,t} F_t \quad F_{t+1} = 0.5 R_t A_{t+1}$$

The total number  $N_t$  of MU1 birds at 15 January in timestep  $t$  is given by

$$N_t = \lambda_{A,s,t} A_t + \lambda_{F,s,t} F_t$$

The total number  $N_t^C$  of geese (all three management units) observed in January in timestep  $t$  is derived using (deterministic) estimates of the summer populations of the Baltic and North Sea management units  $N_t^B$  and  $N_t^N$ . For these birds, a natural survival  $\theta$  over period  $s$  is taken into account, as well as the regional derogation offtake rate from their populations, giving:

$$N_t^C = N_t + (1 - h_{s,t}^N) \theta N_t^N + (1 - (h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta N_t^B$$

For natural survival rate  $\theta$  a fixed, deterministic, value is used, obtained from preliminary capture-mark-resighting survival analysis for the Baltic and North Sea MUs.

The fraction  $\pi_t$  of juveniles at 15 January in timestep  $t$  is given by

$$\pi_t = \frac{\lambda_{F,s,t} F_t}{(\lambda_{F,s,t} F_t + \lambda_{A,s,t} A_t)} = \frac{\lambda_{F,s,t} F_t}{N_t}$$

The derogation offtake in period  $s$  in Baltic Sea region  $H_{s,t}^B$  and in North Sea region  $H_{s,t}^N$  are given by:

$$\{H_{s,t}^B = h_{s,t}^B (\rho \theta_{F,s,t} F_t + \theta_{A,s,t} A_t + \theta N_t^B) \quad H_{s,t}^N = h_{s,t}^N (\rho \theta_{F,s,t} F_t + \theta_{A,s,t} A_t + \theta N_t^B + \theta N_t^N)$$

The derogation offtake in period  $w$  in Baltic Sea region  $H_{w,t}^B$  and in North Sea region  $H_{w,t}^N$  are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\{H_{w,t}^B &= h_{w,t}^B \left[ \rho (1 - \rho(h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta_{F,s,t} F_t + (1 - (h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta_{A,s,t} A_t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - (h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta N_t^B \right] H_{w,t}^N \\ &= h_{w,t}^N \left[ \rho (1 - \rho(h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta_{F,s,t} F_t + (1 - (h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta_{A,s,t} A_t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - (h_{s,t}^B + h_{s,t}^N)) \theta N_t^B + (1 - h_{s,t}^N) \theta N_t^N \right]\end{aligned}$$

This assumes that derogation offtake in period  $s$  is taking place after natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) in period  $s$ , and that derogation offtake in period  $w$  occurs before natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest) in period  $w$ .

The model equations are presented in an alternative way, separately for the three MUs, in Table 23. The model also produces predictions of the derogation offtake for MU2 and MU3. However, these numbers and rates refer only to the derogation offtake that occurs while the birds of MU1 are present. MU2 and MU3 will be subject to additional derogation measures, e.g., in and around the breeding period.

**Table 23.** Overview of the population dynamic model for MU1 (column 2 and 3), with the equations used to calculate derogation offtake and the numbers at the end of the two periods making up annual timestep. The equations for MU2 and MU3 (column 4 and 5) are not part of the population dynamic model, but are used to account for the presence of MU2 and MU3 birds in the monitoring data (January counts and regional derogation offtake).

Period	MU1 juveniles	MU1 adults	MU2	MU3
July	$F$	$A$	$N^B$	$N^N$
derogation $s$	$\rho (h_s^B + h_s^N) \theta_{F,s} F$	$(h_s^B + h_s^N) \theta_{A,s} A$	$(h_s^B + h_s^N) \theta N^B$	$h_s^N \theta N^N$
January	$(1 - \rho (h_s^B + h_s^N)) \theta_{F,s} F$	$(1 - (h_s^B + h_s^N)) \theta_{A,s} A$	$(1 - (h_s^B + h_s^N)) \theta N^B$	$(1 - h_s^N) \theta N^N$
January	$F^1$	$A^1$	$N^{B1}$	$N^{N1}$
derogation $w$	$\rho (h_w^B + h_w^N) F^1$	$(h_w^B + h_w^N) A^1$	$(h_w^B + h_w^N) N^{B1}$	$h_w^N N^{N1}$
July	$\theta_{F,w} (1 - \rho (h_w^B + h_w^N)) F^1$	$\theta_{A,w} (1 - (h_w^B + h_w^N)) A^1$	NA	NA

The main assumptions in the population dynamics model are:

- natural mortality (from natural causes and harvest in Russia) occurs before derogation in period  $s$  and after derogation in period  $w$
- derogation mortality is additive to natural mortality
- derogation offtake occurs simultaneously in the Baltic and North Sea regions
- young birds are more vulnerable to derogation offtake than older birds, and the rate of differential vulnerability is constant

#### 4. Integrated population model

The following yearly data were compiled in a single CSV file (Appendix E IPM data input file), with in parenthesis the name of the column in the CSV file and the corresponding model parameter in the IPM.

- January counts of the total flyway (Count,  $N_t^C$ );
- Number of observed juveniles in groups of known size (nFledgling,  $\pi_t$ )
- Group size for which the number of juveniles was observed (nGroup)
- Period  $s$  derogation offtake in the Baltic Sea region (hSummerBS,  $H_{s,t}^B$ )
- Period  $w$  derogation offtake in the Baltic Sea region (hWinterBS,  $H_{w,t}^B$ )
- Period  $s$  derogation offtake in the North Sea region (hSummerNS,  $H_{s,t}^N$ )
- Period  $w$  derogation offtake in the North Sea region (hWinterNS,  $H_{w,t}^N$ )

- Population counts in the North Sea region in the preceding summer in ( $N_{tNS1}, N_t^N$ )
- Population counts in the Baltic Sea region in the preceding summer ( $N_{tBS1}, N_t^B$ )

The IPM was implemented in JAGS 4.3.0 (Plummer 2003) which was run from within the R computing environment version 3.6.0 (Team 2019) employing the R package runjags (Denwood 2016). The full R code, including reading and processing of the data, is given in Appendix E R/JAGS code.

The JAGS code for survival was split into years without derogation offtake, for which total survival equals natural survival (including unknown Russian harvest), and years with derogation offtake for which total survival is the product of natural survival and the derogation offtake rate. The number of MCMC runs was imported from a separate file with the following settings:

adapt = 5000, burnin = 100000, sample = 100000, thin = 1, chains = 3.

With these settings a single run takes about 6 hours.

## 5. Data likelihoods and prior distributions

### 5.1 Prior for initial population size

The initial value for the “true” number of juveniles  $F_1$  and adults  $A_1$  in the first year are commonly chosen to be close to the population counts. However, only an initial total count of juveniles + adults is available and therefore this total count needs to be subdivided in some way. The percentage juveniles can be calculated from the data used in section 2.4, and this gives a long-term October mean of 15% for the years from 1974/75 to 2018/19. We used this percentage for subdivision of the initial population size. With an initial population count of around 40,000, this results in 6,000 juveniles and 34,000 adults. Using these values as means, employing a lognormal distribution and assuming a coefficient of variation of 50% for juveniles and 20% for adults, results in a 95% prediction interval for juveniles of (2,126, 13,545) and (22,614, 49,151) for adults. These intervals seem wide enough as initial population sizes. The resulting priors for the initial population size are then given by, in JAGS notation:

$$\begin{aligned} nF[1] &\sim \text{dlnorm}(8.70, \\ nA[1] &\sim \text{dlnorm}(10.43, 25.50) \end{aligned} \quad 4.48)$$

The mean and precision of these lognormal distribution are obtained by means of

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mean} &= \log(\text{initialNumber}) - 0.5 * \log(1 + \text{CV} * \text{CV}) \\ \text{precision} &= 1 / \log(1 + \text{CV} * \text{CV}) \end{aligned}$$

### 5.2 Prior for survival

This section concerns the natural survival rates  $\theta_{F,s}$ ,  $\theta_{F,w}$ ,  $\theta_{A,s}$  and  $\theta_{A,w}$  for juveniles and adults in period  $s$  and  $w$ . These rates include unknown Russian harvest but exclude derogation in the Baltic and North Sea regions. It was envisaged that the survival rates (total survival, i.e. including derogation in the Baltic and North Sea regions) given in Table 1 could somehow be used as fixed priors for the survival rates in the IPM. However, there are three problems with such an approach. First, the confidence intervals in Table 1 are small, especially for adults, which would result in narrow prior distributions. This might disregard the possibly large year-to-year variation. Secondly, one of the purposes of the IPM is to use it for future years to see how the population will evolve under different scenarios. When highly informative priors for the survival rates would be employed, nothing will be learned about these rates from fitting the model. Thirdly, the rates in Table 1 include derogation while rates excluding derogation are required in the IPM. Therefore an alternative approach was used which employs a so-called random effects model for the natural survival  $\theta$ . This assumes that the year-to-year rates are drawn from some distribution with hyper parameters. It is common to define a model for a probability, like

the survival rate, on the logit scale. In JAGS code such a model reads, for instance for Fledglings summer survival:

```

meanLogit.F.s ~ dnorm( $\mu_{FS}$ ,  $\tau_{FS}$ )
sigmaLogit.F.s ~ dunif(0,  $\sigma_{FS}$ )
tauLogit.F.s = 1/(sigmaLogit.F.s * sigmaLogit.F.s)
for (t in 1:nyears) {
  logit.theta.F.s[t] ~ dnorm(meanLogit.F.s, tauLogit.F.s)
  logit(theta.F.s[t]) = logit.theta.F.s[t]
}

```

In this case no distinction is made between survival before and after 2007. Instead the year-to-year survival parameters are drawn from a normal distribution with parameters *meanLogit* and *tauLogit* which themselves follow hyper prior distributions with fixed parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . The idea is that the yearly probabilities do differ, but they also have something in common namely a shared underlying distribution. The Bayesian analysis hopefully learns something from the data about this shared distribution, and the posterior distributions of *meanLogit* and *tauLogit* can then be used for future simulations of the population. This approach assumes that the mean and variance are constant over time. Alternatively, a trend in time could be modelled by e.g.  $\mu = \alpha_\mu + \beta_\mu \times \text{Time}$  in which case priors for  $\alpha_\mu$  and  $\beta_\mu$  would be required.

The question then is what to choose for the fixed meta parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . Note that the median of the distribution of the survival rate  $\theta$  equals  $\text{ilogit}(\mu)$  where  $\text{ilogit}()$  is the inverse of the  $\text{logit}()$  function. Examples of the resulting distribution of the survival rate for various values of the meta parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  are given in Figure 27. Here, the parameter  $\mu$  was chosen such that the median of the distribution of the survival rate  $\theta$  equals 0.6 (left panels), 0.75, 0.90 and 0.95 (right panels). The top bar in every plot is obtained by a fixed value “*sigmaLogit* =  $\sigma/2$ ”, while the bottom bar is obtained by also simulating “*sigmaLogit* ~  $\text{dunif}(0, \sigma)$ ”. The bottom distribution is, by definition, somewhat wider than the top distribution. Despite the rather small confidence intervals in Table 20, the following wide priors were chosen depicted with a grey background in Figure 27:  $\sigma=4$ ,  $\tau=4$  and  $\mu=0.41$  for Fledglings (with median survival 0.6) and  $\sigma=4$ ,  $\tau=4$  and  $\mu=2.20$  for adults (with median survival 0.9). The same priors were chosen for summer and winter survival. For the chosen values, there is little difference between the top and bottom bars in Figure 27. Therefore the more simple case with a fixed value “*sigmaLogit* =  $\sigma/2$ ” was used.

