

**AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT PLATFORM**



**4<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE  
AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT  
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP**

*18-20 June 2019, Perth, Scotland, United Kingdom*



---

**OUTCOMES AND DECISIONS ON THE KEY POINTS  
RELATED TO THE DRAFT  
AEWA ISSMPs FOR THE BARNACLE GOOSE  
AND THE GREYLAG GOOSE**

**AEWA INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT PLANNING WORKSHOP FOR THE  
BARNACLE GOOSE AND THE GREYLAG GOOSE (NW/SW European population)**

*19 June 2018, Leeuwarden, the Netherlands*

---

**OUTCOMES AND DECISIONS ON THE KEY POINTS RELATED TO THE DRAFT  
AEWA ISSMPs FOR THE BARNACLE GOOSE AND THE GREYLAG GOOSE**

### **Background**

The third draft of the International Single Species Management Plans (ISSMPs) for the three populations (Russia/Germany & Netherlands, East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland, Svalbard/South-west Scotland) of the Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) and the third draft for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose (*Anser anser*) were submitted for review by the Range States, at the International Management Planning Workshop for the Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose (NW/SW European Population) held on 19 June in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands.

At the same time, Range States were requested to consider the clarifications provided in the document *Summary of Key points related to the draft AEWA ISSMPs for the Barnacle Goose and for the Greylag Goose* (Doc. AEWA/BG/GG/MPWS/2.5/Rev.1) and to provide further guidance concerning the key issues covered by the key points for decision.

This document summarizes the main outcomes and decisions from the workshop. Specific comments on the draft ISSMPs have been incorporated directly into the ISSMPs and are not reflected in this paper.

The Secretariat has received written comments from Range States and stakeholders, which are either reflected in this document or incorporated directly into the ISSMPs, as appropriate.

### **Key points for decision**

The following three fundamental pending points were discussed and a decision was taken by the Range States on the way forward:

- 1 Is there any need for flyway management plans for the Barnacle Goose and for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose?**
- 2 If there is a need for flyway management plans; can Range States provide a better quantification of damage, including their goose management costs and the changes of these over time?**
- 3 If there is a need for flyway management plans that include minimum and maximum population targets?**

It was agreed that there is a need for flyway management plans for Barnacle Goose and for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose.

In case of the Greylag Goose, the ISSMP and the Adaptive Flyway Management Programmes (AFMPs) will facilitate better co-ordination of hunting and population regulation under derogation at flyway level, and help maintain the population between agreed lower and upper limits. Furthermore, an additional value of the ISSMP is to address agricultural and other damage, as well as air safety issues in a more co-ordinated and efficient way between Range States, especially by improving knowledge on these issues.

Noting that the Barnacle Goose is listed on Annex I of the EU Birds Directive and is not a huntable species in the EU, the main added-value of the Barnacle Goose ISSMP will be to help prevent damage and to reduce the risk to air safety in a more co-ordinated and efficient way between Range States, especially by improving knowledge on these issues. It was agreed that if a necessity was identified, the population will be adjusted to a particular level at an appropriate scale.

The ISSMPs will help ensure that all derogations granted at Range State level when considered together, keep the populations at the agreed satisfactory level above favourable conservation status. Through the Adaptive Flyway Management Programmes (AFMPs) Range States will undertake better assessments e.g. on damage, population level and on any correlation between damage and population level in each Management Unit.

### **Key decisions – General points on the ISSMPs**

Key points that have been raised during the workshop have been directly incorporated into the ISSMPs, e.g. reflected in the fundamental objectives and means objectives of the ISSMPs.

It should be noted that the order in which the objectives are sequenced in the text do not follow a priority order, but instead are interlinked and complementary, as is indicated already in the relevant footnote in the plans.

### **Key decisions on the Barnacle Goose ISSMP**

Specific comments on the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft ISSMP have been incorporated directly into the 4<sup>th</sup> draft ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose.

Range States agreed to include further implementation details and create a specific mandate for activities to be included in each AFMP.

