

# European Goose Management Platform - National Report 2020

As outlined in Rule 32 of the Modus Operandi of the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG) adopted at the 1st Meeting of the Working Group (EGM IWG1) in December 2016, reports on the implementation of the AEWA International Species Action and Management Plans within the remit of the European Goose Management Platform (EGMP) shall be prepared by each Range State, according to a format agreed by the EGM IWG, and be presented at each face-to-face meeting of the EGM IWG.

These National Reports are also expected to provide the basis for the reporting obligations of the EGM IWG to the AEWA bodies (Modus Operandi Rule 33).

As such, countries are invited to report on their implementation progress and provide information and data as available, regarding the International Action and Management Plans to which they are a Principle Range State using the following template.

## Scope of National Reports

The scope of the National Reports is on activities foreseen in the respective Action and Management Plans as well as the implementation of adaptive harvest management programmes. In addition, reporting on other tasks as decided by the EGM IWG in terms of implementation, are included as necessary.

## Data provision to the EGMP Data Center

It should be noted that data required for the adaptive harvest management processes running under the EGMP are **not** to be included in the template. As indicated in document AEWA/EGM/ IWG 2.10, presented to the EGM IWG at the 2nd EGM IWG meeting in Copenhagen in June 2017, all metadata and information on the monitoring activities on the population size, demographics, harvest levels and derogation numbers, will be submitted by Range States separately directly to the EGMP Data Centre.

## Reporting structure

The National Report template encompasses five sections.

I. General information

II. General non-species-specific reporting

III. Reporting on the implementation of the International Species Management Plan for the Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose, following the structure of the four main objectives of the plan

Reporting of the implementation of the International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Taiga Bean Goose, based on the structure of the biannual implementation plan agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016.

The Taiga Bean Goose template is divided into two sub-sections according to Management Units:

IV. Sub-section A: Eastern 1 Management Unit

V. Sub-section B: Western and Central Management Units

**Please note that country-specific questions are indicated (see bold text in square brackets under the questions)** and only need to be answered by the respective countries.

## Deadline for submission

The final deadline for submission of the National Reports to the Secretariat is set for **Thursday 30 April 2020**.

## I. General information

## **To be completed by all Range States**

Name of reporting country

> Belgium

## **Designated National EGMP Administrative Authority**

Full name of the institution

> Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos

Name and title of the head of institution

> Marleen Evenepoel, Administrateur-Generaal

Mailing address - Street and number

> VAC Brussel - Herman Teirlinck

Havenlaan 88

P.O. Box

> bus 75

Postal code

> 1000

City

> Brussels

Country

> Belgium

Telephone

> 02 553 81 02

E-mail

> anb@vlaanderen.be

Website

> www.naturenbos.be

## **Designated National Government Representative (NGR) for EGMP matters**

Name and title of the NGR

> Floris Verhaeghe

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos

Mailing address - Street and number

> VAC Brugge - Jacob Van Maerlantgebouw

Koning Albert I-laan 1/2

P.O. Box

> bus 74

Postal code

> 8200

City

> Bruges

Country

> Belgium

Telephone

> +32 (0) 479 89 01 09

E-mail

> Floris.Verhaeghe@Vlaanderen.be

Website

> www.natuurenbos.be

**Additional designated National Government Representative (NGR) for EGMP matters (if available)**

Name and title of the NGR

>

Affiliation (institution, department)

>

Mailing address - Street and number

>

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

>

City

>

Country

>

Telephone

>

E-mail

>

Website

>

**Designated National Expert (NE) for EGMP matters**

Name and title of the NE

> Frank Huysentruyt

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Instituut voor Natuur en Bosonderzoek

Mailing address - Street and number

> Gaverstraat 4

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

> 9500

City

> Geraardsbergen

Country

> Belgium

Telephone

> +32 (0) 499 86 53 40

E-mail

> Frank.Huysentruyt@inbo.be

Website

> www.inbo.be

### **Additional designated National Expert (NE) for EGMP matters (if available)**

Name and title of the NE

>

Affiliation (institution, department)