### 5.3 Prior for reproduction


For the reproduction rate  $R_t$  a similar approach as for the natural survival rate  $\theta_t$  was chosen, i.e. a random effects model with a hyper prior. The only difference is that the reproduction rate can be larger than 1. It was assumed that the reproduction rate cannot be larger than 2, and a random effects model is then given by, in JAGS notation:

```


meanLogit.R ~ dnorm( $\mu_R$ ,  $\tau_R$ )
sigmaLogit.R ~ dunif(0,  $\sigma_R$ )
tauLogit.R = 1/(sigmaLogit.R * sigmaLogit.R)
for (t in 1:nyears) {
  logit.repro[t] ~ dnorm(meanLogit.R, tauLogit.R)
  repro[t] = 2/(1+exp(-logit.repro[t]))
}

```

The only difference with the random effects model for survival is that the reproduction  $\text{repro}[t]$  is multiplied by 2 giving values in the interval (0,2) rather than (0,1). Again, the question is what to choose for the fixed hyper parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . The estimated survival rates in Table 20 were used to get some idea of the population development for various fixed reproduction rates  $R$ . This employs the deterministic model given in Figure 26, starting with 700,000 individuals in Mid-June 2007, of which 15% are Juveniles. This exercise suggests that a reproduction rate of around one is required to obtain a growing population for the last 10 years. The parameter  $\mu_R$  was therefore set to zero implying a median reproduction rate of one. Prior distributions with  $\mu_R = 0$  and various values of  $\tau_R$  and  $\sigma_R$  are given in Figure 28. The distribution with  $\mu_R = 0$ ,  $\tau_R = 2$  and  $\sigma_R = 2$ , depicted with a grey background in Figure 28, seems reasonably uninformative and was therefore chosen. Again, for these chosen values there is not much difference between the top and bottom bars, and therefore the more simple case with a fixed value “ $\text{sigmaLogit} = \sigma/2$ ” was employed.



**Figure 27.** Prior distributions for the natural survival rate  $\theta$  for various values of the fixed hyper parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . The blue bar represents 80% of the distribution, and the orange/red bars extend to 90/99% of the distribution. The black dot depicts the median. The different values of  $\mu$  are such that the median probability equals 0.6, 0.75, 0.9 and 0.95 (left to right panels). The top bar in every panel is obtained by employing a fixed value “ $\text{sigmaLogit} = \sigma/2$ ”, while the bottom bar is obtained by simulating “ $\text{sigmaLogit} \sim \text{dunif}(0, \sigma)$ ”. The panels with a grey background depict the chosen priors for Juveniles ( $\mu=0.41$ ) and Adults ( $\mu=2.20$ ) respectively.



**Figure 28.** Prior distributions for the reproduction parameter  $R$  for various values of the fixed meta parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . The parameter  $\mu$  was set to zero such that the median reproduction rate equals one in all panels. See Figure 8 for a further description. The panel with a grey background depicts the chosen prior.


#### 5.4 Prior for derogation offtake rates

Before 2007 there was no derogation offtake. After 2007 total observed derogation offtake relative to counts of the total flyway population was always smaller than 3%. Uninformative uniform priors between 0 and 10% were employed for the yearly derogation offtake rates in the Baltic and North Sea regions both in period  $s$  and  $w$ , i.e. for the parameters  $h_{s,t}^B$ ,  $h_{s,t}^N$ ,  $h_{w,t}^B$ ,  $h_{w,t}^N$ . These uninformative priors allow the model to deviate from the observed derogation offtake rates.

#### 5.5 Observation error January counts

The total number of geese  $N_t^C$  of all three MUs in January, defined by the population model, has to be linked to the observed January counts  $Y_t$ . Since  $Y_t$  is measured with error the link employs a statistical distribution. This is called the *observation error* in the IPM terminology and reflects both error in the counts and lack of fit of the model. For large counts, such as for the Barnacle Goose, it is common to specify a logNormal distribution for the error. A logNormal( $\mu$ ,  $\sigma^2$ ) distribution has median  $\exp \exp(\mu)$ , mean  $E = \exp \exp\left(\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)$  and variance  $V = E^2 (\exp \exp(\sigma^2) - 1)$ . It follows that the coefficient of variation equals  $CV = \frac{\sqrt{V}}{E} = \sqrt{\exp \exp(\sigma^2) - 1}$ . The inverse of the latter equation gives  $\sigma^2 = \log \log (CV^2 + 1)$ . In the JAGS model the parameter  $\mu$  of the lognormal distribution is set to the logarithm of  $N_t^C$  and we need a prior for the variance  $\sigma^2$ . We choose to specify a prior for  $CV$  instead because this is a more natural parameter.

Assuming that the observed January counts follow a more or less smooth function in time, the residuals from a fitted function then provide information about the error distribution. Fitting a smoothing spline in time with 2 degrees of freedom to the observed counts, employing a generalized linear model with the gamma distribution and a log-link, gives an estimate of 15% for the coefficient of variation, with very similar  $CV$  values for smoothing splines with 3 and 4 degrees of freedom. The fitted smoothing spline is depicted in Figure 29. Fitting the smoothing spline to the data before 2000 resulted in an estimate of the  $CV$  value of 17%, while the data after 2000 gives an estimate of 11%.



**Figure 29.** Observed January counts and fitted smoothing spline with 2 degrees of freedom employing a generalized linear model with the gamma distribution and a log-link.

These estimates of the *CV* value of the error of the January counts might be too large because the population model has ample room to follow the observed counts more closely. Therefore a gamma hyper prior for the *CV* value was employed such that a 98% prediction interval for the *CV* equals (5%, 20%). The R function `gamma.parms.from.quantiles()` (Belisle 2012) was employed to calculate the associated gamma parameters. In JAGS the inverse of the scale parameter, i.e. the rate parameter, is required. The R code to obtain the JAGS parameters is given by the following code which includes a check in the last two lines.

```
intervalCV = c(5, 20)
coverageProb = 0.98
quantiles = c((1-coverageProb)/2, (1+coverageProb)/2)
parms = gamma.parms.from.quantiles(intervalCV/100, quantiles)
shapeCount = parms$shape
scaleCount = parms$scale
rateCount = 1/scaleCount
print(cbind(shapeCount, scaleCount, rateCount))
cvCount = rgamma(100000, shape=shapeCount, scale=scaleCount)
quantile(100*cvCount, quantiles)
```

The resulting shape and rate parameters are 11.83 and 106.3 respectively. The JAGS code for the observation error of the January counts is then given by, with `januaryCount[t]` representing  $N_t^C$  and `Count[t]` the observed January count:

```
cvCount ~ dgamma(11.83, 106.3)
log.tauCount = 1/log(cvCount*cvCount + 1)
for (t in 1:nyears) {
  log.januaryCount[t] = log(januaryCount[t])
  Count[t] ~ dlnorm(log.januaryCount[t], log.tauCount)
```



}

## 5.6 Observation error derogation offtake


Johnson et al. (2020) employed a Poisson distribution for the offtake divided by 100. The derogation offtake data analysed here ranged from 1000 to 13000, giving “Poisson” numbers between 10 and 130. The coefficient of variation  $CV$  for Poisson distributions with means  $\lambda = 10, 20 \dots 130$  are given in Table 24. Such  $CV$  values seem rather small, especially because observed derogation numbers are possibly prone to bias due to underreporting or overreporting. Therefore, employing the same approach as for the error for the January counts, a gamma prior was used with a 98% prediction interval for the  $CV$  equalling (5%, 40%). The resulting shape and rate parameters are 5.558 and 31.12 respectively. The same hyper prior was employed for the four derogation counts in the Baltic and North Sea regions as well as in period  $s$  and  $w$ , i.e. for the parameters  $H_{s,t}^B$ ,  $H_{s,t}^N$ ,  $H_{w,t}^B$ ,  $H_{w,t}^N$ .

**Table 24.** Coefficient of variation  $CV$  for a Poisson distribution with mean  $\lambda$ .

$\lambda$	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130
$CV$	32	22	18	16	14	13	12	11	11	10	10	9	9

## 5.7 Observation error number of juveniles in groups of known size

A beta-binomial distribution was employed for the observed number of juveniles with binomial totals the corresponding group size and probability of success  $\pi_t$  which is given in the IPM model. Following Johnson et al. (2020), the parametrization used for the Beta distribution is:  $\alpha_t = \omega \pi_t$  and  $\beta_t = \omega (1 - \pi_t)$  where  $\omega$  is the temporally constant over-dispersion parameter, see section 2.4. An informative prior for  $\omega$  was derived from the  $\omega$  data in Table 21. A gamma distribution was fitted to these data giving estimates shape=2.6635 and rate=0.059374, and these values were used as prior for  $\omega$ . Figure 30 displays the values of the yearly over-dispersion parameter  $\omega$  given in Table 21 (vertical bars) along with a graphical depiction of the fitted gamma distribution. Note that there are only 22 observed  $\omega$  values and therefore the fitted distribution extends above the minimum and maximum of the observed values.



**Figure 30.** Observed yearly over-dispersion parameter  $\omega$  (vertical bars) of the Beta distribution for juvenile proportions excluding the season 2000/01. Fitted gamma distribution (horizontal line) where the dot denotes the median of the distribution, the blue bar represents 80% of the fitted distribution, and the orange/red bars extend to 90/99% of the distribution.

The JAGS code for the observed number of juveniles in a group is then as follows, in which  $pFledgling[t]$  is the proportion according to the model, and  $nFledgling[t]$  is the number of observed juveniles in a group of  $nGroup[t]$  individuals:

```

shapeFledgling = 2.6635
rateFledgling   = 0.059374
dispFledgling   ~ dgamma(shapeFledgling, rateFledgling)
for (t in 1:nyears) {
  propFledgling[t] ~ dbeta(dispFledgling * pFledgling[t], dispFledgling * (1-pFledgling[t]))
  nFledgling[t]    ~ dbin(propFledgling[t], nGroup[t])
}
```

}

## 6. Results

### 6.1 Results of the Integrated Population Model

For all the monitored parameters the potential scale reduction factor (psrf) was in the interval (1.000, 1.003) indicating convergence of all parameters. Posterior means and 95% credible intervals for the demographic rates of the Russian population are depicted in Figure 31 to Figure 37.

Figure 31 reveals that the January counts of the total flyway population are well represented by the model although there are some counts, 2011/12 and 2013/14, which are outside the posterior 95% interval. However, these counts are possibly “too large” when compared to counts in surrounding years. Before 2000, the January posterior means of the arctic population are almost identical to the posterior means of total flyway population which is in accordance with the small size of the North Sea and Baltic populations in that period. In the last four years, the total flyway population and the Russian population both seem to level off, the latter at a level of around 1 million birds.

Figure 32 shows that, due to the assumed overdispersion of the beta-binomial distribution, the yearly posterior 95% intervals of the proportion juveniles in October to January are quite wide and that all observed proportions are within the intervals. After considerable variation until the year 2000, the proportion juveniles seems to stabilize from 2000 onwards. The mean proportion for the season 2006/07 and onwards equals 0.12.

Figure 33 reveals that the yearly posterior intervals for the reproduction rate  $R_t$  roughly varies between 0.2 and 1.2 fledglings/adult pair. The reproduction rate is mostly below 1, the median of the assumed prior. Again, from 2000 onwards, the reproduction is more or less stable; this goes hand in hand with the stable proportion of juveniles in later years in Figure 32. The mean reproduction for the season 2006/07 and onwards equals 0.54.

Figure 34 shows the mean posterior survival rates  $\theta$  for juveniles and adults. Adult survival is more or less constant across the years and there is not much difference between survival in period  $s$  and  $w$ . Juvenile survival in period  $w$  is generally smaller than in period  $s$  and is also more variable across years. Table 25 lists the estimates of NIOO (Table 20) for the total survival (including harvest in EU) and the mean of the yearly posterior means for the period before and after 2007 of the natural survival (excluding harvest in EU but including the unknown Russian offtake). The difference should be in the harvest rate in EU (Baltic and North Sea region), see below.


Figure 35 depicts mean posterior survival rates along with the accompanying 95% credible intervals. The intervals for juveniles are quite wide, generally between 0.3 and 1.0. The intervals for adults are roughly given by (0.9, 1.0). Note that the length of the intervals more or less depends on the posterior mean, with smaller intervals for posterior means close to 1 and wider intervals for posterior means in the vicinity of 0.5. This is a direct consequence of the formulation of survival rates in the IPM as logit-transformed normal variables.