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. Although the ISSMP does not envisage the application of flyway-level derogations, 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 human health and air safety as well as to other flora and fauna that can be attributed to the population in the Management Unit in question, including predicted future changes in these;
- ii. A 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 damage and to reduce risks, including their effectiveness and sufficiency to tackle the problem;
- iv. Understanding of the link between population level and damage or risk.

Each AFMP shall also contain information on habitat conservation measures, including designation of Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under Article 4 (2) 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.).

Appropriate indicators for assessing the progress towards achieving the fundamental objectives will be developed by the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG) during the development of the AFMPs, also taking into account the information needs outlined above. This information will be updated annually.

### **Key decisions on the Greylag Goose ISSMP**

Specific comments on the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft ISSMP have been incorporated directly into the 4<sup>th</sup> draft ISSMP for the Greylag Goose.

A clear distinction and differentiated management between resident and migratory units is necessary. Hence, it was agreed to include preliminary Management Units (MUs) into the Greylag Goose ISSMP.

The complete analysis of Greylag Goose MUs is envisaged to be ready in September 2018, however, in the meantime the MUs will be defined based on preliminary results discussed at the workshop.

Range States agreed to include further implementation details and create a specific mandate for activities to be included in each AFMP.

To the extent that derogations from the provisions of Articles 5-8 of the Birds Directive (or the protections prescribed by the Bern Convention) may be appropriate for addressing the problems posed by Greylag Geese, AFMPs have the potential to assist Range States in assessing whether such derogations are necessary 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 the risks to human health and air safety as well as to other flora and fauna that can be attributed to the population in the MU in question, including predicted future changes in these;
- ii. A 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 damage and to reduce risks, including their effectiveness and sufficiency to tackle the problem;
- iv. Understanding of the link between population level and damage or risk.

Each AFMP shall also contain information on habitat conservation measures including designation of Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under Article 4 (2) of the EU 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.).

Appropriate indicators for assessing the progress towards achieving the fundamental objectives will be developed by the EGM IWG during the development of the adaptive management programmes taking into account also the information needs outlined above. This information will be updated annually.

### **Defining Favourable Reference Values (FRVs)**

It was agreed that in the case of AEWA Species Action and Management Plans, the definition of Favourable Conservation Status set out in Paragraph 1(c) of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) is applicable:

- i. Population dynamics data indicate that the migratory species is maintaining itself on a long-term basis as a viable component of its ecosystems;
- ii. The range of the migratory species is neither currently being reduced, nor is likely to be reduced on a long-term basis;
- iii. There is, and will be in the foreseeable future, sufficient habitat to maintain the population of the migratory species on a long-term basis; and
- iv. The distribution and abundance of the migratory species approach historic coverage and levels to the extent that potentially suitable ecosystems exist and to the extent consistent with wise wildlife management.

In the case that defining FRVs for the populations of Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose is considered necessary, it was agreed that the proposed approach for defining FRVs, presented in document AEWA/BG/GG/MPWS/2.6/Rev.1, shall be applied.

It was noted that the Netherlands is able to accept the presented FRV approach to be used for this Goose Management process. The Netherlands wishes, however, to make a disclaimer with regard to

the use of this approach for other Birds Directive related subjects, in order to avoid setting a precedent in using this approach.

### **Using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) in case population targets are set**

Range States agreed to apply the MCDA process as a test exercise for the Greylag Goose (NW/SW European population). For the time being, this approach will not be used for the Barnacle Goose populations.

Results of this exercise will be compiled, circulated and discussed at the next EGM IWG meeting in 2019.

### **Next steps up to the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Parties (MOP7)**

The 4<sup>th</sup> draft of the ISSMPs will be circulated to Range States for formal consultation by the end of July 2018. Range States will have time to provide feedback and comments to the Secretariat by 7 September 2018 at the very latest in order to meet the MOP7 document deadline in early October.

### **Next steps after MOP7**

The ISSMPs will be presented for discussion at the MOP in December 2018 and if adopted, detailed planning will commence for the implementation phase. This can then be discussed further at the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG4), in June 2019.