



## Barnacle Goose Session

***Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the E. Greenland Barnacle Goose population***

*Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.13* **EGMP Secretariat & Data Centre**

## New Sections AFMP

- Changes **highlighted in green**
- Revision of the document in the Task Force (version circulated in April)
- Main sections added /updated:
  - 1. Introduction (updates on table 1 and table 2)
  - 2. Updated FRP values (Chapter 2)
  - 3. Workplans developed by the Task Force (Annex 1)
  - 4. Analysis of Box 1 (Annex 2)
  - 5. Integrated Population Model (Annex 3)
  - 6. Update and progress on the impact models (Annex 4)

# AEWA European Goose Management Platform

21-23 June 2021

EGM IWG6

Online Conference Format



**Table 3.** FRP values for the East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population

Country	Breeding FRP (in pairs)	Non-breeding FRP (in individuals)	Notes
Greenland	17,400	n.a.	Assuming 2,000 pairs in Iceland.
Iceland	2,000	54,000	Breeding FRP is reported by the government Non-breeding FRP is estimated based on the wintering FRP assuming insignificant mortality after the spring census
Republic of Ireland	n.a.	8,500	Based on distribution of numbers around 2000
United Kingdom	n.a.	45,500	Based on distribution of numbers around 2000
<b>Population total</b>	<b>19,400</b>	<b>54,000</b>	Represents the total of the wintering population

## FRVs for the East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population of Barnacle Goose

**Table 4.** FRR values for the East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population

Country	Breeding FRR (in km <sup>2</sup> )	Non-breeding FRR (in km <sup>2</sup> )	Notes
Greenland	100,000	n.a.	Estimates based on Boertmann & Nielsen (2010)
Iceland	1,000	10,800	The FRRs are provided by the government
Republic of Ireland	n.a.	12,000	
United Kingdom	n.a.	14,156	The FRR is provided by the government
<b>Population Total</b>	<b>101,000</b>	<b>36,956</b>	

# AEWA European Goose Management Platform

21-23 June 2021

EGM IWG6

Online Conference Format



BG AFMP: Workplans  
Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.13

## Annual workplans

Cross-cutting action	Actions from the ISSMP	Priority	Timescale	Activities carried out by				
				Population/MU specific Task Force	Ad hoc cross cutting TF	Data Centre & Modelling Consortium	Belgium	Denmark
	1.1 Provide adequate protection and management to key sites of international importance under Article 4(1) of the Birds Directive in the EU and other relevant instruments in other Range States throughout the range of the populations and maintain them in good ecological status	Essential	Short / Rolling					
	1.2 Promote goose-based eco-tourism at selected key sites	Medium	Medium					
	2.1 Take key sites for geese into account in land use planning and growing of sensitive crops[1]	High	Immediate / Rolling					
	2.2. Provide accommodation areas to reduce risks and conflicts at sensitive areas through e.g. subsidies[2]	Medium	Medium/ Rolling					
	2.3 Apply scaring and/or land management techniques to reduce the attractiveness of sensitive areas to geese, monitoring the implications of such local displacement for conflicts at wider scale[3]	High	Short / Rolling					
	3.1. Reduce risk posed by goose migration to air safety through operational measures such as radar surveillance[4]	High	Short / Rolling					
x	3.2 Establish an internationally coordinated programme to assess agricultural damage including monitoring and assessment protocols	High	Short					
	3.3 Liaise with farmers affected by goose damages to reduce agricultural conflicts	High	Short / Rolling					
	4.1 If necessary and if there is no other satisfactory solution, apply lethal population control under derogations according to the provisions of the Birds Directive, the Bern Convention and AEWA, for preventing serious damage to crops	Essential	Short					
	4.2 Assess periodically, and report to the AEWA EGM IWG, the cumulative impact of derogations (as well as hunting in Range States in which derogation is not required) on the development of the population, the likelihood of serious damage to agriculture and risk to air safety and to other flora and fauna (including the Arctic ecosystems), and the non-lethal measures taken to	Essential	Short					



## Box 1

- The International Single Species Management Plans (ISSMP) envisages the use of more detailed analysis of data on **damage to agriculture** and **risk to air safety and to other flora and fauna** as set out in Box 1
- In 2020,
  - all range states responded to a questionnaire covering **damage to agriculture and risk to other flora and fauna**.
  - a questionnaire regarding **air safety** was treated separately by direct contact to the relevant national air safety organisations.
- In 2021,
  - a final report should be submitted and presented at the IWG6 as the final steps in the project
  - The document aims at reporting the obtained information in a transparent way, providing a baseline for the future work.

## Overview of provided information

*Table 1. Overview of provided information by each range state. The information in the upper row refers to the numbers in Box 1. iia refers to agricultural damages, iib to damages to other flora and fauna, iv-b to breeding and iv-w to winter.*

<b>Country</b>	<b>ia</b>	<b>ib</b>	<b>iia</b>	<b>iib</b>	<b>iii</b>	<b>iv-b</b>	<b>iv-w</b>	<b>SPAii-iii</b>
IRL	X						X	X
IS			X	X	X	X		
UK	X	X	X		X		X	X

## Summary

- The East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland Barnacle Goose population is significantly increasing on the long-term but stabilizing or declining on short-term.
- There are limited data on the actual costs and applied methods to prevent agricultural damages caused by this population.
- The response from the range states provides an overview of the Barnacle Geese are managed inside and outside the SPAs and how damage prevention is tackled.
- We have received no information from airports along the migratory route for this population. Presumably, no current conflict between this population and air safety exists.



## Lessons learned – all populations

- The box 1 analysis is extremely complex with a lot of different questions and items
- The replies reflected that it was complicated for the responders to reply to all items and/or that a large part of the items was not managed in the range states
- Most range states replied as much as possible, however, the management is clearly different between range states and the format of the replies varied considerably, which made the analyses difficult
- The report include a lot of results and if the range states allow each reply to be made public available, it may be used for more detailed analyses by others