Figure 36 shows posterior means and accompanying intervals for derogation offtake (top panels) and derogation offtake rates (bottom panels) both in the North Sea and the Baltic Sea region. All reported offtake is within the 95% intervals. The intervals in period  $w$  are quite wide at the end of the observation period. Mean posterior derogation offtake rates for the more recent years are around 0.5% in period  $s$  and around 1.5% in period  $w$  with some differences between the two regions.


Figure 37 compares the priors and posteriors for the hyper parameters for the survival (natural survival including unknown Russian harvest) and reproduction rates, the coefficient of variation of the error distribution for January population counts and harvest numbers, and the dispersion parameter of the beta-binomial distribution of the observed number of juveniles in groups of known size. The posteriors for juvenile survival in period  $s$  and period  $w$  are shifted to the right implying that survival rates are larger than envisaged by the prior. Survival of juveniles is somewhat larger in period  $w$  than in period  $s$ . The posteriors of adult survival in periods  $s$  and  $w$  are very similar; they are also shifted to the right as compared to the priors. The posterior for the reproduction rate is shifted to the left and is much narrower than the prior, so the IPM model learned something along the way. The posterior of the CV value for the January counts is shifted to the right, but still in the range of the prior. This indicates that a wider prior for this parameter will probably not make a big difference. The posterior of the CV value for the derogation offtake is shifted to the right and much wider than the prior.

Finally, Figure 37 reveals that the posterior for the overdispersion parameter of the beta-binomial distribution is more or less equal to the prior. This is not surprising because a good fitting model to detailed data was used to obtain this prior.


From the results obtained for the last decade, the MU1 population appears to combine a relatively low mean productivity (0.54 fledglings / adult pair), a high mean natural survival rate (including offtake in Russia) for adults ( $s$ : 0.9771;  $w$ : 0.9690) and a low mean natural survival rate (including offtake in Russia) for juveniles ( $s$ : 0.6215;  $w$ : 0.7727). Derogation offtake rates may have increased to around 1% (period  $s$ ) and around 3% (period  $w$ ), summed over Baltic and North Sea regions. Overall, the combination of reproduction, survival and derogation offtake rates appears to result in a levelling off of population growth (Figure 31).




**Figure 31.** January total flyway population counts (red dots), posterior means (black line) and posterior 95% intervals (grey area) along with the January posterior means of the arctic population (blue line).



**Figure 32.** Observed proportion Juveniles (red dots) in the Netherlands and the German Dollard region in October to January, posterior means (black line) and posterior 95% intervals (grey area).




**Figure 33.** Posterior means and posterior 95% intervals for the reproduction rate of the MU1 population.




**Figure 34.** Posterior means for the natural survival (including unknown offtake in Russia) for juveniles and adults in period w (“winter”) and period s (“summer”).

**Table 25.** Estimated *total* survival rates by NIOO (NIOO Esti), *natural* survival rates (including unknown Russian harvest) from the IPM (IPM Esti), and *total* survival rates estimated from the IPM (IPM Esti<sub>total</sub>). Only the total survival estimates include the derogation offtake rates. Values are categorized by stage, summer/winter and observation period (before or after 2007).


Stage	Summer/Winter	Period	NIOO Esti	IPM Esti	IPM Esti <sub>total</sub>
Juvenile	Summer	Before 2007	0.7438	0.6852	
Juvenile	Winter	Before 2007	0.9662	0.7578	
Adult	Summer	Before 2007	0.9687	0.9664	
Adult	Winter	Before 2007	0.9751	0.9626	
Juvenile	Summer	After 2007	0.4871	0.6215	0.6169
Juvenile	Winter	After 2007	0.8785	0.7727	0.7553
Adult	Summer	After 2007	0.8906	0.9771	0.9734
Adult	Winter	After 2007	0.9244	0.9690	0.9579



**Figure 35.** Posterior means and posterior 95% interval for natural survival (including unknown offtake in Russia) for juveniles and adults in period *w* (“winter”) and period *s* (“summer”) in the arctic population.



**Figure 36.** Top panels: observed derogation offtake numbers in the North Sea (red dots) and the Baltic Sea (black dots) regions along with posterior means (lines) and posterior 95% intervals (areas). Bottom panels: derogation offtake rates with posterior means and posterior 95% intervals.



**Figure 37.** 95% intervals and means for the prior (black) of the hyper parameters along with the 95% interval and means of the posterior (red).


## 6.2 Scenario analysis

The results of the IPM can be employed to simulate how the population will evolve in future years under different derogation scenarios. There are two ways to go about this: (1) simulating future years internally in the IPM, or (2) employing the posterior distributions of survival, reproduction and population numbers in the final year to simulate future years external to the IPM. (Kéry and Schaub 2012)) advocate the first approach such that all uncertainties are properly propagated. However, it was found that, for the IPM at hand, the two approaches are indistinguishable for simulating future years without derogation. Therefore the second approach was followed because this only requires a single run of the JAGS model and is thus much more flexible in examining different scenarios. The second approach requires:

- The number of juveniles and adults with which to start the simulation. For this the IPM posteriors of these numbers in the final year, i.e. July 2017, were taken.
- The posteriors for the survival and reproduction hyperparameters (meanLogit.F.s, meanLogit.F.w, meanLogit.A.s, meanLogit.A.w and meanLogit.R) since these define the information we have obtained about the year-to-year variation in these rates.
- The derogation offtake rates, which will be imposed. The following derogation offtake scenarios were simulated: (1) no derogation offtake, (2) derogation offtake rate in period *s* of 0.5% and in period *w* of 1%, (3) rates 1% and 2% in period *s* and *w* respectively, and (4) rates 1% and 3% in period *s* and *w*. The latter scenario is more or less according to the mean posterior derogation offtake rates in the final season, see Figure 36.

The posteriors, obtained by running the IPM, for the final numbers of juveniles and adults, the survival rates and the reproduction rate were thinned by a factor 3 leaving 100,000 draws from each posterior. For each draw a trajectory of the total number in January, i.e. halfway a season, was simulated for 10 future years according to the stage-structured life cycle of Figure 26. This involves simulation of survival rates and a reproduction rate separately for each year. For example with *sFs*[1] the first sample of the posterior of the hyper parameter meanLogit.F.s for juveniles in summer, a separate survival rate  $\theta_{F,s,t}$  is simulated for each year  $t=1\dots 10$ . This employs the pseudo code  $\theta_{F,s,t} \sim \text{ilogit}(\text{dnorm}(\text{sFs}[1], \text{sigma}=4))$ . The 100,000 trajectories were then summarized by their mean, median, 50% and 90% central interval, giving Figure 38 for the four harvest scenarios. This reveals that the uncertainty in the initial population size, as represented by the posterior, is becoming larger and larger when time progresses such that it seems hazardous to draw firm conclusions. However, for the largest derogation offtake rates there is a risk that the population will decline.







**Figure 38.** Mean (solid line), Median (dotted line), 50% central interval (grey) and 90% central interval (light grey) of 100,000 simulated future trajectories of MU1 population for four derogation offtake scenarios, with different offtake percentages in period  $s$  (“Sum”) and  $w$  (“Win”), employing the original posteriors for the hyper parameters.

The posteriors for the hyper parameters are derived from the data for the full 43 year period. However, Figure 33 (reproduction) and Figure 34 (survival) indicate that at the end of the observation period the survival of adults might be somewhat larger, the survival of juveniles somewhat smaller and the reproduction rate also seems somewhat smaller. Therefore, in a second simulation, the posteriors of the hyper parameters were shifted such that the median of each posterior equals the median of the logit transformed samples (see e.g. Figure 35) for the last ten years. Figure 39 compares simulated survival and reproduction rates according to the original and according to the shifted posterior. This shows that the shift mainly increases survival of adults. The scenario analysis employing the shifted posteriors is summarized in Figure 40. For the largest derogation offtake percentages the population declines somewhat, but again there is considerable variation.

For both tested situations, there is a large difference after 10 years between the “No derogation” scenario and the derogation offtake scenario with 1% in summer and 3% in winter.



**Figure 39.** Distributions of survival (natural survival including unknown Russian harvest) in period  $s$  ("sum") and  $w$  ("win"), of juveniles (F) and adults (A), and of the reproduction rate according to the original posterior distribution and according to the shifted posterior distribution. The black dot denotes the median, the blue line the 80% central interval, which is extended towards the 90/95% interval by the orange/red lines.



**Figure 40.** Mean (solid line), Median (dotted line), 50% central interval (grey) and 90% central interval (light grey) of 100,000 simulated future trajectories of the MU1 population for four harvest scenarios, with different derogation offtake percentages in period *s* (“Sum”) and *w* (“Win”), employing the shifted posteriors for the hyper parameters.

## 7. Discussion

In an IPM analysis, it is notoriously difficult to decide on the best definition of priors and observation errors, especially when changes in definitions appear to have contradictory outcome: an improved fit for one monitoring data set but a deteriorated fit for another. Having an accepted overall goodness-of-fit test for IPM would help, but such a test appears not to exist as yet. However, a similar approach as in Johnson et al. (2020) applying Chi-squared goodness-of-fit tests for the individual datasets could be adopted, possibly allowing for a more objective way to choose settings.

In the trial-and-error approach we followed, the coefficient of variation for the observation errors of counts and derogation offtake appeared to have a large impact on the results of the IPM. Besides the default settings, leading to the results in section 6.1, we tested the impact of alternative priors for the *CV* of these observation errors in two additional analyses. To see whether the prior for the *CV* of the derogation offtake observation error had a large influence on the results, the model was re-run with different values for this *CV*. The results in Appendix A Different priors for the *CV* of the derogation offtake reveal that this prior only has an impact on the fitted derogation numbers and the derogation offtake rates, but not on survival and reproduction. In an additional analysis, see Appendix C Different coefficients of variation for observation errors, two alternative sets of values for the *CV* values were employed, see Table 7. The alternative setting with 5-10 and 5-20 for *CV* counts and *CV* derogation, respectively, gave an improved fit for the January and derogation counts, and therefore a scenario analysis for this setting was also performed, see Figure 56. This reveals that, given the large uncertainty, there is hardly any difference with the scenario analysis for the default setting 5-20 / 5-40 (Figure 38).

The IPM assumes that juveniles are twice as vulnerable to derogation offtake than adults, i.e.  $\rho = 2$ . As this assumption is not backed up by much evidence, the results were compared to a JAGS run without a difference in vulnerability, i.e.  $\rho = 1$ , see Appendix B Differential vulnerability to derogation offtake of juveniles. The differences are minor, only the estimated derogation offtake rates (*h*) are slightly higher in both regions and periods, compensating for relatively lower offtake for juveniles.

The monitoring data with probably the highest uncertainty are the reported offtake numbers per region. For these both a bias from under- and overreporting seem to be possible. Underreporting or overreporting would mean that the real offtake is systematically higher or lower than what is accounted for in the IPM. Both directions of the bias could have consequences for the estimated demographic rates and thus for the scenarios. To test this, an additional analysis was performed assuming a bias of 0.5 (underreporting) and 2.0 (overreporting), see Appendix D Bias in reported derogation offtake. The results show minor differences in the mean of the posteriors of the January counts (Figure 57). The posteriors of the hyperparameters are very similar for survival and reproduction but not for the *CV* of the derogation error, which is a direct consequence of the bias parameter (Figure 58). The main impact of the bias parameter is in changing the fitted derogation offtake rate such that the fitted derogation with bias=0.5 is twice as large and the fitted derogation with bias=2.0 is half of the original fitted derogation. This seems to imply that for the current relatively low derogation rates (around 1 to 3%) a considerable bias in the observed derogation offtake (doubling or halving it) only has a minor effect on the posteriors of the demographic rates and thus also a minor effect on the outcome of any scenario analysis.