>

Mailing address - Street and number

>

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

>

City

>

Country

>

Telephone

>

E-mail

>

Website

>

### **Other relevant institutions/entities/individual experts that have contributed to this report**

Please insert information on any other relevant institutions/entities/individual experts that have contributed to this report

>

### **Additional information and comments (optional)**

Please insert additional information and comments

>

## II. General non-species-specific reporting

### To be completed by all Range States

II.1. Are you monitoring the level of agricultural conflict (damage, complaints) with geese in your country on national (centralized for the entire country), regional(sub-national) or local level?

(PfG ISMP p.33, Objective II / 4+5)

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No  
 Not relevant

Please indicate the level:

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)  
 Regional (sub-national)  
 Local

### National (centralized for the entire country) monitoring

Please provide details on the national monitoring methods, units, frequency and the coverage

>

Are these national activities species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please list the species

>

### Regional (sub-national) monitoring

Please provide details on the regional monitoring methods, units, frequency and the coverage

> Geese only winter in the northern part of Belgium (Flanders). The Flemish authority has foreseen a scheme to pay for agricultural damage caused by wintering geese. Farmers have to report damage first by filling in a form in order to get a compensation for the damage. Only damage higher than 300€ is paid. As such, it is thus rather a passive monitoring of the damage.

Also farmers organisations conduct on their own a yearly (qualitative) questionnaire about conflicts between wildlife and agriculture. The conclusions with regards to EGMP matters are shared in the Flemish goose management working group.

Are these regional activities species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please list the species

> Damage caused by protected goose species: barnacle goose.

Damage caused by game species for which there is no open hunting period: pink-footed goose, bean goose, white-fronted goose.

Damage caused by game species on which hunting is open but where hunting cannot assist in damage-control/prevention due to the fact that the birds come from areas where hunting is not allowed (nature reserves): greylag goose, Canada goose.

### Local monitoring

Please provide details on the local monitoring methods, units, frequency and the coverage

>

Are these local activities species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes

No

Please list the species

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

II.2. What management measures does your country apply to manage agricultural conflicts related to geese on national (centralized for the entire country), regional (sub-national) or local level?

(PfG ISMP p. 33, Objective II / 4+5)

Possibility for multiple options

- No agricultural conflict related to geese has been recorded in my country
- No management measures are applied to manage agricultural conflicts related to geese
- Compensation schemes (payments to farmers for losses e.g. crop damage)
- Subsidy schemes (payments to support farmers to provide for/tolerate geese on their land, replacing agricultural use)
- Scaring schemes or other preventive measures designed to actively keep geese away from farmland
- Designation of goose foraging areas (accommodation areas)
- Derogation shooting to keep geese away from sensitive crops and to reduce population size
- Any other management measures to alleviate agricultural conflict

### **No management measures are applied**

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Compensation schemes (payments to farmers for losses e.g. crop damage)**

Please indicate the level at which the schemes are applied

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)
- Regional (sub-national)
- Local

Please explain how the damage (yield loss) is determined

> Farmers have to report the damage and fill in a form in order to get compensation. A species expert visits the fields shortly thereafter in order to determine which species has caused the damage. In the growing season, the field is visited again by an Agricultural expert in order to determine how the damage is affecting the growth and yield. When harvested, the reduction of yield compared to reference plots is determined and the financial compensation is calculated.

Are these schemes species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide details on the species-specific measures

>

Please provide any other details (e.g. results), if available

>

Please explain the reasons

> The schemes are species-specific in the way that the damage-causing species is determined. But for the rest of the procedure the same protocol is followed (estimation of harvest loss).

Is the effectiveness of this scheme evaluated?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>

Please provide any other details (e.g. results), if available

>

Please explain the reasons

> The effectiveness of the scheme is not scientifically evaluated but throughout the contacts with the farmers and farmers organisations it is generally agreed that this is a fair way to compensate for the damage. There are no or very little complaints about the way of calculating the compensation nor are complaints about the amount of compensation.

