

# European Goose Management Platform - National Report 2019

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 18 April 2019**, two months before the annual meeting of the EGM IWG.

## I. General information

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

Name of reporting country

> Denmark

## **Designated National EGMP Administrative Authority**

Full name of the institution

> The Environmental Protection Agency  
Ministry of Environment and Food of Denmark

Name and title of the head of institution

> Lars Hindkjær  
Director

Mailing address - Street and number

> Haraldsgade 53

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

> 2100

City

> Copenhagen

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +45 72 54 40 00

E-mail

> mst@mst.dk

Website

> <http://mst.dk/>

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

Name and title of the NGR

> Camilla Uldal  
Head of section

Affiliation (institution, department)

> The Environmental Protection Agency  
Species and Nature Protection

Mailing address - Street and number

> Haraldsgade 53

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

> 2100

City

> Copenhagen

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +45 93 58 79 47

E-mail

> cakis@mst.dk

Website

> http://mst.dk/

**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

> Jesper Madsen. professor

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Aarhus University  
Department of Bioscience

Mailing address - Street and number

> Grenåvej 14

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

> 8410

City

> Rønne

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +45 29440204

E-mail

> jm@bios.au.dk

Website

> [http://pure.au.dk/portal/da/persons/jesper-madsen\(d68f4bd0-2909-4a5c-b687-e62a33fb5cfb\).html](http://pure.au.dk/portal/da/persons/jesper-madsen(d68f4bd0-2909-4a5c-b687-e62a33fb5cfb).html)

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

Name and title of the NE

> Anthony D. Fox, professor

Affiliation (institution, department)

> Aarhus University

Department of Bioscience

Mailing address - Street and number

> Grenåvej 14

P.O. Box

>

Postal code

> 8410

City

> Rønne

Country

> Denmark

Telephone

> +4587158847

E-mail

> tfo@bios.au.dk

Website

> [http://pure.au.dk/portal/en/persons/anthony-david-fox\(deb15e30-223d-4759-b62b-1df46dcf0d62\).html](http://pure.au.dk/portal/en/persons/anthony-david-fox(deb15e30-223d-4759-b62b-1df46dcf0d62).html)

### **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

>

Are these regional activities species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

Please list the species

>

### 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

> Since there is no schemes for subsidies or compensation for goose damage in Denmark, there is no monitoring of goose damage.

The Environmental Protection Agency register all applications for derogation shooting and the number of applications are used as an indicator for the level of conflict. This holds especially for barnacle geese but less for greylag and pink-footed as conflicts with these species during the open season are managed by hunting.

Therefore there are no applications for derogation shooting during this period and consequently no way of measuring the level of conflict

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

>

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

>

### **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

> Advice is provided by the Ministry of Environment and Food on the use of scaring devices. The use of scaring devices is a prerequisite to getting a permission for derogation shooting.

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

> No such scheme is in place

## Designation of goose foraging areas (accommodation areas)

Please provide details on the foraging areas (accommodation areas)

>

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

>

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

> Farmers who experience problems with geese can apply electronically for a license to shoot geese under derogation (administrated by the Ministry of Environment and Food)

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

>

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

>

Please explain the reasons

> Derogations are granted for huntable goose species outside the hunting season and for barnacle geese. The Ministry of Environment and Food registers all applications and the number of geese shot under derogation. When registering the number of geese shot applicants are asked to evaluate the effect of derogation shooting in the categories 'No effect', 'Limited effect' or 'Effect reached'. However these data have not been analysed.

## 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. NEW QUESTION:** 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

>

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

> Not yet decided, but the international management plan is implemented directly

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

> Established in 2012 by the Ministry of Environment and Food

Please list the working group members and coordinator

> Camilla Uldal, Ministry of Environment and Food (coordinator)  
Iben Hove Sørensen, Danish Hunters' Association  
Niels Erik Jørgensen, Danish Hunters' Association  
Knud Flensted, BirdLife Denmark  
Boris Schønfelddt, BirdLife Denmark  
Karen Post, Danish Agriculture and Food Council  
Camilla Rosenquist, Copenhagen Airport  
Jesper Madsen, Aarhus University, National expert

Please provide details about the functions of the working group

> The working group is advisory to the Ministry of Environment and Food and constitutes the national delegation for the EGMP IWG; the working group comments on documents, draft management plans etc. prior to decision making

Please provide a main contact

> Camilla Uldal, Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, Environmental Protection Agency

### **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

>

Please indicate the region 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

>

### **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.

[Pink-footed Goose sites Denmark.xlsx](#) - Danish sites for pink-footed geese

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

> Roosting sites in all key sites have been protected (NATURA 2000), including disturbance and hunting-free zones.