Overall, these findings indicate that the actual size of the derogation may not be the biggest point of concern, but rather the context in which this derogation offtake takes place: the current demographic rates of the MU1 population. A few “bad” years with low survival and/or reproduction will have a much larger impact on the arctic population than the limited derogation rates which have been reported thus far. However, if demographic

coefficients stay what they appear to be from the analysis, any derogation offtake may (slightly) increase the risk of having a declining population, as shown by the scenarios. Whether this constellation of demographic rates is somewhat coincidentally caused by the few recent years in which the counts appear to level off, or whether this levelling off and the consequences it has on the estimated demographic rates is real, can only be concluded after data have become available for additional years.

## 8. Conclusions

The results obtained for the Russian population so far

- suggest that the population might be levelling off at around 1 million birds. However, this stabilization, if any, appears to be only in the few recent years. More data in future years will be needed to draw a definite conclusion.
- show a considerable year-to-year variation in demographic rates. There is some indication that, during the last decade, reproduction stabilizes at a somewhat lower level, adult natural survival is slightly larger and juvenile survival slightly lower.
- show that maintaining the estimated current derogation offtake rates with the current estimates of demographic rates implies some risk of a declining MU1 population in the near future.

## 9. Acknowledgements

The work for this report was carried out in the framework of a project commissioned by the national (Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality) and provincial authorities in the Netherlands and carried out by a consortium of Wageningen Environmental Research, Netherlands Institute of Ecology, Dutch Centre for Avian Migration and Demography and Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland. It is supervised by the national AEWA Goose working group (WAG) with delegates from the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, the provinces, BIJ12 and the regional Wildlife Councils.


## References

- Belisle, P. 2012.** Computing gamma distribution parameters by `gamma.parms.from.quantiles()`. <http://www.medicine.mcgill.ca/epidemiology/Joseph/PBelisle/GammaParmsFromQuantiles.html>.
- Denwood, M. J. 2016.** runjags: An R Package Providing Interface Utilities, Model Templates, Parallel Computing Methods and Additional Distributions for MCMC Models in JAGS. 2016 71:25.
- EGMP, A. 2019.** Definition of management units in the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose and implications for monitoring. UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/4.15.
- Huysentruyt, F., P. Verschelde, T. Van Daele, J. Casaer, A. Neukermans, and T. Adriaens. 2020.** Management options for a resident Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) population in Flanders. A comparison of different scenarios using population modelling. Research Institute for Nature and Forest, Brussels. DOI: [doi.org/10.21436/inbor.17611440](https://doi.org/10.21436/inbor.17611440).
- Jensen, G. H., J. Madsen, S. Nagy, and L. M. 2018.** AEWA International Single Species Management Plan for the Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) - Russia/Germany & Netherlands population, East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population, Svalbard/South-west Scotland population. AEWA Technical Series No. 70. Bonn, Germany.
- Johnson, F. A., G. S. Zimmerman, G. H. Jensen, K. K. Clausen, M. Frederiksen, and J. Madsen. 2020.** Using integrated population models for insights into monitoring programs: An application using pink-footed geese. *Ecological Modelling* 415.

- Kéry, M., and M. Schaub. 2012.** Bayesian Population Analysis Using WinBUGS. A Hierarchical Perspective. Academic Press, Waltham, MA, USA.
- Koffijberg, K., P. Clausen, K. Devos, F. Haas, K. Isaksen, H. Hjelldberg, T. Lehtinimie, J. Madsen, R. D. Nielsen, L. Nilsson, T. Toivanen, I. Tombre, J. Wahl, and E. v. Winden. 2020.** Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population status report 1980-2018.
- Layton-Matthews, K., M. J. J. E. Loonen, B. B. Hansen, C. F. D. Coste, B.-E. Saether, and V. Grotan. 2019.** Density-dependent population dynamics of a high Arctic capital breeder, the barnacle goose. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 88:1191-1201.
- Plummer, M. 2003.** JAGS: A Program for Analysis of Bayesian Graphical Models Using Gibbs Sampling. Proc, 3rd. Int. Work. Distrib. Stat. Comput, Vienna, Austria. [http://refhub.elsevier.com/S0304-3800\(19\)30377-1/sbref0240](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S0304-3800(19)30377-1/sbref0240).
- Saunders, S. P., M. T. Farr, A. D. Wright, C. A. Bahlai, J. W. Ribeiro Jr., S. Rossman, A. L. Sussman, T. W. Arnold, and E. F. Zipkin. 2019.** Disentangling data discrepancies with integrated population models. *Ecology* 100:e02714.
- Schaub, M., and F. Abadi. 2011.** Integrated population models: a novel analysis framework for deeper insights into population dynamics. *Journal of Ornithology* 152:227-237.
- Team, R. C. 2019.** R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Van der Jeugd, H., B. Voslamber, C. v. turnhout, H. Sierdsema, N. Feige, J. Nienhuis, and K. Koffijberg. 2006.** Overzomerende ganzen in Nederland: grenzen aan de groei? SOVON report 2006/2, SOVON.
- Van der Jeugd, H. P., G. Eichhorn, K. E. Litvin, J. Stahl, K. Larsson, A. J. Van Der Graaf, and R. H. Drent. 2009.** Keeping up with early springs: rapid range expansion in an avian herbivore incurs a mismatch between reproductive timing and food supply. *Global Change Biology* 15:1057-1071.
- Van der Jeugd, H. P., and A. Kwak. 2017.** Management of a Dutch resident barnacle goose *Branta leucopsis* population: How can results from counts, ringing and hunting bag statistics be reconciled? *Ambio* 46:251-261.

## Appendix A. Different priors for the CV of the derogation offtake


Figure 37 reveals that the posterior for the coefficient of variation of the observation error distribution for the derogation offtake is considerably shifted to the right as compared to the prior. Therefore different gamma hyperpriors for this error were used to re-run the model. These priors were defined by 98% prediction interval in between (5%, MAX), where MAX was set to 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 100%.




**Figure 41.** 95% intervals and means for priors (black) of the hyper parameters along with the 95% interval and means of the posterior (red) for different values of the upper 99% point (MAX) of the prediction interval of the gamma hyperprior for the error of reported derogation offtake.



The IPM model was re-run with the following number of MCMC runs: adapt=5,000, burnin=10,000, sample=15,000, thin=1 and chains=3. All parameters converged with psrf values in the interval (1.000, 1.03). Figure 41 reveals that the posteriors of the four survival parameters and the reproduction parameter do not depend on the value of MAX. Figure 42 shows that this also holds for the CV value of the observation error of the January counts and the dispersion parameter of the juvenile proportions, although the latter posterior is somewhat shifted to the left for MAX=100. The posterior for the CV value of the observation error for the derogation numbers is further shifted to the right when the MAX value increases. Posterior means for yearly January counts, the yearly proportion juveniles, the yearly reproduction and the yearly survival rates were hardly affected by the value of MAX. Only posterior means for derogation numbers, see Figure 43 and thus for derogation offtake rates were affected. A value of MAX=40% was more or less arbitrarily chosen for the model in the main text, since for larger values the fitted derogation numbers are (much) larger than the observed numbers.



**Figure 42.** 95% intervals and means for priors (black) of the hyper parameters along with the 95% interval and means of the posterior (red) for different values of the upper 99% point (MAX) of the prediction interval of the gamma hyperprior for the observation error of derogation numbers.




**Figure 43.** Observed derogation offtake numbers in the North Sea (red dots) and the Baltic Sea region (black dots) along with posterior means (lines) and posterior 95% intervals (areas) for different values of the upper 99% point (MAX) of the prediction interval of the gamma hyperprior for the observation error of derogation offtake. Left column: derogation offtake in period *s*; right column: derogation offtake in period *w*.




## Appendix B Differential vulnerability to derogation offtake of juveniles

The IPM assumes that juveniles are twice as vulnerable to derogation offtake than adults, i.e.  $\rho = 2$ . The results were compared to a JAGS run without a difference in vulnerability, i.e.  $\rho = 1$ , employing the same number MCMC runs as for  $\rho = 2$ . Figure 44 displays the posteriors of the hyper parameters while Figure 45 compares the posterior means of the harvest rates. There are hardly any differences between the results for  $\rho = 1$  and  $\rho = 2$ .



**Figure 44.** 95% intervals and means for priors (black) of the hyper parameters along with the 95% interval and means of the posterior (red) for the two values of the differential vulnerability ( $\rho$ ) of juveniles to derogation offtake.




**Figure 45.** Posterior means and posterior 95% intervals for the derogation offtake rate in the North Sea and the Baltic Sea for the two values of the differential vulnerability ( $\rho$ ) of juveniles to derogation offtake.

### Appendix C Different coefficients of variation for observation errors


The coefficient of variation for the observation errors of counts and derogation offtake can possibly have a large impact on the results of the IPM. Therefore two alternative sets of values for the *CV* values were employed, see Table 26. In the figures below the results of the IPM are compared for these three sets.

**Table 26.** Coefficients of variation for counts and derogation offtake which are compared in this Appendix. The interval defines the a 98% prediction interval for the respective priors

	cvCount	cvDerogation
Main study	5 - 20	5 - 40
Alternative 1	1 - 5	5 - 20
Alternative 2	5 - 10	5 - 20




**Figure 46.** January total flyway population counts (black dots) and posterior means (lines) for the three sets of *CV* values.




**Figure 47.** January Arctic population counts (black dots) and posterior means (lines)


The January counts in Figure 46 are followed very closely for the scenario with the smallest prior for the *CV* of the counts (1-5, red line). The more moderate values (5-10, blue line) seem to fit the counts better than the *CV* values used in the main study (5-20, black line) especially at the end of the observation period. The difference in mean posterior of the total flyway between the latter two settings is around 80,000 at the end of the observation period, with a similar difference for the Arctic population (Figure 47). Posterior means of the reproduction rate and natural survival are similar for the setting 5-20 / 5-40, as in the main study, and the setting 5-10 / 5-20, see Figure 49 to Figure 53, while the setting 1-5 / 5-20 give different results.




**Figure 48.** Observed proportion juveniles (dots) in the Netherlands and the German Dollard region in October to January, and posterior means (lines) for the three sets of *CV* values.




**Figure 49.** Posterior means for the reproduction rate of the MU1 population for the three sets of *CV* values.




**Figure 50.** Posterior means for the natural survival (including unknown offtake in Russia) of juveniles in summer for the three sets of *CV* values.



**Figure 51.** Posterior means for the natural survival (including unknown offtake in Russia) of juveniles in winter for the three sets of *CV* values.




**Figure 52.** Posterior means for the natural survival (including unknown offtake in Russia) of adults in summer for the three sets of *CV* values.



**Figure 53.** Posterior means for the natural survival (including unknown offtake in Russia) of adults in winter for the three sets of *CV* values.


Figure 54 again reveals that the posteriors for the hyperparameters are quite similar for the *CV* settings 5-20 / 5-40 and 5-10 / 5-20, off course excluding the *CV* hyperparameters, while the setting 1-5 / 5-20 gives different results.

Figure 55 shows that the narrower priors for the *CV* of the derogation observation error (middle and bottom panels) reproduce the observed derogation counts almost perfectly along with quite narrow 95% credible intervals.




**Figure 54.** Posteriors of the hyperparameters for the three sets of  $CV$  values.





**Figure 55.** Observed derogation offtake in the North Sea (red dots) and the Baltic Sea (black dots) in period *s* (“summer”) (left panels) and *w* (“winter”) (right panels) for the three sets of *CV* values along with posterior means (lines) and posterior 95% intervals (areas).

It is concluded that the setting 1-5 / 5-20 for *CVcount* and *CVderogation* respectively gives a very good fit to both the January population counts and the derogation counts. However the narrow prior for *CVcount* seems to be too informative given the smoothing spline analysis in section 5.5. The setting 5-10 / 5-20 is possibly more realistic and therefore a scenario analysis for this setting was performed, see Figure 56. This reveals that, given the large uncertainty, there is hardly any difference with the scenario analysis with the setting 5-20 / 5-40 in the main study, see Figure 38. This is rather comforting since it seems to imply that the specific priors for *CVcount* and *CVderogation* hardly have an effect on the scenario analysis as long as these *CV* values are not different from the values in the main study.