## **Subsidy schemes (payments to support farmers to provide for/tolerate geese on their land, replacing agricultural use)**

Please indicate the level at which subsidy schemes are provided

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)
- Regional (sub-national)
- Local

Please provide details on the subsidy schemes

>

Are these schemes species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide details on the species-specific measures

>

Please provide any other details (e.g. results) if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Is the effectiveness of this scheme evaluated?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>

Please provide any other details (e.g. results) if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Scaring schemes or other preventive measures designed to actively keep geese away from farmland**

Please indicate the level of the schemes

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)
- Regional (sub-national)
- Local

Please provide details on the scaring schemes or other preventive measures

> In Flanders, in order to be able to get compensation for goose damage at least some kind of scaring, to a reasonable extent, has to be done on the field. The level of scaring is decided by law in Code of Good Conduct. In important bird areas, designated for wintering waterbirds, this is not obligatory.

Is the effectiveness of this scheme evaluated?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>

Please provide any other details (e.g. results) if available

>

Please explain the reasons

> The scaring scheme was developed together with the agricultural sector. The code of good conduct works well, and combined with the damage compensation scheme there's a feeling this addresses the issue to a satisfactory level.

## **Designation of goose foraging areas (accommodation areas)**

Please provide details on the foraging areas (accommodation areas)

> In areas where large numbers of waterbirds are foraging, all hunting stops at the 15th of november.

Please indicate at which level the foraging areas are designated

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)  
 Regional (sub-national)  
 Local

Is the effectiveness of accommodation areas evaluated?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

> The most important foraging areas have been assigned as special protection areas under the birds directive. These (but also other) important foraging areas are monitored through mid-monthly waterbird censuses. Also foraging areas outside these accommodation areas are monitored in order to be able to detect a shift in the behaviour and feeding patterns.

Please provide any other details (e.g. results), if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Derogation shooting to keep geese away from sensitive crops and to reduce population size**

Please provide species-specific details on the derogation shooting

> Only greylag geese and Canada geese can be shot through derogation. Damage caused by these species is not covered by the compensation scheme unless the flocks com from nature reserves where hunting is not allowed.

Derogation is possible for the breeding population of Greylag goose, Canada goose and Barnacle goose in order to reduce damage to agricultural crops and vulnerable nature in the growing season.

Please indicate the application level of the derogation shooting

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)  
 Regional (sub-national)  
 Local

Is the effectiveness of derogation shooting evaluated?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No



Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

> The breeding population is estimated every year through mid-july counts on the most important areas. As there's a problem with funding these counts the last years, other methods are being explored.

Please provide any other details (e.g. results), if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Any other management measures taken to alleviate agricultural conflicts**

Please provide details on the management measures that are taken

>

Please indicate the level of the measures

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)
- Regional (sub-national)
- Local

Are these measures species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please give details on the species-specific measures

>

Please provide brief details (attach file or provide weblink)

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Is the effectiveness of these measures evaluated?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>

Please provide any other details (e.g. results), if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

II.3. Has your country developed new or adjusted existing legislation to facilitate the implementation of adaptive harvest management within the framework of an ISSAP or ISSMP?

(TBG ISSMP; PFG ISSMP)

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- The legislation has been reviewed and no need to adjust existing or develop new legislation has been identified
- No, but the development of new or adjustment of existing legislation is currently under political discussion
- No, but the development of new or adjustment of existing legislation is currently under technical discussion
- The legislation has not been reviewed yet for any possible need of adjustment or development of new legislation
- Other

Please provide details on the new legislation or the adjustments to existing legislation and the issues addressed

>

Please attach the legislation

Please indicate if you have used the Guidance on Implementation of AHM through Domestic Legal Regulations (adopted at EGM IWG3)

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please explain what other guidance has been used instead

>

Please provide details

>

Is there an anticipated date to conclude considerations related to development or adjustment of legislation related to AHM within your country

>

Is there an anticipated date to conclude considerations related to development or adjustment of legislation related to AHM within your country

>

Please explain the reasons

> In the PfG ISSMP Belgium foresees to reduce damage through habitat restoration of the wintering areas not by assisting in the population reduction through hunting.

