



**AEWA**

## **European Goose Management Platform - National Report 2021**

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 **Friday 30 April 2021**.

# I. General information

## To be completed by all Range States

Name of reporting country

>>> Norway

## Designated National EGMP Administrative Authority

Full name of the institution

>>> Norwegian Environment Agency

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Director General Ellen Hambro

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Norwegian Environment Agency

P.O. Box

>>> P.O. Box 5672 Torgard

Postal code

>>> 7485

City

>>> Trondheim

Country

>>> Norway

Telephone

>>> +4773580500

E-mail

>>> postmottak@miljodir.no

Website

>>> www.miljodirektoratet.no

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

Name and title of the NGR

>>> Principal Adviser Øystein Størkersen

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Norwegian Environment Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

P.O. Box

>>> P.O. Box 5672 Torgard

Postal code

>>> 7485

City

>>> Trondheim

Country

>>> Norway

Telephone

>>> +4773580500

E-mail

>>> oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

Website

>>> www.miljodirektoratet.no

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

Name and title of the NGR

>>> Senior Adviser Arild Espelien

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Norwegian Environment Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Arild.espelien@miljodir.no

P.O. Box

>>> P.O. Box 5672 Torgard

Postal code

>>> 7485

City

>>> Trondheim

Country

>>> Norway

Telephone

>>> +4773580500

E-mail

>>> arild.robert.espelien@miljodir.no

Website

>>> www.miljodirektoratet.no

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

Name and title of the NE

>>> Senior Researcher Ingunn Tombre

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Norwegian Institute for Nature Research/NINA

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Ingunn.tombre@nina.no

P.O. Box

>>> P.O. Box 6606 Langnes

Postal code

>>> 9296

City

>>> Tromsø

Country

>>> Norway

Telephone

>>> +4773801400

E-mail

>>> ingunn.tombre@nina.no

Website

>>> www.nina.no

### **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

>>> Norwegian Farmers Union: Ove Martin Gundersen (ove.martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no)

Norwegian Hunters Association:

Webjørn Svendsen (ws@njff.no)

### **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

>>> No general approach here. The compensation scheme is not dependent on description of conflict volume.

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

>>> See para II.1 + 2 above.

Are these schemes species-specific?

*Please select only one option*

Yes

No

Please provide details on the species-specific measures

>>> Compensation information to be provided by applicant.

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

>>> Ongoing evaluation and dialog with farmers and through municipal action plans measuring which are the best options and their effects.

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

>>>

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

>>>

## **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

>>> Applications according to wildlife act regulation and related to specific species. These are handled at the local municipal level. Derogations are only used to remove specific specimens, not to reduce the population. Hitherto derogations have only been applied for GLG.

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

>>> Partly on regional basis, but under evaluation and revision as part of the five year revision of hunting regulation.

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

>>> Municipal action plans and collaboration with landowners and/or their regional associations on how to best practice derogation and/or regular hunt to reduce damage.

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

>>> Specific in the sense that the derogation hunting and other management are targeting different species. So far applicable only to GLG.

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

>>> As part of the ongoing analysis/research initiatives, by NINA and the farmer union.

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

>>> Ongoing revision of huntingh regyulations. Will be concluded at the end of the year and published prior to new 5 year period starting March 2022.

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

>>>

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Regional Management Plans Norway PINKFEETS.pdf](#) - List regional management plans in Norway,pinkfeets

Please indicate the region the plan encompasses

**Regional** Management Plan

>>> Mid-Norway (Trøndelag County)

and

North-Norway (Vesterålen, Nordland County)

Please indicate the date of adoption

**Regional** Management Plan

>>> 2010 & 2016.

Please indicate by whom the plan was adopted

**Regional** Management Plan

>>> County Governor and municipality.

Please provide details about the implementing agency

**Regional** Management Plan

>>> County Governor and municipality.

Please provide a reference to the plan

**Regional** Management Plan

>>> Fylkesmannen i Nord-Trøndelag (County Governor of Nord-Trøndelag), 2010. Forvaltningsplan for vår- og høsttrekkende kortnebbgås i Nord-Trøndelag (in Norwegian; Management Plan for spring and autumn-staging pink-footed geese in Nord-Trøndelag). Rapport Miljøvern avdelingen 03/2010 Sortland Municipality 2016 (Compiler). REVIDERT FORVALTNINGSPLAN FOR GJESS I VESTERÅLSKOMMUNENE (in Norwegian; Revised Management Plan for geese in the municipalities in Vesterålen).