**Figure 56.** Scenario analysis for the CV setting 5-10 / 5-20 for January counts and derogation respectively. Mean (solid line), Median (dotted line), 50% central interval (grey) and 90% central interval (light grey) of 100,000 simulated future trajectories for MU1 for four derogation offtake scenarios, with different offtake percentages in period *s* ("Sum") and *w* ("Win").

## Appendix D Bias in reported derogation offtake

In an additional analysis a fixed bias parameter for derogation offtake was added to the model. For example, for summer derogation in the Baltic Sea region, the following JAGS lines:

```
log.summerHarvest.BS[t] <- log(summerHarvest.BS[t])
```


```
hSummerBS[t] ~ dlnorm(log.summerHarvest.BS[t], log.tauHarvest.s)
```

were replaced by, employing the extra “bias” parameter:


```
log.summerHarvest.BS[t] <- log(bias * summerHarvest.BS[t])
```

```
hSummerBS[t] ~ dlnorm(log.summerHarvest.BS[t], log.tauHarvest.s)
```


The same modification was made for winter derogation in the Baltic and for winter and summer derogation in the North Sea region. Note that this modification is more or less similar to dividing the observed derogation counts by the bias parameter. The IPM was run again for bias=0.5 and for bias=2.0, and the results were compared with the original IPM run which basically employs bias=1. Figure 57 reveals that there is hardly any difference in the mean of the posteriors of the January counts for the different bias parameters. Only at the very end of the observation period, where indeed derogation was largest, there is a noticeable difference with the original IPM: bias=2.0 gives a final mean posterior which is around 20,000 larger and bias=0.5 gives a final mean posterior which is around 40,000 smaller than the original IPM run. Figure 58 shows that the posteriors of the hyperparameters are very similar indeed except for the *CV* of the derogation error which is a direct consequence of the value of the bias parameter. Finally, Figure 59 shows that the only impact of the added bias parameter is in changing the fitted derogation offtake rate such that the fitted derogation with bias=0.5 is twice as large and the fitted derogation with bias=2.0 is half of the original fitted derogation. This seems to imply that bias in the observed derogation offtake only has a minor effect on the posteriors of the demographic rates and thus also a minor effect on any scenario analysis.



**Figure 57.** January total flyway population counts (black dots) and posterior means (lines) for the three values of the fixed bias parameter.



**Figure 58.** Posteriors of the hyperparameters for the three values of the fixed bias parameter.



**Figure 59.** Observed derogation offtake in the North Sea (red dots) and the Baltic Sea (black dots) in period *s* (“summer”) (left panels) and *w* (“winter”) (right panels) for the three values of the fixed bias parameter along with posterior means (lines) and posterior 95% intervals (areas). Note that the y-axis range for bias=0.5 is twice the range for the original IPM run, while the y-axis range for bias=2.0 is half of the original range.

## Appendix E IPM data input file

**Table 27.** The data input file used by the IPM. (Partly) imputed data is highlighted. The January counts were based on imputed values for Germany, in the last two years. The first part (before 2005) of the data for the Netherlands (NtNS1) was based on an assumed exponential growth model; same applies to Finish timeseries (NtBS1) before 2008. The whole Finnish timeseries was multiplied by 3.

Nr	Year	Season	Count	nFledgling	nGroup	hSummerBS	hWinterBS	hSummerNS	hWinterNS	NtNS1	NtBS1
1	1976	'1975/76'	44225	2184	5985	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
2	1977	'1976/77'	40349	897	5985	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
3	1978	'1977/78'	68172	275	5985	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
4	1979	'1978/79'	51488	119	5985	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
5	1980	'1979/80'	42249	1023	5985	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
6	1981	'1980/81'	64850	1867	8490	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
7	1982	'1981/82'	59928	950	8639	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
8	1983	'1982/83'	78623	999	7456	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	0
9	1984	'1983/84'	78733	1256	4040	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	0
10	1985	'1984/85'	80190	242	3787	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	0
11	1986	'1985/86'	113720	1295	3502	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	6
12	1987	'1986/87'	123633	132	2654	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	9
13	1988	'1987/88'	147627	126	2101	NA	NA	NA	NA	27	12
14	1989	'1988/89'	196423	600	2000	NA	NA	NA	NA	39	18
15	1990	'1989/90'	168022	345	3000	NA	NA	NA	NA	57	27
16	1991	'1990/91'	138393	330	1436	NA	NA	NA	NA	83	39
17	1992	'1991/92'	212685	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	121	54
18	1993	'1992/93'	210632	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	176	81
19	1994	'1993/94'	314367	608	2029	NA	NA	NA	NA	257	117
20	1995	'1994/95'	286347	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	375	171
21	1996	'1995/96'	264426	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	548	252
22	1997	'1996/97'	315793	3034	11086	NA	NA	NA	NA	800	366
23	1998	'1997/98'	318237	2352	19680	NA	NA	NA	NA	1168	534
24	1999	'1998/99'	324907	1511	8479	NA	NA	NA	NA	1705	780
25	2000	'1999/00'	382226	2143	9602	NA	NA	NA	NA	2489	1140
26	2001	'2000/01'	512952	131	778	NA	NA	NA	NA	3634	1665
27	2002	'2001/02'	506714	615	3608	NA	NA	NA	NA	5306	2433
28	2003	'2002/03'	549714	1091	8973	NA	NA	NA	NA	7747	3552
29	2004	'2003/04'	522164	3932	38955	NA	NA	NA	NA	11310	5184
30	2005	'2004/05'	540714	4719	36812	NA	NA	NA	NA	16513	7569
31	2006	'2005/06'	693423	4633	28722	NA	NA	NA	NA	25000	11049
32	2007	'2006/07'	638002	555	5308	NA	NA	NA	NA	27825	16134

33	2008	'2007/08'	767316	156	2482	NA	461	NA	124	30650	23553
34	2009	'2008/09'	638243	1356	15453	154	649	41	2930	33475	34389
35	2010	'2009/10'	682982	3585	26551	216	619	977	5206	36300	40344
36	2011	'2010/11'	873288	2238	20912	206	708	1735	234	41600	43161
37	2012	'2011/12'	1088846	2773	22795	236	1330	78	1074	46900	53484
38	2013	'2012/13'	1016746	3681	28764	443	1703	362	4312	52200	60258
39	2014	'2013/14'	1331560	2929	28866	568	3047	2520	3206	51573	65022
40	2015	'2014/15'	1187499	2543	20995	1016	3929	5358	10503	57276	78270
41	2016	'2015/16'	1112357	2566	25992	1310	13897	7056	12745	55558	74991
42	2017	'2016/17'	1326989	3326	29257	4632	11289	5710	15204	47653	85422
43	2018	'2017/18'	1302768	1703	30468	3763	12044	6383	19090	59844	95505

## Appendix E R/JAGS code

```
## IPM for barnacle geese of the Russian management unit
Rprogram = "JAGS-Final"
intervalCVcounts <- c(5, 20)
intervalCVharvest <- c(5, 40)
coverageProb <- 0.98

## Fixed value for relative sensitivity of Fledglings to Derogation offtake
rho <- 2.0

## Fixed value for summer period survival of NS and BS birds (average)
phi <- 0.9

options(width=120)
source("../Rutils/gamma.parms.from.quantiles.R")
seed <- 8438381
set.seed(seed)

## Prior parameters for initial population size: LogNormal
## Initial population size is for the year before the first count (44225)
## CV value of Fledglings/Adults is 50%/20%
initPop <- 40000
initPopF <- 0.15*initPop
initPopA <- initPop - initPopF
tauInit.nF <- 1/log((50/100)^2 + 1)
tauInit.nA <- 1/log((20/100)^2 + 1)
muInit.nF <- log(initPopF)
muInit.nA <- log(initPopA)
cbind(muInit.nF, tauInit.nF, muInit.nA, tauInit.nA)

## Prior parameters for survival: Logistic-Normal
mu.sFs <- 0.41; tau.sFs <- 4; sigma.sFs <- 4
mu.sFw <- 0.41; tau.sFw <- 4; sigma.sFw <- 4
mu.sAs <- 2.20; tau.sAs <- 4; sigma.sAs <- 4
mu.sAw <- 2.20; tau.sAw <- 4; sigma.sAw <- 4

## Prior parameters for Reproduction: Logistic-Normal multiplied by 2
mu.repro <- 0; tau.repro <- 2; sigma.repro <- 2

## Prior parameters for proportion Fledglings
shapeFlegdling <- 2.6635; rateFlegdling <- 0.059374
```



```

## Prior parameters for derogation Rates
hrateLower <- 0.00; hrateUpper <- 0.10

## Process error for January counts: LogNormal.
## The %CV value is with probability coverageProb in intervalCVcounts
quantiles <- c((1-coverageProb)/2, (1+coverageProb)/2)
parms <- gamma.parms.from.quantiles(intervalCVcounts/100, quantiles)
shapeCount <- parms$shape
scaleCount <- parms$scale
rateCount <- 1/scaleCount
print(cbind(shapeCount, scaleCount, rateCount))
cvCount <- rgamma(100000, shape=shapeCount, scale=scaleCount)
meanCV <- mean(cvCount); sdCV <- sd(cvCount); cvCV <- 100*sdCV/meanCV
qqCV <- quantile(100*cvCount, quantiles)
mean <- 100*shapeCount*scaleCount
q1 <- 100*qgamma(0.025, shape=shapeCount, scale=scaleCount)
q2 <- 100*qgamma(0.975, shape=shapeCount, scale=scaleCount)
cbind(meanCV, sdCV, cvCV, qq1=qqCV[1], qq2=qqCV[2], mean, q1, q2)

## Process error for derogation counts: LogNormal.
## The %CV value is with probability coverageProb in intervalCVharvest
quantiles <- c((1-coverageProb)/2, (1+coverageProb)/2)
parms <- gamma.parms.from.quantiles(intervalCVharvest/100, quantiles)
shapeHarvest <- parms$shape
scaleHarvest <- parms$scale
rateHarvest <- 1/scaleHarvest
print(cbind(shapeHarvest, scaleHarvest, rateHarvest))
cvHarvest <- rgamma(100000, shape=shapeHarvest, scale=scaleHarvest)
meanCV <- mean(cvHarvest); sdCV <- sd(cvHarvest); cvCV <- 100*sdCV/meanCV
qqCV <- quantile(100*cvHarvest, quantiles)
mean <- 100*shapeHarvest*scaleHarvest
q1 <- 100*qgamma(0.025, shape=shapeHarvest, scale=scaleHarvest)
q2 <- 100*qgamma(0.975, shape=shapeHarvest, scale=scaleHarvest)
cbind(meanCV, sdCV, cvCV, qq1=qqCV[1], qq2=qqCV[2], mean, q1, q2)

## Read data; REPLACE MISSING HARVEST WITH 1
data <- read.csv("Data_extended_2020_04_14.csv")
data$hSummerBS[is.na(data$hSummerBS)] = 1
data$hWinterBS[is.na(data$hWinterBS)] = 1