Please specify

>

### III. Pink-footed Goose International Species Management Plan (PFG ISMP)

Participating Range States: Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway

#### General Implementation

III.1. Does your country have a national (centralized for the entire country), regional (sub-national) or local management plan for the Pink-footed Goose?

(PFG ISMP, p. 29; Objective II+IV/6)

*Please select only one option*

- Yes, adopted and being implemented
- Yes, adopted but not being implemented
- A plan(s) is/are being developed
- No

Please indicate the level of the plan

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)
- Regional (sub-national)
- Local

#### National management plan

Please indicate the date of adoption

**National** Management Plan

>

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

**National** Management Plan

>

Please provide details about the implementing agency

**National** Management Plan

>

Please provide a reference to the plan

**National** Management Plan

>

Please provide a main contact

**National** Management Plan

>

Does the management plan/s promote recreational uses such as tourism and hunting?

(PFG ISMP, p. 33, Objective II+IV/6)

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide more details on the activities

>

Please indicate the economic, cultural and other value of the recreational activities at national level

>

Please explain the reasons

>

#### Regional management plan

In case of various management plans, please upload a document or table listing all the management plans, including the details required in the sections below

>

Please indicate the region the plan encompasses

**Regional** Management Plan

>

Please indicate the date of adoption

**Regional** Management Plan

>

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

**Regional** Management Plan

>

Please provide details about the implementing agency

**Regional** Management Plan

>

Please provide a reference to the plan

**Regional** Management Plan

>

Please provide a main contact

**Regional** Management Plan

>

Does the management plan promote recreational uses such as tourism and hunting?

(PfG ISMP, p. 33, Objective II+IV/6)

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide more details on the activities

>

Please indicate the economic, cultural and other value of the recreational activities at regional level

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Local management plan**

In case of various management plans, please upload a document or table listing all the management plans, including the details required in the sections below

>

Please indicate the area the plan encompasses

**Local** Management Plan

>

Please indicate the date of adoption

**Local** Management Plan

>

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

**Local** Management Plan

>

Please provide details about the implementing agency

**Local** Management Plan

>

Please provide a reference to the plan

**Local** Management Plan

>

Please provide a main contact

**Local** Management Plan

>

Does the management plan promote recreational uses such as tourism and hunting?

(PFG ISMP, p. 33, Objective II+IV/6)

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide more details on the activities

>

Please indicate the economic, cultural and other value of the recreational activities at local level

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please indicate the level of the plan

National (centralized for the entire country)

Regional (sub-national)

Local

### **National management plan**

Please indicate the date of adoption

National management plan

>

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

National management plan

>

Please provide details about the implementing agency

National management plan

>

Please provide a reference to the plan

National management plan

>

Please provide a main contact

National management plan

>

### **Regional management plan**

Please indicate the region the plan encompasses

Regional management plan

>

Please indicate the date of adoption

Regional management plan

>

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

Regional management plan

>

Please provide details about the implementing agency

Regional management plan

>

Please provide a reference to the plan

Regional management plan

>

Please provide a main contact

Regional management plan

>

### **Local management plan**

Please indicate the area the plan encompasses

Local management plan

>

Please indicate the date of adoption

Local management plan

>

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

Local management plan

>

Please provide details about the implementing agency

Local management plan

>

Please provide a reference to the plan

Local management plan

>

Please provide a main contact

Local management plan

>

In case of various management plans, please upload a document or table listing all the management plans, including the details required in the sections above

>

Are the management plan/s promoting recreational uses such as tourism and hunting?