Please provide a main contact

**Regional** Management Plan

>>> Ingunn Tombre & Ole Martin Gundersen.

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

>>> Organized through the ongoing research and hunting organisation project and involving the hunters union and farmers union coordinator (cf O.M. Gundersen). Both municipal and regional level.

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

>>> Hunting tourism is the main fund generator. No figures available.

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

>>>

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

>>> 2010.

Please list the working group members and coordinator

>>> Informal and conducted by national coordinators, such as NINA, NEA and farmers union representatives. Meetings also attended by national BirdLife partner and national hunter organisation.

Please provide details about the functions of the working group

>>> Sharing information on best practices, research activities, local management plans and on EGMP processes and their results.

Please provide a main contact

>>> Tombre, Gundersen & Espelien.

### **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

>>> See below.

Please indicate the region the working group services

>>> Regional WG established for Nordland county (collaborative forum for geese management). In 2021 a similar forum was established in Trøndelag county with one forum for PfG and one for GLG.



Please indicate the date of establishment

>>> See above.

Please list the working group members and coordinator

>>> Main contact is Ove Martin Gundersen from the National Farmers Union.

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 required 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  
>>> Main sites that are protected are listed/included in the CSN tool with similar and cartographic data. The species uses these sites mainly as resting areas, while foraging on the nearby cultivated farmlands.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

Specific\_information\_Norway.xlsx

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

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>> Staging sites are numerous and availability of grazing similarly widespread.

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

>>> Monitoring of situation ongoing, but issue not deemed to be widespread as yet.

### **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

>>>

Please indicate how these conflicts are being addressed

>>> Mainly monitoring and possible use of subsidies.

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)

>>> Sample plots on the tundra sites have been laid out and are monitored at regular intervals.

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

>>> Have to await results of ongoing study.

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)

>>> Training of hunters in techniques and best practice behaviour implemented. Most recently in 2020 a course on geese hunting has been established, together with a new video on geese hunting (2021). In addition a course for training with clay pigeons to reduce crippling has been established (2016).

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Video hunting - Best practice hunting video

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

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

>>> Involvement of local, regional and national hunting organisations and the training of hunters help alleviate the issue.

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

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

>>> Organization of local hunters is beneficial to the hunters and is an ongoing exercise to share information and to comply with the targets of the ISSAP.

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

>>> No hunting for this species allowed, ie nationally fully protected.

Please indicate when it was adopted

>>> As of 2002.

Please indicate how the legislation is enforced

>>> Ordinary Control of hunters and information through regular information to hunters, including at meetings.

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

>>> Ongoing research contract with Nord University and BirdLife Norway.

Please list the key sites where monitoring activities are being undertaken

>>> Børgefjell national park, Trøndelag and Nordland counties.  
Pasvik-valley, Finnmark county.

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>>>

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Search for TB DNA](#) - Article on the research related to DNA profiling

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

*Please select only one option*

- Yes  
 No

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Field ID TB - BirdLife information for identification

Please describe the activities undertaken

>>>

Please provide relevant identification materials or weblinks, if available

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>> Expert bird watchers with no need.

#### 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

>>> No need.

#### 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

>>> Over the y

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

>>> DNA from feathers and droppings collected in Børgefjell. See para IV 2.1 for information.

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.)

>>> Through annual ordinary info to all hunters.

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

>>> Only through ID guides, e.g. books and through hunting education and as informed by national BirdLife partner, see para IV 2.1.

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

>>> Not funded.

**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

>>> Protected and should not be hunted.

#### **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

>>> Through ID guides, the obligatory hunting education and regular meetings.

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

>>> Conducted by government funded initiatives.

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]**

>>> A ban on draining of mires has been adopted by the Government in Norway.

For the last decade funds have been allocated for repair and restoration of mires. Annual allocation ca 1,5 mill euro. A plan for continuation of the program is developed and will include restoration in general of wetlands other than bogs/mires. Not sure if this is of relevance to the TBG.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Restoration mires report 2016](#) - Example of ongoing program for restoration mires

**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

>>> At the moment not deemed relevant.

**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

>>> Non-huntable species in Norway. However, crippling is a problem for other huntable species of geese and dealt with for those species.

## **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

>>> Part of general training of hunters. ID info as developed by national BirdLife partner and the use of recently developed ID guidance by the TF (spring 2020).

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

>>> National BL partner has been involved in Production of ID skills and documents and has published these.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[News BirdLife Norway identification guide bean goose.docx](#)

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

>>>

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Taiga Bean Goose activities in Norway 2019 2020.pdf](#)