```

```

data$hSummerNS[is.na(data$hSummerNS)] = 1
data$hWinterNS[is.na(data$hWinterNS)] = 1
data$pFledgling = data$nFledgling/data$nGroup
N <- nrow(data)
N1 <- N-1
startHunting = data[data$Year==2008, "Nr"]
startHunting1 = startHunting - 1
data[c(1:6, N - c(5:0)),]

## Combine structures to pass to JAGS in a list
JAGSinput <- list(N=N, N1=N1, startH1=startHunting1, startH=startHunting,
  Count=data$Count, NtBS1=data$NtBS1, NtNS1=data$NtNS1,
  hSummerBS=data$hSummerBS, hWinterBS=data$hWinterBS,
  hSummerNS=data$hSummerNS, hWinterNS=data$hWinterNS,
  nFledgling=data$nFledgling, nGroup=data$nGroup,
  muInit.nF=muInit.nF, tauInit.nF=tauInit.nF,
  muInit.nA=muInit.nA, tauInit.nA=tauInit.nA,
  mu.sFs=mu.sFs, tau.sFs=tau.sFs, sigma.sFs=sigma.sFs,
  mu.sFw=mu.sFw, tau.sFw=tau.sFw, sigma.sFw=sigma.sFw,
  mu.sAs=mu.sAs, tau.sAs=tau.sAs, sigma.sAs=sigma.sAs,
  mu.sAw=mu.sAw, tau.sAw=tau.sAw, sigma.sAw=sigma.sAw,
  mu.repro=mu.repro, tau.repro=tau.repro, sigma.repro=sigma.repro,
  shapeFlegdling=shapeFlegdling, rateFlegdling=rateFlegdling,
  shapeCount=shapeCount, rateCount=rateCount,
  shapeHarvest=shapeHarvest, rateHarvest=rateHarvest,
  hrateLower=hrateLower, hrateUpper=hrateUpper,
  rho=rho, phi=phi)
save(JAGSinput, file=paste0(Rprogram, "-Input.RData"))

## Define the JAGS model
JAGSmodel <- "model
{
  ## Priors for initial population size in July, just after reproduction
  nF[1] ~ dlnorm(muInit.nF, tauInit.nF) # prior for initial number of Fledglings
  nA[1] ~ dlnorm(muInit.nA, tauInit.nA) # prior for initial number of Adults

  ## Hyper-prior Logit-Normal for Survival Fledgling/Adult and Summer/Winter
  muLogit.sFs ~ dnorm(mu.sFs, tau.sFs)
  muLogit.sFw ~ dnorm(mu.sFw, tau.sFw)
  muLogit.sAs ~ dnorm(mu.sAs, tau.sAs)

```

```

muLogit.sAw ~ dnorm(mu.sAw, tau.sAw)

## Hyper-prior for Beta-Binomial dispersion for proportion of Fledglings
dispFlegdling ~ dgamma(shapeFlegdling, rateFlegdling)

## Survival for years WITHOUT hunting
for (t in 1:startH1) {
  logit.theta.sFs[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sFs, 4/(sigma.sFs*sigma.sFs)) # Fledgling summer
  logit.theta.sFw[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sFw, 4/(sigma.sFw*sigma.sFw)) # Fledgling winter
  logit.theta.sAs[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sAs, 4/(sigma.sAs*sigma.sAs)) # Adult summer
  logit.theta.sAw[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sAw, 4/(sigma.sAw*sigma.sAw)) # Adult winter
  logit(theta.sFs[t]) <- logit.theta.sFs[t]
  logit(theta.sFw[t]) <- logit.theta.sFw[t]
  logit(theta.sAs[t]) <- logit.theta.sAs[t]
  logit(theta.sAw[t]) <- logit.theta.sAw[t]
  lambda.sFs[t] <- theta.sFs[t]
  lambda.sFw[t] <- theta.sFw[t]
  lambda.sAs[t] <- theta.sAs[t]
  lambda.sAw[t] <- theta.sAw[t]
}

## Survival for years WITH hunting
for (t in startH:N) {
  hRate.s.BS[t] ~ dunif(hrateLower, hrateUpper)
  hRate.w.BS[t] ~ dunif(hrateLower, hrateUpper)
  hRate.s.NS[t] ~ dunif(hrateLower, hrateUpper)
  hRate.w.NS[t] ~ dunif(hrateLower, hrateUpper)
  hRate.s[t] <- hRate.s.BS[t] + hRate.s.NS[t]
  hRate.w[t] <- hRate.w.BS[t] + hRate.w.NS[t]
}

for (t in startH:N) {
  logit.theta.sFs[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sFs, 4/(sigma.sFs*sigma.sFs)) # Fledgling summer
  logit.theta.sFw[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sFw, 4/(sigma.sFw*sigma.sFw)) # Fledgling winter
  logit.theta.sAs[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sAs, 4/(sigma.sAs*sigma.sAs)) # Adult summer
  logit.theta.sAw[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.sAw, 4/(sigma.sAw*sigma.sAw)) # Adult winter
  logit(theta.sFs[t]) <- logit.theta.sFs[t]
  logit(theta.sFw[t]) <- logit.theta.sFw[t]
  logit(theta.sAs[t]) <- logit.theta.sAs[t]
  logit(theta.sAw[t]) <- logit.theta.sAw[t]
  lambda.sFs[t] <- (1-rho*hRate.s[t]) * theta.sFs[t]

```

```

lambda.sFw[t] <- (1-rho*hRate.w[t]) * theta.sFw[t]
lambda.sAs[t] <- (1- hRate.s[t]) * theta.sAs[t]
lambda.sAw[t] <- (1- hRate.w[t]) * theta.sAw[t]
}

## Hyper-prior Logit-Normal for Reproduction
muLogit.repro ~ dnorm(mu.repro, tau.repro)
for (t in 1:N) {
  logit.Repro[t] ~ dnorm(muLogit.repro, 4/(sigma.repro*sigma.repro)) # Fledgling summer
  Repro[t] <- 2/(1+exp(-logit.Repro[t]))
}

## Hyper-prior for process error for January Count
cvCount ~ dgamma(shapeCount, rateCount)
log.tauCount <- 1/log(cvCount*cvCount + 1)

## Hyper-prior for process error for Derogation; identical for BS and NS
cvHarvest ~ dgamma(shapeHarvest, rateHarvest)
log.tauHarvest <- 1/log(cvHarvest*cvHarvest + 1)

## IPM Population dynamics for July
for (t in 1:N1) {
  nA[t+1] <- max(1000, lambda.sAs[t]*lambda.sAw[t]*nA[t] + lambda.sFs[t]*lambda.sFw[t]*nF[t])
  nF[t+1] <- 0.5*Repro[t]*nA[t+1]
}

## Data: Counts in January
for (t in 1:N) {
  arcticCount[t] <- lambda.sAs[t]*nA[t] + lambda.sFs[t]*nF[t]
  januaryCount[t] <-arcticCount[t] + (1-hRate.s.NS[t])*phi*NtNS1[t] + (1-hRate.s[t])*phi*NtBS1[t]
  log.januaryCount[t] <- log(januaryCount[t])
  Count[t] ~ dlnorm(log.januaryCount[t], log.tauCount)
}

## Data: Fraction of fledglings in January; assumed to be identical in all three populations
for (t in 1:N) {
  pFledgling[t] <- lambda.sFs[t]*nF[t]/(lambda.sAs[t]*nA[t] + lambda.sFs[t]*nF[t])
  betaFledgling[t] ~ dbeta(disFlegdling*pFledgling[t], disFlegdling*(1-pFledgling[t]))
  nFledgling[t] ~ dbin(betaFledgling[t], nGroup[t])
}

```

```

## Data: derogation in Summer/Winter for 2008 - 2018
for (t in startH:N) {
  ## Summer Harvest
  summerTMP[t] <- rho*theta.sFs[t]*nF[t] + theta.sAs[t]*nA[t] + phi*NtBS1[t]
  summerHarvest.BS[t] <- hRate.s.BS[t]*summerTMP[t]
  summerHarvest.NS[t] <- hRate.s.NS[t]*(summerTMP[t] + phi*NtNS1[t])
  log.summerHarvest.BS[t] <- log(summerHarvest.BS[t])
  log.summerHarvest.NS[t] <- log(summerHarvest.NS[t])
  hSummerBS[t] ~ dlnorm(log.summerHarvest.BS[t], log.tauHarvest)
  hSummerNS[t] ~ dlnorm(log.summerHarvest.NS[t], log.tauHarvest)

  ## Winter derogation
  winterTMP[t] <- rho*(1-rho*hRate.s[t])*theta.sFs[t]*nF[t] +
    (1-rho*hRate.s[t]) * (theta.sAs[t]*nA[t] + phi*NtBS1[t])
  winterHarvest.BS[t] <- hRate.w.BS[t]*winterTMP[t]
  winterHarvest.NS[t] <- hRate.w.NS[t]*(winterTMP[t] + (1-hRate.s.NS[t])*phi*NtNS1[t])
  log.winterHarvest.BS[t] <- log(winterHarvest.BS[t])
  log.winterHarvest.NS[t] <- log(winterHarvest.NS[t])
  hWinterBS[t] ~ dlnorm(log.winterHarvest.BS[t], log.tauHarvest)
  hWinterNS[t] ~ dlnorm(log.winterHarvest.NS[t], log.tauHarvest)
}

## Data: derogation in Summer/Winter for 1976 - 2007
## Redundant but necessary for monitoring
for (t in 1:startH1) {
  hRate.s.BS[t] ~ dunif(0.0, 0.00001)
  hRate.w.BS[t] ~ dunif(0.0, 0.00001)
  hRate.s.NS[t] ~ dunif(0.0, 0.00001)
  hRate.w.NS[t] ~ dunif(0.0, 0.00001)
  hRate.s[t] <- hRate.s.BS[t] + hRate.s.NS[t]
  hRate.w[t] <- hRate.w.BS[t] + hRate.w.NS[t]
  summerTMP[t] <- rho*theta.sFs[t]*nF[t] + theta.sAs[t]*nA[t] + phi*NtBS1[t]
  summerHarvest.BS[t] <- hRate.s.BS[t]*summerTMP[t]
  summerHarvest.NS[t] <- hRate.s.NS[t]*(summerTMP[t] + phi*NtNS1[t])
  winterTMP[t] <- rho*(1-rho*hRate.s[t])*theta.sFs[t]*nF[t] +
    (1-rho*hRate.s[t]) * (theta.sAs[t]*nA[t] + phi*NtBS1[t])
  winterHarvest.BS[t] <- hRate.w.BS[t]*winterTMP[t]
  winterHarvest.NS[t] <- hRate.w.NS[t]*(winterTMP[t] + (1-hRate.s.NS[t])*phi*NtNS1[t])
}