(PFG ISMP, p. 33, Objective II+IV/6)

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide more details on the planned activities

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please indicate why the plan is not being implemented

>

Please indicate the timeline for the finalization of the plan

>

Please indicate when it is expected to be adopted

>

Please indicate the level of the plan(s) (National, regional, local)

>

Please explain the reasons

> The Pink-footed Goose is a game species but there is no open hunting season. For this species conservation goals have been set and as long as numbers in the field are not substantially higher, and agricultural damage stays limited, there's no general support nor demand to open the hunting season.

In the international adaptive management plan for the species, the role of Belgium (Flanders) lies in the accomodation of wintering flocks through habitat restoration, not in population management.

Field for additional information on management plan/s (optional)

>

III.2. Has your country established a working group to support the implementation of the PfG ISMP?

(PfG ISMP, p. 29, Objective I+II+III+IV/1)

*Please select only one option*

- Yes, a working group has been established  
 The establishment of a working group is under consideration  
 No

Please indicate the type of working group that has been established

Possibility for multiple options

- National (centralized for the entire country)  
 Regional (sub-national)  
 Local

### **National working group**

Please indicate the date of establishment

>

Please list the working group members and coordinator

>

Please provide details about the functions of the working group

>

Please provide a main contact

>

### **Regional working group**

In case of multiple regional working groups, please upload a document or table listing all the working groups, including the details required in the sections below

> Implementation of the PfG ISMP is coordinated within the Flemish Goose Working Group (which covers also other EGMP-related issues). As Pink-footed geese only hibernate in the Flemish region, there's no need for similar working groups in the other regions of Belgium.

Please indicate the region the working group services

> The Flemish working group brings together the different stakeholders and aims to find a wide consensus in the point of view in general and for specific points that are discussed at the AEWA working group meetings.

Please indicate the date of establishment

> 2014

Please list the working group members and coordinator

> Coördinator: Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos (Floris Verhaeghe)

Members: nature conservation NGO's (Natuurpunt vzw, Vogelbescherming Vlaanderen), farmers organisations (Boerenbond, Algemeen Boerensyndicaat), hunting organisation (Hubertus Vereniging Vlaanderen), species

experts (Instituut voor Natuur en Bosonderzoek and individual species experts).

Please provide details about the functions of the working group

> In the working group the issues regarding wintering geese and the EGMP are discussed. The working group comes together at least once a year. In this working group the counts of the geese are discussed and the trend in the level of agricultural damage. The working group aims to reach consensus in the point of view of the range state in order to give the national representative(s) a clear message to bring at EGMP-related meetings.

Please provide a main contact

> Floris Verhaeghe

## Local working group

In case of multiple local working groups, please upload a document or table listing all the working groups, including the details require in the sections above

>

Please indicate the area the working group services

>

Please indicate the date of establishment

>

Please list the working group members and coordinator

>

Please provide details about the functions of the working group

>

Please provide a main contact

>

Please indicate by when a decision on the establishment will be taken

>

Please indicate which existing structure or capacity is responsible for the implementation of the PfG ISMP instead

>

Field for additional information on working group (optional)

>

## Objective I. Maintain a sustainable and stable Pink-footed Goose population and its range

III.3. Have key sites for the Pink-footed Goose been identified in your country?

(PfG ISMP, p. 32, Objective I/4)

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please upload an Excel table and include specific information for each site on the following items

1 Country

2 Site

3 Size (ha)

4 Location (decimal geographic coordinates; and separately upload a map indicating roost and main foraging areas if possible)

5 Main habitat types

6 Has this site been afforded appropriate designation status at international levels (e.g. Ramsar site, SPA, etc.)?

6a Designation status

6b Date of designation

6c Any other relevant information

7 Has this site been afforded appropriate protected area status at national levels?

7a Designation status



- 7b Date of designation  
7c Any other relevant information  
8 Does a management plan exist that address the conservation requirements of pink-footed geese?  
8a Provide brief details e.g. about the hunting regulations and other management regimes  
>

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Site information pfg\\_Belgium.xlsx](#) - Sites with conservation goals for pinkfoot goose in Belgium

Please explain the reasons

>

III.4. Are measures being taken to restore and/or rehabilitate Pink-footed Geese roosting and/or feeding habitats?

