



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

>>> Sweden

Designated National EGMP Administrative Authority

Full name of the institution

>>> Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Björn Risinger, Director General

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Naturvårdsverket, 106 48 Stockholm

P.O. Box

>>>

Postal code

>>> 106 48

City

>>> Stockholm

Country

>>> Sweden

Telephone

>>> +46 10 698 10 00

E-mail

>>> kundtjanst@naturvardsverket.se

Website

>>> <http://www.swedishepa.se/>

Designated National Government Representative (NGR) for EGMP matters

Name and title of the NGR

>>> Per Risberg, Senior Scientific Officer

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

>>>

P.O. Box

>>>

Postal code

>>> 106 48

City

>>> Stockholm

Country

>>> Sweden

Telephone

>>> +46 10 698 10 00

E-mail

>>> per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se

Website

>>> <http://www.swedishepa.se/>

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

Name and title of the NGR

>>> Louise Bednarz, Senior Advisor

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

>>>

P.O. Box

>>>

Postal code

>>> 106 48

City

>>> Stockholm

Country

>>> Sweden

Telephone

>>> +46 10 698 10 00

E-mail

>>> louise.bednarz@naturvardsverket.se

Website

>>> <http://www.swedishepa.se/>

Designated National Expert (NE) for EGMP matters

Name and title of the NE

>>> Urban Johansson, Senior Scientific Officer

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Mailing address - Street and number

>>>

P.O. Box

>>>

Postal code

>>> 106 48

City

>>> Stockholm

Country

>>> Sweden

Telephone

>>> +46 10 698 10 00

E-mail

>>> urban.johansson@naturvardsverket.se

Website

>>> <http://www.swedishepa.se/>

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

Name and title of the NE

>>> Johan Månsson, Researcher

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences/Wildlife Damage Center

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Inst för Ekologi, Viltskadecenter

P.O. Box

>>>

Postal code

>>> 730 91

City

>>> Riddarhyttan

Country

>>> Sweden

Telephone

>>> +46 581 69 73 25

E-mail

>>> johan.mansson@slu.se

Website

>>> www.slu.se/viltskadecenter

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Montras-Janer et al 2019 - Relating national levels of crop damage to abundance of large grazing birds.pdf](#)

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

>>> In 1995, the Swedish Government launched a system to compensate farmers for crop damage caused by large grazing birds. Since then, all farmers can report crop damage to the County Administrative Boards (CABs) to receive compensation. All reported damages are verified according to a standardized procedure by trained and authorized inspectors from the CABs (Månsson et al., 2011). The specific methodology varies slightly between crop types (e.g. potato, cereals, hay) but is in general based on a comparison between damaged and undamaged parts of the same field (or a field in close proximity if the whole field is damaged) to estimate yield loss. If damage occurs during an early stage, the field is visited twice: first immediately after the damage occurs to geo-tag the affected area and to identify the species responsible and then a second time just before harvest, to estimate the yield loss. The inspectors verify the affected crops and identify the species responsible based on established protocols (Månsson et al., 2011). Because the first inspection takes place immediately after the farmer contacts the CAB, we expect the identification of the culprit species to be accurate. Harvest loss due to other factors such as drought, flooding or other wildlife (e.g. wild boar *Sus scrofa*) is also estimated and deducted from the total loss (Månsson et al., 2011). Once the damage is

registered, the CABs calculate the economical compensations due to be paid, based on the annual crop market price.

Are these local activities species-specific?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please list the species

>>> All geese, common crane and whooper swan.

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

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

Possibility for multiple options

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

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Månsson et al 2015 - Riktlinjer-forvaltning-stora-faglar-i-odlingslandskapet - vers 2.pdf](#)

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

>>> Based on inspection, County Administrative Boards decides on compensation for each damage.

Are these schemes species-specific?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide details on the species-specific measures

>>> Observation.

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
>>> See attached file.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Månsson et al 2011 - Besiktning av viltskador på gröda.pdf](#)

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

>>> Done by both County Administrative Boards and farmers.

Is the effectiveness of this scheme evaluated?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>>> Swedish Wildlife damage center is currently working with this issue.

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)

>>> Several County Administrative Boards has established accomodation areas in concentration 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 accomodation areas evaluated?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>>> Swedish center for wildlife damages at SLU has some work ongoing.

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

>>> Both conditional hunting at fields with unharvested crops and derogation decided upon by County Administrative Boards.

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

>>> <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Om-Naturvardsverket/Publikationer/ISBN/8700/978-91-620-8793-7/>

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Månsson 2017 - Lethal scaring.pdf](#)

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

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Any other management measures taken to alleviate agricultural conflicts

Please provide details on the management measures that are taken

>>>

Please indicate the level of the measures

Possibility for multiple options

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

Are these measures species-specific?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please give details on the species-specific measures

>>>

Please provide brief details (attach file or provide weblink)

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Is the effectiveness of these measures evaluated?