```

```
}  
"  
  
## Load JAGS libraries  
library(coda)  
library(rjags)  
library(runjags)  
  
## What to monitor  
JAGSmonitor <- c("januaryCount", "arcticCount", "nF", "nA",  
  "pFledgling", "betaFledgling", "Repro",  
  "summerHarvest.BS", "winterHarvest.BS", "summerHarvest.NS", "winterHarvest.NS",  
  "hRate.s.BS", "hRate.w.BS", "hRate.s.NS", "hRate.w.NS",  
  "theta.sFs", "theta.sFw", "theta.sAs", "theta.sAw",  
  "lambda.sFs", "lambda.sFw", "lambda.sAs", "lambda.sAw",  
  "muLogit.sFs", "muLogit.sFw", "muLogit.sAs", "muLogit.sAw", "dispFlegdling",  
  "muLogit.repro", "cvCount", "cvHarvest")  
  
## MCMC settings  
source(".RunFinal.r")  
test=TRUE  
test=FALSE  
if (test) {  
  adapt <- 500; burnin <- 1000; sample <- 1000; thin <- 1; chains <- 3  
}  
  
## Set initial values  
vNA <- rep(NA,N)  
TMPinits <- list(  
  nF=vNA, nA=vNA,  
  muLogit.sFs=NA, muLogit.sFw=NA, muLogit.sAs=NA, muLogit.sAw=NA,  
  muLogit.repro=NA ,dispFlegdling=NA, cvCount=NA, cvHarvest=NA,  
  .RNG.seed=seed, .RNG.name="base::Wichmann-Hill")  
  
## Inits; repeat for different chains  
JAGSinits <- list()  
initpopF <- 6000  
initpopA <- 34000  
initpopCV <- 10  
initpopVAR <- log((initpopCV/100)^2 + 1)
```

```

initpopSD <- sqrt(initpopVAR)
meanFledgling <- shapeFlegdling/rateFlegdling

c1 <- 0.5
for (ii in 1:chains) {
  TMPinits$nF[1] <- rlnorm(1, log(initpopF) - initpopVAR/2, initpopSD)
  TMPinits$nA[1] <- rlnorm(1, log(initpopA) - initpopVAR/2, initpopSD)
  TMPinits$muLogit.sFs <- runif(1, mu.sFs - c1, mu.sFs + c1)
  TMPinits$muLogit.sFw <- runif(1, mu.sFw - c1, mu.sFw + c1)
  TMPinits$muLogit.sAs <- runif(1, mu.sAs - c1, mu.sAs + c1)
  TMPinits$muLogit.sAw <- runif(1, mu.sAw - c1, mu.sAw + c1)
  TMPinits$muLogit.repro <- runif(1, mu.repro - c1, mu.repro + c1)
  TMPinits$dispFlegdling <- runif(1, meanFledgling-10, meanFledgling+10)
  TMPinits$cvCount <- rgamma(1, shape=shapeCount, rate=rateCount)
  TMPinits$cvHarvest <- rgamma(1, shape=shapeHarvest, rate=rateHarvest)
  TMPinits$.RNG.seed <- TMPinits$.RNG.seed + 1
  JAGSinits[[ii]] <- TMPinits
}

## Run JAGS model
start_time = Sys.time()
runjags.options(force.summary=TRUE)
samples <- run.jags(model=JAGSmodel, data=JAGSinput, inits=JAGSinits, monitor=JAGSmonitor,
  n.chains=chains, adapt=adapt, burnin=burnin, sample=sample, thin=thin)
Sys.time()- start_time

## Save all results
## Save selected columns from summary for producing graphs.
## Note that colnames and rownames are written to separate files
save(samples, file=paste0(Rprogram, ".RData"))
attr(samples[[1]], "class") <- NULL
sumAllColumns <- summary(samples)
rownames(sumAllColumns) <- colnames(samples$mcmc[[1]])
selectCols <- c(4,1,2,3,11)
summary <- cbind(sumAllColumns[, selectCols])
summaryRows <- colnames(samples$mcmc[[1]])
summaryCols <- colnames(sumAllColumns)[selectCols]
save(summary, file=paste0(Rprogram, "-Summary.RData"))
save(summaryRows, file=paste0(Rprogram, "-SummaryRows.RData"))
save(summaryCols, file=paste0(Rprogram, "-SummaryCols.RData"))

```

```
## January counts and fitted values
Nmean <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("januaryCount", rownames(summary)), 'Mean'])
Nlow <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("januaryCount", rownames(summary)), 'Lower95'])
Nupp <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("januaryCount", rownames(summary)), 'Upper95'])
NFmean <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("nF", rownames(summary)), 'Mean'])
NFlow <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("nF", rownames(summary)), 'Lower95'])
NFupp <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("nF", rownames(summary)), 'Upper95'])
NAmean <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("nA", rownames(summary)), 'Mean'])
NALow <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("nA", rownames(summary)), 'Lower95'])
NAupp <- as.numeric(summary[grepl("nA", rownames(summary)), 'Upper95'])
cbind(data[,c(2,4)], Nmean, Nlow, Nupp, NFmean, NFlow, NFupp, NAmean, NALow, NAupp)
```



## Annex 4. Impact Models

According to the ISSMPs for the Greylag Goose and the Barnacle Goose Range States are mandated to quantify the consequences of changes in population size on fundamental objectives, e.g., investigate if there is a relationship between goose abundances and the amount of damage caused by the species to agricultural crops, risks to air safety or other sensitive flora and fauna.

In order to scale up an assessment of the extent of damage or risks from local to regional, national or even flyway levels, it is necessary to apply either a retrospective time series, statistical analysis or a predictive simulation approach. With regard to agricultural damage, some first indicative examples of national time series analyses were provided in the respective ISSMPs based on compensation payments to farmers in relationship to annual abundances of geese. For Sweden this analysis has been extended and validated (Montr  z-Janer et al. 2019). In case of Denmark, where compensation or subsidies are not used to support crop damage management, derogation has been used as a proxy of the intensity of crop loss. At national level, there was a relationship between Barnacle Goose numbers and licenses granted for derogation shooting (Clausen et al. 2020). In the Netherlands, retrospective analyses are also in progress .

Predictive models to assess the relationship have so far been developed at regional levels in Norway (Baveco et al. 2017). Work is in progress in the Netherlands and Denmark (at regional level), using individual-based models and agent-based simulations, respectively. The process of building, parameterisation and testing such models is resource demanding and cannot be rolled out easily to all Range States. Hence, at least for the foreseeable future, such models can realistically only be used for selected regions.

### Progress on the Danish regional simulation model

This model is built into the existing ALMaSS system (Animal, Landscape and Man Simulation System), which provides a dynamic and detailed representation of the underlying landscape, including habitat types, farm management, crop rotation etc. as well as changes in weather, vegetation growth and food availability over time. The model includes three species of migratory geese overwintering in Denmark (Pink-footed Goose, Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose), using pattern-oriented modelling (an iterative framework where different versions are tested against performance criteria in order to assess suitability of the model) to make it behaves as closely as possible to the real world. Individual geese interact with the environment and potentially with each other, making foraging choices based on their current memory and energetic state. Population level patterns emerge as a consequence of the behaviour of each of the individuals in the three populations, and the interplay between geese and landscape allow for inference about how and where geese affect the underlying landscape. The model is validated against literature and field data, and may potentially be used for a number of research questions in relation to habitat use, crop damage, foraging decisions and management actions.

The current version aims specifically to address the impact of growing Barnacle Goose numbers on habitat use and crop cultivation, e.g. by identifying the relationship between goose numbers and crop damage. The landscape, weather and simulation of spatial behaviours is fully implemented in the model, while foraging decisions and energetics of individual geese are subject to ongoing development.

### Progress on the Dutch regional simulation model

Movements and foraging decisions of Barnacle Geese are simulated with a custom-made, spatially-explicit, individual-based model. The model comprises foraging on grasslands in Friesland (appr. 70x70 km), the Netherlands, with a spatial resolution of 100x100m (1ha) and temporal resolutions of 1 hour for goose behaviour and 1 day for grass growth. Goose movements and foraging decisions depend on a decision tree, which is based on energy expenditure and intake, memory, interactions between flocks, and time of day. The model has been calibrated with GPS data of barnacle geese foraging in Friesland. At present, model validation is ongoing. With this model, we can assess the impacts of different management scenarios and barnacle goose

population sizes on goose foraging behaviour and its effects on goose distributions across agricultural grasslands in Friesland. The model can be extended to include other goose species and their interactions.

#### Retrospective analyses

A thorough analysis was performed on the relation between damage on agricultural grasslands and goose numbers in the province of Friesland, the Netherlands. We linked automatically executed damage reports to estimated goose numbers, using monthly goose counts and an approximation of homogeneous spatial redistributing of these geese that is based on GPS observations. Based on a pilot analysis, three goose species were qualified for use in the final analysis: Barnacle Goose, Greylag Goose, and Greater White-fronted Goose. We expect to publish our findings in 2021.

#### **References**

**Baveco, H.M. et al. (2017).** Combining modelling tools to evaluate a goose management scheme. *Ambio* 46(2): 210-223.

**Clausen, K.C., Heldbjerg, H., Balsby, T., Clausen, P., Nielsen, R.D., Skov, F. & Madsen, J. (2020).** *Sammenhæng mellem forekomst af bramgæs og reguleringsindsats i Danmark*. Scientific Report, Aarhus University, Denmark (in press).

**Montràz-Janer, T., Knape, J., Nilsson, L., Tombre, I., Pärt, T. & Månsson, J. (2019).** Relating national levels of crop damage to the abundance of large grazing birds: Implications for management. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 56: 2286-2297.

## Annex 5. Indicator factsheets

### I.1. Population size compared to the Favourable Reference Population (FRP)

#### Rationale

This indicator measures the progress towards the Fundamental Objective I. Maintain the population at a satisfactory level. The FRPs at national and flyway level are set in Chapter 2 of this AFMP. These FRPs correspond to the ecological requirements part of Article 2 of the Birds Directive.

#### Indicator definition

The FRP will be monitored both on the breeding grounds of MUs 2 and 3 and at the wintering grounds for the population as a whole.

#### Methodology

##### *Data collection*

The assessment of the FRP will be based on monitoring protocols described in Chapter 5 of this AFMP.

##### *Data flow*

The dataflow is described in Chapter 5 of this AFMP.

##### *Methodology for indicator calculation*

Methodology is described in Chapter 5 of this AFMP.

##### *Methodology for gap filling*

Updates on methodology for gap filling is presented in the annual EGMP Population Status and Assessment Report.

##### *Methodology uncertainty*

The pre-migration aerial surveys represent a snapshot and some flocks might be easily missed.

### I.2 Range extent compared to the Favourable Reference Range (FRR)

#### Rationale

This indicator measures the progress towards the Fundamental Objective I. Maintain the population at a satisfactory level. The population is considered to be maintained at a satisfactory level if the range is maintained at or above the level of the Favourable Reference Range, which is set (for most Range States) in Table 2 of this AFMP at the level of the 2003-2018 period.

#### Indicator definition

This indicator consists of two sub-indicators:

- Actual breeding range in proportion of the breeding FRR;
- Actual non-breeding (staging and wintering range) in proportion of the non-breeding FRR.

The breeding range includes the areas where nesting and brood rearing before fledging takes place.

According to the CMS definition, the non-breeding range includes any areas the migratory species stays in temporarily, crosses or overflies during its normal migration. Hence, the range is not restricted to key sites only, but includes all areas where the species regularly (although not necessarily) occurs annually.

## Methodology

### *Data collection*

The breeding ranges of MUs 2 and 3 are within the territories of the EU Member States. Consequently, the breeding distribution can be monitored based on the six-yearly Birds Directive Article 12 reports. The entire breeding range of MU 1 is outside of the European Union. Consequently, there are no reporting obligations under Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive. The AEWA reporting on national population status reporting does not require Range States to report on distribution or range. Therefore, special reporting should be set up to monitor the changes in range extent.

Both the breeding and non-breeding ranges of the population should be monitored following the standards set for the reporting under Article 12 of the EU Birds Directive and use the range method described in DG Environment (2017, pp. 124-128).

Considering the high costs associated with monitoring of the breeding range in Russia, it is proposed to update the range information only once during the lifespan of the ISSMP in 2027.

Data for the non-breeding range will be collected at the same time as for breeding distribution data is collected national population status reporting to AEWA (i.e. 2024). Range States are recommended to use the Range Tool<sup>21</sup> developed for the reporting under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive to determine the range. The recommended gap distance for the Barnacle Goose is 140 km based on Box 3.2 in Bijlsma (2019, p. 40) using a body mass value of 1.765 kg. Information on non-breeding distribution can be obtained from the national IWC scheme, goose counts, and online observation reporting portals (such as Observation.org, Ornitho, etc.) active in the respective Range States.

### *Data flow*

Range States should calculate the range based on their distribution mapping and report it to the EGMP Data Centre by 31 December 2025.

### *Methodology for indicator calculation*

For both sub-indicators the actual range will be compared to the national, MU and flyway level FRRs.

### *Methodology for gap filling*

No need for gap filling is foreseen in the Range States.

### *Methodology uncertainty*

The methodology is sensitive to changes on the edges of the range. Currently, the range method was not applied by all Range States.

## References

- Bijlsma, R., Agrillo, E., Attorre, F., Boitani, L., Brunner, A., Evans, P., . . . van Kleunen, A. (2019).** *Defining and applying the concept of Favourable Reference Values for species and habitats under the EU Birds and Habitats Directives*. Retrieved from <https://edepot.wur.nl/469035>
- DG Environment. (2017).** *Reporting under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive: Explanatory notes and guidelines for the period 2013-2018*. In (pp. 188). Brussels: European Commission.