(PFG ISMP, p. 33, Objective I+II/7)

Possibility for multiple options

- In staging areas  
 In the wintering areas  
 Not relevant

### **In the staging areas**

Please provide brief details, listing sites and measures

>

### **In the wintering areas**

Please provide brief details, listing sites and measures

> Measures mostly focus on the restoration of wet polder grasslands (with micro-reliëf) in order to foresee good foraging opportunities for the geese in nature reserves to reduce agricultural damage in the neighbourhood.

Please explain the reasons

>

III.5. Has a programme for prevention of Pink-footed Goose breeding on mainland been developed and implemented in your country?

(PFG ISMP, p. 31, Objective I+II+II/2)

#### **[only for Norway]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes, the programme is being implemented  
 Yes, but the programme is not being implemented to date  
 No, but a programme is under development  
 No

Please provide information on measures taken to date

>

Please provide results, if available

>

Please provide brief details on the measures and timeline of the programme

>

Please explain why it has not been implemented

>

Please provide brief details and expected date of enacting it

>

Please provide details on any other relevant activities undertaken, if any

>

### **Keep agricultural conflicts to an acceptable level**

III.6. Are agricultural conflicts related to Pink-footed Geese (e.g. crop damage) currently at an acceptable level within your country?

(PfG ISMP, p. 33, Objective II / 4+5)

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please indicate how these conflicts are being addressed

> Damage is compensated, habitat restoration in nature reserves is done in order to accommodate the wintering pinkfeet as much as possible away from Agricultural fields.

Please indicate how these conflicts are being addressed

>

Please provide further details, as necessary

>

### **Objective III. Avoid increase in tundra vegetation degradation on the breeding range**

III.7. Is the extent of arctic tundra degradation on Svalbard caused by the Pink-footed Goose monitored?

(PfG ISMP, p. 33-34, Objective III /8)

**[only for Norway]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please provide details on the type of monitoring activities (who is conducting them and how they are conducted)

>

Is there an increase in the level of degradation of the arctic tundra?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please provide any results or evidence

>

Please provide any results or evidence

>

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Objective IV. Allow for recreational use that does not jeopardize the population**

III.8. Does your country promote and/or implement (in the past three years) any national or regional (sub-national) hunting-related campaigns, training programmes and/or management activities ?

(PfG ISMP, p. 31, Objective VI/3)

**[only Norway and Denmark]**

Possibility for multiple options

- Wise use hunting practices  
 Best practices to reduce crippling rates  
 Self-organization and coordination of local hunting  
 No campaigns, programmes or activities have been implemented

#### **Wise use hunting practices**

Please provide brief details (attach files or provide web links, if available)

>

#### **Best practices to reduce crippling rates**

Please provide brief details (attach files or provide web links, if available)

>

### **Self-organization and coordination of local hunting**

Please provide brief details (attach files or provide web links, if available)

>

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Optionally, please provide any other information related to the implementation of the PFG ISMP**

Please provide further information here

>

## **IV. Sub-section A: Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan (TBG ISSAP) - Eastern 1 Management Unit**

Participating Range States: **Belarus, Estonia, Germany, Latvia, Ukraine**

### **Objective 1. Increase survival rate of adults**

#### **Result 1.1 Legal harvest does not jeopardize an increase of adult survival rates**

IV.1. Has your country developed and adopted legislation for the closure of hunting of TBG to allow for TBG to pass before goose hunting is opened?

