AEWA European Goose Management Platform

21-23 June 2021
EGM IWG6
Online Conference Format

Greylag Goose Session

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European GG population

Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15 EGMP Secretariat & Data Centre

GG AFMP
Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15

New Sections AFMP

- Changes highlighted in green
- Revision of the document in the Task Force (version circulated in April)
- Main sections added /updated:
  - Introduction (updates on table 1 and table 2)
  - National, management unit and population level FRVs (Chapter2, table 3)
  - Inclusion of management criterion of 15% reduction in population over 10 years, according to which up to 40% increase in the nominal level of offtake was possible, as agreed at EGM IWG5 (Chapter 4, figure 3)
  - Workplans developed by the Task Force (Annex 1)
  - Analysis of Box 1 (Annex 2)
  - Update and progress on the impact models (Annex 4)

Document title
Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15

Updated FRVs for Greylag Goose NW/SW European population

Country	bFRP (pairs)	bFRR (km2)	bFRH (Y/N)	wFRP (inds)	nFRR (km2)	nFRH (Y/N)
Norway	10,000	269,300	Y	436	194,200	Y
Sweden	12,000	155,900	Y	23,883	78,000	Y
Finland	2,700	22,000	Y	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Denmark	6,400	45,400	Y	9,931	49,500	Y
Germany	49,780[F]	203,338[F]	?	191,636	?	?
Netherlands	21,000	37,869	Y	107,321	38,136	Y
Belgium	2,000	21,800	Y	11,146	29,300	Y
France	200	256,400	Y	3,350	512,300	Y
Spain	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	24,698	?	?
Total MU1	**31,100**	**492,600**	**4/0**	**112,893**	**?**	**3/0**
Total MU2	**72,980**	**519,407**	**3/0**	**264,916**	**?**	**2/0**
Total Population	***104,080***	***1,012,007***	***7/0***	***370,400***	***?***	***5/0***

GG AFMP: Workplans
Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15

Annual workplans

				Activities carried out by				
Cross-cutting action	Actions from the ISSMP	Priority	Timescale	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

- An analysis of data on **damage to agriculture** and **risk to air safety and to other flora and fauna** was conducted
  - (as described in Box 1 in the International Single Species Management Plan (ISSMP))
- 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 buy each range state

Country	ia	ib	iia	iib	iii	iv-b	iv-w	SPAii-iii
BE	X		X		X	X	X	X
DE						X	X	
DK		X			X	X	X	X
ES Andalusia	X						X	X
FI					X			
FR								
NL	X		X		X	X	X	
NO					X	X		
SE					X		X	X

France stated that there are no goose damages in the country and hence no derogation shooting.

Summary

- The population of Greylag Goose is increasing on the long-term and stabilizing on the short-term
- We have limited knowledge and data on the actual costs in most ranges states but see increasing costs in the Netherlands in a period with a relatively stable population
- Due to a high variation between the views from the different range states, there is high degree of uncertainty towards what methods that have an effect
- Greylag Goose is one of the goose species most frequently reported to have been involved in birdstrikes
- Many airports expect an increase in problems associated with the presence of geese in the future

Lessons learned – all populations

- The box 1 analysis is extremely complex with a lot of different questions and items
- The replies reflect that a large part of the items was not managed in the range states
- The manegement is clearly different between range states and the format of the replies varied considerably

Next steps

- Change the focus to detailed studies of selected parts and on a broad geographical scale
  - Conduct the most important studies nationally
  - Coordinate the work across borders
- Involve the range states in the communication with the air security
- Consider to let EGMP make the replies public available, since it may be used for more detailed analyses

GG AFMP: dynamic model based management
Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15

Preconditions for the dynamic, model-based management of the population