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please provide details on the evaluation of effectiveness

>>>

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

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

(TBG ISSMP; PfG ISSMP)

Please select only one option

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

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

>>>

Please attach the legislation

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please explain what other guidance has been used instead

>>>

Please provide details

>>>

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

>>> New open and conditional hunting seasons valid by July 1.

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

>>> Few birds reported, spread over large areas

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

>>>

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

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

Please select only one option

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

Please indicate the type of working group that has been established

Possibility for multiple options

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

National working group

Please indicate the date of establishment

>>>

Please list the working group members and coordinator

>>>

Please provide details about the functions of the working group

>>>

Please provide a main contact

>>>

Regional working group

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

>>>

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

>>> No group for PfG, but a national group for management of geese, swans and cranes

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
- >>>

Please explain the reasons

>>> New species

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

>>> No former roosting or feeding habitats known

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

>>> No reports from farmers of damages from PFG

Please indicate how these conflicts are being addressed

>>>

Please provide further details, as necessary

>>>

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

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

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

[only for Norway]

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

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

>>>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please provide any results or evidence

>>>

Please provide any results or evidence

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

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

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

[only Norway and Denmark]

Possibility for multiple options

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

Wise use hunting practices

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

>>>

Best practices to reduce crippling rates

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

>>>

Self-organization and coordination of local hunting

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

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Optionally, please provide any other information related to the implementation of the PfG ISMP

Please provide further information here

>>>

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

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

Objective 1. Increase survival rate of adults

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

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

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

[all Participating Range States]

Please select only one option

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

Please describe what legislation has been developed

>>>

Please indicate when it was adopted

>>>

Please indicate how the legislation is enforced

>>>

Please describe what legislation has been developed

>>>

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

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

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

[all Participating Range States]

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

Please select only one option

- Yes
- No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>>>

Please list the key sites where monitoring activities are being undertaken

>>>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

Please select only one option

- Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>>>

Please provide relevant identification materials or weblinks, if available

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>>>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>>>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

IV.2.5. Any other relevant activities

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please describe the activities undertaken

>>>

Please provide relevant documents or weblinks

>>>

Result 1.2 Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels

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

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

[Only for Belarus and Ukraine]

Please select only one option

Yes, an awareness-raising campaign is being implemented

No, but an awareness-raising campaign is under development

No

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

>>>

Please provide brief details about the activities that are being implemented

>>>

Please provide a weblink or upload more information on the campaign

>>>

Does the campaign include guidance on identification of grey geese?

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please upload identification guides and provide weblinks

>>>

Please provide further information, if available

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Please indicate who is in charge of developing the campaigns

>>>

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

>>>

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

>>>

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

>>>

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

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

[Only for Ukraine]

Please select only one option

- Yes produced and disseminated
 Yes, currently being produced
 No

Please provide details on dissemination, upload publication or provide weblink

>>>

Please provide details on the timeframe

>>>

Please indicate who is in charge of producing the publication

>>>

Please provide details on the dissemination plans

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Other objectives and results as decided by the EGM IWG

Reducing Taiga Bean Goose crippling

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

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

[all Participating Range States]

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Not applicable

Please provide details on the activities

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Raising identification skills and awareness amongst hunters

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

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

[all Participating Range States]

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Not applicable

Please provide more information on the training programmes

>>>

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

Please select only one option

Yes

No

Please provide a list of cooperating partners

>>>

Please provide more information of detailed activities with partners

>>>

Please upload any relevant materials

>>>

Please provide weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

Please provide information here

>>>

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

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

Objective 1 Increase survival rate of adults

Result 1.2 Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels

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

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

[Only for Denmark]

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please indicate what activities have been undertaken

>>>

Please provide results, relevant publications and weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

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

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

[Only for Finland]

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please list the areas where the campaigns are being undertaken

>>>

Please list the hunting associations involved

>>>

Please provide any other relevant details and weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

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

[Only for Finland]

Please select only one option

- Yes
 No

Please explain what activities have taken place

>>>

Please provide results, relevant publications and weblinks

>>>

Please explain the reasons

>>>

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

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

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

[Only for Finland and Sweden]

Please select only one option

Yes

No

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

>>> The raccoon dog project, commissioned by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and lead by the Swedish Association for Hunting and Wildlife Management. In 2019, 30 adult raccoon dogs and 2 pups were captured. Since 2010, when we set up our first monitoring system in Norrbotten, the population has declined considerably and is now kept at a very low level.

Please provide details on the effectiveness of the programmes

>>> See attached document.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[02 - Årsrapport Svenska Jägareförbundet - Invasiva Arter 2020 1.pdf](#)

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

>>> Same situation as last year, even fewer animals

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]

>>> County Administrative Boards continues with accomodation areas for geese. There have been some uncertainties regarding financing due to rules in CAP.

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]

>>> No such ongoing activities

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

>>> No reports on collisions

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

>>> Educational activities are currently under development

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

>>> This is a part of the Hunter's exam and a part of the educational activities that currently are under development.

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

>>> No information from Swedish Association for Hunting and Wildlife Management

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

>>> Adriaan de Jong at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences has funding for genetic studies.