(activity 1.1.1.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

##### **[all Participating Range States]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes, developed and adopted
- Yes, developed but not adopted
- No

Please describe what legislation has been developed

>

Please indicate when it was adopted

>

Please indicate how the legislation is enforced

>

Please describe what legislation has been developed

>

Please indicate the timeframe when the legislation is expected to be adopted

>

Please explain the reasons

>

#### **IV.2. Please indicate how you are improving the knowledge of the occurrence of TBG on sub-species level in your country**

(activity 1.1.1.2 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

##### **[all Participating Range States]**

IV.2.1. Ensuring national monitoring at all known key sites

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>

Please list the key sites where monitoring activities are being undertaken

>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

IV.2.2. Providing identification training to people carrying out the monitoring activities

*Please select only one option*

- Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>

Please provide relevant identification materials or weblinks, if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

IV.2.3. Providing equipment to people carrying out the monitoring activities

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

IV.2.4. Carrying out a satellite/GPS tagging project on TBG in the wintering/staging areas

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

IV.2.5. Any other relevant activities

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>

## **Result 1.2 Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels**

IV.3. Does your country implement an awareness-raising campaign for hunters to complement necessary legislation changes?

(activity 1.2.2.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[Only for Belarus and Ukraine]**

*Please select only one option*

Yes, an awareness-raising campaign is being implemented

No, but an awareness-raising campaign is under development

No

Please indicate who is involved in the implementation (e.g. national NGOs, research institutes, etc.)

>

Please provide brief details about the activities that are being implemented

>

Please provide a weblink or upload more information on the campaign

>

Does the campaign include guidance on identification of grey geese?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please upload identification guides and provide weblinks

>

Please provide further information, if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please indicate who is in charge of developing the campaigns

>

Please provide information on when the development is expected to be finalized

>

Please indicate when the implementation of the campaign is envisaged to start

>

Please provide reasons why an awareness-raising campaign is not in place

>

IV.4. Has special publication on the occurrence of the Taiga Bean Goose been produced and disseminated?

(activity 1.2.2.2 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[Only for Ukraine]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes produced and disseminated
- Yes, currently being produced
- No

Please provide details on dissemination, upload publication or provide weblink

>

Please provide details on the timeframe

>

Please indicate who is in charge of producing the publication

>

Please provide details on the dissemination plans

>

Please explain the reasons

>

**Other objectives and results as decided by the EGM IWG**

**Reducing Taiga Bean Goose crippling**

IV.5. Have you undertaken any activities to reduce TBG crippling rates?

(activity agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016)

**[all Participating Range States]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Not applicable

Please provide details on the activities

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Raising identification skills and awareness amongst hunters**

IV.6. Have training programmes to develop identification skills amongst hunters been organized by national hunting associations?

(activity agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016)

### **[all Participating Range States]**

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Not applicable

Please provide more information on the training programmes

>

Have the training programmes been developed in cooperation with BirdLife partners and other conservation NGOs?

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide a list of cooperating partners

>

Please provide more information of detailed activities with partners

>

Please upload any relevant materials

>

Please provide weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Optionally, please provide any other information related to the implementation of the TBG ISSAP**

Please provide information here

>

## V. Sub-section B: Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan (TBG ISSAP) - Western and Central Management Units

Participating Range States: **Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, UK**

### Objective 1 Increase survival rate of adults

#### Result 1.2 Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels

V.1. Is TBG shooting investigated in north-east Jutland and Zealand?

(activity 1.2.2.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

##### **[Only for Denmark]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please indicate what activities have been undertaken

>

Please provide results, relevant publications and weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

#### Result 1.3: Impact of huntable native predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced

V.2. Are annual campaigns undertaken amongst hunters in the breeding areas to strengthen fox management in your country?

(activity 1.3.1.1 Biannual Taiga Bean Goose implementation plan agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016)

##### **[Only for Finland]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please list the areas where the campaigns are being undertaken

>

Please list the hunting associations involved

>

Please provide any other relevant details and weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

V.3. Has fox management in northernmost Finland been further strengthened by the Finnish Wildlife Agency and the Forestry and Parks Service?

(activity 1.3.1.2 Biannual Taiga Bean Goose implementation plan agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016)

##### **[Only for Finland]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please explain what activities have taken place

>

Please provide results, relevant publications and weblinks

>



Please explain the reasons

>

## **Result 1.4: Impact of alien predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced**

V.4. Does your country implement programmes for the eradication of the raccoon dog?