---

<sup>21</sup>[http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/habitats\\_art17/Reporting2019/Guidelines\\_for\\_EEA\\_range\\_tool\\_README\\_.pdf](http://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/help/habitats_art17/Reporting2019/Guidelines_for_EEA_range_tool_README_.pdf)

## II.1. Relative change in damage payments

### Rationale

This indicator measures the progress towards the Fundamental Objective II. Minimize agricultural damage and conflicts. The most direct indicator would be the loss of yield of a given crop type caused by Barnacle Geese, aggregated from local to national and international levels. However, such measurements would be extremely costly and models for upscaling do not exist. Therefore, it is necessary to resort to measurable proxy indicators, such as (1) compensation payments or (2) subsidies, or management actions taken to prevent agricultural damage, such as (3) offtake under derogation.

### Indicator definition

This indicator includes three sub-indicators (for definition and current use in the EGMP Range States, see Tombre et al. (2019)<sup>22</sup>:

1. Monetary compensation payments for crop damages cause by Barnacle Geese, under which farmers eligible for compensation receive public money to counterbalance for the lost crop.
2. Subsidy payments, i.e. farmers receiving public funds in order to allow goose grazing on their properties. Subsidies are usually paid in advance and may hence not directly reflect the level of damage.
3. Offtake under derogation, referring to the culling of flight-less geese (adults and young), removing of nests or eggs during summer, or geese shot outside the hunting season to protect crops.

Because the three sub-indicators are used slightly differently among Range States and do not all use a monetary currency, they will be used on a relative scale to evaluate trends in damage.

### Methodology

#### *Data collection*

Data collected for the three sub-indicators at national level, species-specific and annually. Compensation payments, subsidies paid, and numbers of Barnacle Geese killed under derogation will be compiled from the national statutory authorities, who are also responsible for the quality check of the information provided. The authorities will also be asked to report any change in policies, regulations or management practices, which may influence payments or use of derogation.

#### *Data flow*

Data for each year from the period of 2020 – 2024 is to be reported to the EGMP Data Centre by 31 December 2025. Data collection shall continue also in 2025 – 2026.

#### *Methodology for indicator calculation*

The national payments and derogation information will be entered into a common database. Damage in 2020 will be set at an index of 100 for each country, and subsequent data will be indexed relatively to the starting year, taking into account the national inflation rate. An overview for all range states and the three relative sub-indicators will be updated annually.

---

<sup>22</sup>[https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/download/population\\_status\\_reports/EGMP\\_010\\_Management\\_measures\\_for\\_geese.pdf](https://egmp.aewa.info/sites/default/files/download/population_status_reports/EGMP_010_Management_measures_for_geese.pdf)

*Methodology for gap filling*

No gap filling.

*Methodology uncertainty*

The sub-indicators are sensitive to changes in management policies, regulations and practices. A metabase will document all the reported changes. Some countries do not have species-specific reporting of damage and can only give a rough estimate of the damage caused by Barnacle Geese. A system will have to be set up to assess the uncertainties in the reporting.

### **III.1. Number of birdstrikes with aircrafts caused by Barnacle Goose**

**Rationale**

This indicator measures the progress towards the Fundamental Objective III. Minimize the risk to air safety. The frequency of birdstrikes with Barnacle Goose is the direct indicator for the development in incidents, cumulated from local airports to national and international levels. The risk is likely to increase with the number of Barnacle Geese passing over airports (see Indicator III.2).

**Indicator definition**

The indicator is the number of birdstrikes caused by Barnacle Geese in commercial airports in the Range States.

**Methodology**

*Data collection*

Data collected at airport and national level, species-specific and annually. This indicator is reported as a standard in all commercial civil airports and the airport authorities attempt to make an identification of the species causing the birdstrike. Airports will be asked to report:

- a) Date, time of birdstrike,
- b) Species, flock size, number struck,
- c) Aircraft model,
- d) Phase of flight (takeoff, landing, descent, climb, en route).

Birdstrike data will be compiled from the national statutory authorities. The authorities will also be asked to report any change in reporting practices, which may influence the indicator.

*Data flow*

Data for each year from the period of 2020 – 2024 is to be reported to the EGMP Data Centre by 31 December 2025. Data collection shall continue also in 2025 – 2026.

*Methodology for indicator calculation*

Range States will be asked to select at least three high-risk civil commercial airports within the national range of the Barnacle Goose for reporting. The frequency of birdstrikes will be listed per airport and per country. An overview for all range states will be updated annually.

*Methodology for gap filling*

No gap filling is necessary.

*Methodology uncertainty*

The frequency of birdstrikes with Barnacle Goose is low in most airports. Therefore, the indicator has to be combined with III.3 to give a more reliable indication of the risk.

## III.2. Number of Barnacle Geese passing over commercial airports

### Rationale

This indicator measures the progress towards the Fundamental Objective III. Minimize the risk to air safety. The number of Barnacle Geese passing over an airport indicates the risk of birdstrikes in a given airport (Indicator III.1) and can be related to the national and international levels.

### Indicator definition

The indicator is the cumulative number of Barnacle Geese passing over civil commercial airports per year in the range of the Barnacle Goose, using the same airports as in III.1.

### Methodology

#### *Data collection*

Data collected at airport and national level, species-specific and annually. This indicator is reported as a standard in commercial civil airports and the airport authorities attempt to make an identification of the species passing (or landing in the airport). Airports will be asked to report:

- a) Date, time of passage,
- b) Species, flock size.

Barnacle Goose passage data will be compiled from the national statutory authorities. The authorities will also be asked to report any change in reporting practices, which may influence the indicator.

#### *Data flow*

Data for each year from the period of 2020 – 2024 is to be reported to the EGMP Data Centre by 31 December 2025. Data collection shall continue also in 2025 – 2026.

#### *Methodology for indicator calculation*

Range States will be asked to select at least three high-risk civil commercial airports within the national range of the Barnacle Goose for reporting. The cumulative number of Barnacle Geese passing per year will be calculated per airport. A national trend index will be calculated. The starting year will be set at an index of 100, and subsequent data will be indexed relatively to the starting year. An overview for all range states (average national indexes and relative change) will be updated annually.

#### *Methodology for gap filling*

No gap filling.

#### *Methodology uncertainty*

The ability of species identification by bird control employees has to be checked. If some airports use radar for identification, standards for species identifications have to be defined.

## IV.1 Area of natural habitat or habitat of threatened species negatively affected by Barnacle Goose

### Rationale

This indicator measures the progress towards Fundamental Objective IV. Minimize the risk to other flora and fauna. The risk to other flora and fauna can be induced mainly via (1) grazing of plants, e.g. the Arctic tundra vegetation, with possible knock-on consequences for the whole ecosystem or (2) eutrophication of oligotrophic lake ecosystems by goose droppings transferred from foraging grounds to roosts. However, grazing and nutrient transport is amongst the ecological functions of geese and not necessarily a damage.



Therefore, it should be assessed on a case-by-case basis and considered being a damage if it conflicts with the conservation objectives of a site.

### **Indicator definition**

Area of natural habitat or habitat of threatened species negatively affected by Barnacle Goose. This indicator considers the natural habitats of conservation interest, which includes natural habitats listed on Annex I of the EU Habitats Directive or any other natural habitats that are of conservation interest at national level. It also includes the habitat for threatened species regardless whether the habitat is of natural origin or not. In case of such habitats, the important factor is the presence and dependence of a threatened species on the habitat, and the structure and other characteristics of the habitat. In this context, threatened species include species that are listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive or on Annexes II or IV of the Habitat Directive or listed as threatened on a European or national Red List.

### **Methodology**

#### *Data collection*

Range States will need to collect information from the organisations responsible for managing conservation areas on the damage caused by Barnacle Goose two times during the lifespan of this AFMP. As the damage can affect a wide range of species the extent of the habitat damaged will be used as the measurement of the damage. Site management organisations should be asked to report:

- a) the threatened species or habitats affected negatively by Barnacle Goose during the reporting period,
- b) the location, the nature of the damage and the extent of area affected.

#### *Data flow*

Data for each year from the period of 2020 – 2024 is to be reported to the EGMP Data Centre by 31 December 2025. Data collection shall continue also in 2025 – 2026.

#### *Methodology for indicator calculation*

The EGMP Data Centre will report the total area affected and also areas by habitat types or species.

#### *Methodology for gap filling*

No need for gap filling is foreseen.

#### *Methodology uncertainty*

This indicator is dependent on the judgement of the site management organisations.

## **V.1 Number of people enjoying watching geese**

### **Rationale**

This indicator measures the progress towards the cultural/recreational component of Fundamental Objective V. Maximise ecosystem services.

Watching geese represents an important cultural/recreational service for many people (Buij *et al.*, 2017) and the MCDA process (Johnson, 2020) has identified that several stakeholder groups valued this highly. Unfortunately, it is highly difficult to monitor the change in the recreational value of geese. Repeated socio-economic surveys would be rather expensive. Therefore, it is suggested to use the number of people submitting Barnacle Goose observations to online observation recording portals. These portals target the general public and a very high proportion of people interested in watching birds keep records of their observations on these platforms. The main observation portals in the region all contribute to the



EuroBirdPortal. This would allow obtaining data at a very low cost. Even if the indicator would probably underestimate the number of people enjoy watching geese, it is assumed it would correlate closely with the total number of people. It is proposed to focus on the number of people rather than the number of man-days because the latter would require a different level of engagement than simple enjoyment.

### **Indicator definition**

Change in the annual number of people submitting Barnacle Goose observations to an online portal that contributes data to the EuroBirdPortal.

### **Methodology**

#### *Data collection*

No direct reporting is required by the Range States.

#### *Data flow*

Data will be obtained by the EGMP Data Centre from EuroBirdPortal

#### *Methodology for indicator calculation*

An annual index of the number of people submitting goose observations to the online portals will be calculated for each country and aggregated at MU and flyway level.

#### *Methodology for gap filling*

No need for gap filling is foreseen in the Range States.

#### *Methodology uncertainty*

The index might also change if the number of users is changing and it should be tested whether this has any influence on the index.

## **References**

**Buij, R., Melman, T. C., Loonen, M. J., & Fox, A. D. (2017).** Balancing ecosystem function, services and disservices resulting from expanding goose populations. *Ambio*, 46(2), 301-318.

## **VI.1 Relative change in cost of goose management**

### **Rationale**

This indicator measures the progress towards the Fundamental Objective VI. Minimize costs of goose management. An indicator for the successful fulfilment of this objective is that the measurable administrative costs for dealing with the many facets of goose related management and conflict are reduced with the progressive implementation of the ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose.

### **Indicator definition**

This indicator is defined by the number of administrative man-years spent on the management of Barnacle Goose in the Range States, including program management, communication with users, number of field assessments made, reporting (from local to international levels).

### **Methodology**

#### *Data collection*

The EGMP Data Centre will send out a questionnaire to each Range State asking for administrative costs spent on goose management activities at various governance levels (local, regional, national).

*Data flow*

Data for each year from the period of 2020 – 2024 is to be reported to the EGMP Data Centre by 31 December 2025. Data collection shall continue also in 2025 – 2026.

*Methodology for indicator calculation*

The number of man-hours divided into different levels of governance and tasks will be amalgamated for each country and be presented in an international overview at 6- year intervals.

*Methodology for gap filling*

No gap filling.

*Methodology uncertainty*

It is important to standardize the questionnaires, but due to differences in national organisation of goose management, they will have to be tailored specifically. For some countries it may be difficult to make a quantitative assessment, and it may be necessary to resort to a qualitative assessment (increase, stable, decrease).

## **Annex 6. Protocols for the iterative phase**

Monitoring, assessment and decision-making protocols will be developed by the EGMP Data Centre after the adoption of the AFMP.



UNEP/AEWA Secretariat  
UN Campus  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn  
Germany  
Tel.: +49 (0) 228 815 2413  
Fax: +49 (0) 228 815 2450  
[aewa.secretariat@unep-aewa.org](mailto:aewa.secretariat@unep-aewa.org)  
[www.unep-aewa.org](http://www.unep-aewa.org)