Geese primarily forage in adjacent farmlands (up to 40 km from roosts) and these have not been managed

### **In the wintering areas**

Please provide brief details, listing sites and measures

> The designation of NATURA2000 sites in Denmark has included definition of disturbance and hunting free zones in all roosting sites for pink-footed geese, except for some newly occupied sites such as Store Vildmose (not designated for pink-footed goose)

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

> In autumn and winter pink-footed geese primarily forage on waste crops (cereal and maize stubble), supplemented by pastures and winter cereal, but only in cold winters. In spring, they forage on pastures. In the past, pink-footed geese caused damage to newly sown spring cereal fields (taking grain). However, nowadays, pink-footed geese depart on spring migration for Norway in late March/early April, prior to the sowing of spring cereals.

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)

> The Danish Hunters' Association has organised a campaign to promote wise use hunting practices and has organised local courses in west and north Jutland. A series of articles has been produced in the magazine JÆGER on wise use, species identification and goose shooting

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

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

> A national plan to reduce the crippling of game, including geese, has been in place since 1997 (Ministry of Environment and Food). The rate of crippling in pink-footed geese has been monitored by Aarhus University since 1990 (most recently in 2017). The Danish Hunters' Association and the Ministry of Environment and Food have promoted the need for reduction of crippling in several campaigns, specifically targetting the goose hunters, advocating for the use of decoys and blinds to attract the geese at close range, keeping to the recommended maximum shooting distance of 25 m as well as hunting in teams.

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

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

> A project 'Forbedret Gåsejagt' carried out by Aarhus University and the Danish Hunters' Association during 2012-2016 focussed on voluntary self organisation of goose shooting and documented the effects in terms of higher bags, lower cartridge use, improved local communication as well as reduced disturbance of geese. The Danish Hunters' Association has promoted the wider use of self organisation in articles in the magazine JÆGER

Please explain the reasons

>

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

Please provide further information here

> The ISMP has increased the awareness among Danish hunters about their role and responsibility to participate in the management of the population as well as the wise use. It has generally been accepted by the hunters that the hunting season can change according to the status of the population and how close it is to the defined target.

## **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

> As far as possible, Aarhus University has asked observers on the ground to keep an eye open for illegal hunting in NE Jutland. We have also tried to publicize as widely as possible the need to differentiate between Tundra and Taiga Bean Geese on Zealand. Actions there are ongoing to derive photos from hunters of their shot Bean Geese to determine the relative contributions of the two races to the annual bag there. Actions are ongoing and we hope to be able to report on these in the future

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]**

> From the workplan it seems that this question is relevant for Finland only

### **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

> Previous monitoring of the collision risk posed by the large offshore wind turbine test centre at Østerild has been completed and has reported to the clients involved. These results showed that all large bodied birds avoided flying in the vicinity of the turbines and those that did adjusted their altitude to further avoid the sweep area of the turbines. Specific studies on Taiga Bean Geese flying between the turbines showed similar avoidance and no collisions. Intensive searches with specially trained dogs also failed to locate corpses. In depth full reporting of these studies will follow.

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

> There has already been a sustained campaign of public awareness and outreach in relation to the Pink-footed Goose on this subject. Survey of crippling rates (by X-ray) in Taiga Bean Geese will be conducted if a larger catch of geese can be organised

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

> Articles in the Danish Hunters' Association magazine JÆGER has specifically addressed the identification of the two subspecies. Specific local training programs have not yet been organised

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

> The initial initiative has taken place in a cooperation between the Danish Hunters' Association and Aarhus University

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

> The harvest of bean geese in SE Denmark (supposed to target selectively Tundra Bean Geese) will be subject to studies in the coming years, aiming to get a subspecies discrimination of the harvest by photos of heads