(activity 1.4.1.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[Only for Finland and Sweden]**

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide details about the eradication programme(s) (scope, implementing entities, etc.)

>

Please provide details on the effectiveness of the programmes

>

Please provide an update on the current status of the raccoon dog

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Objective 2. Increase reproductive rates**

### **Result 2.2: Intraspecific competition in spring staging areas is reduced**

V.5. Please provide updates on the implementation of the “fields for geese” programme

(activity 2.2.1.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[Only for Sweden]**

>

V.6. Please provide information on the continuation and implementation of the “unharvested-fields-for-birds” programme (within the Common Agricultural Policy)

(activity 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3)

**[Only for Finland]**

>

## **Objective 3. Stop ongoing loss, fragmentation and degradation of habitats, and restore lost, fragmented and degraded habitats**

### **Result 3.1: Impact of forestry works is reduced**

V.7. Have working models been developed for wildlife-friendly forest management?

(activity 3.1.1.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[Only for Finland]**

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide details on the working models developed

>

Are these models being implemented?

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide more information on the progress

>

Have these models been promoted to reach forest owners?

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide more information

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Have these models been promoted to reach forest corporations?

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide more information

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

V.8. Please indicate the implementation progress to reach the annual goals for mire restoration

(activity 3.1.2.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[all Participating Range States]**

>

### **Result 3.3: Breeding, staging and wintering habitats are not further lost due to oil and gas or renewable energy developments**

V.9. Are you monitoring the collision risk posed by renewable energy developments to TBG close to the Special Protection Areas, identified as their important wintering sites?

(activity 3.3.1.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[only for Denmark and other Range States as applicable]**

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide information on the relevant actions that have been undertaken

>

Please provide any results, if available

>

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Result 3.4: Impact of agriculture on natural Taiga Bean Goose habitats is minimized**

V.10. Has the area of managed coastal grasslands under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) increased in your country compared to 2017?

(activity 3.4.1.1 Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

**[only for Finland]**

Please select only one option

- Yes  
 No

Please indicate the size of the total area

>

Please indicate the additional area managed since the beginning of 2017

>

Please describe the activities undertaken on grassland management

>

Please upload relevant documentation and provide weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Other objectives and results as decided by the EGM IWG**

### **Review factors possibly contributing to rapid declines in eastern England and implement appropriate management responses**

V.11. Have possible factors causing population declines in eastern England been reviewed?

(activity 3.4.2. Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions (2018-2020) agreed at the 3rd EGM IWG meeting in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands in June 2018)

#### **[only for UK]**

Please select only one option

- Yes  
 No

Please describe those factors and provide further information as available

>

Are appropriate management responses to these factors being implemented?

Please select only one option

- Yes  
 No

Please provide information on the activities implemented

>

Please provide information about the main achievements and results

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

## **Reducing Taiga Bean Goose crippling**

V.12. Have you undertaken any activities in the past three years to reduce TBG crippling rates?

(activity agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016)

#### **[all Participating Range States]**

Please select only one option

- Yes  
 No  
 Not applicable

Please provide details on the activities

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Raising identification skills and awareness amongst hunters**

V.13. Have training programmes to strengthen identification skills and raise awareness amongst hunters been organized in your country, in particular by national hunting associations?

(activity agreed at the 1st EGM IWG meeting in Kristianstad, Sweden in December 2016)

#### **[all Participating Range States]**

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Please provide more information on the training programmes

>

Have the training programmes been developed in cooperation with BirdLife partners and other conservation NGOs?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes
- No

Please provide a list of cooperating partners

>

Please provide more information of detailed activities with partners

>

Please upload any relevant materials

>

Please provide weblinks

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

Please explain the reasons

>

### **Optionally, please provide any other information related to the implementation of the TBG ISSAP**

Please provide information here

>