



Barnacle Goose Session

Report and Recommendations from the Russia Barnacle Goose Task Force

Doc. AEW A/EGMIWG/6.10 **Coordinator Russia Barnacle Goose TF, Wilmar Remmelts**



Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population

- **21 Members representing:**
 - **8 countries: Estonia, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany, The Netherlands, Belgium,**
 - **the European Commission**
 - **4 NGOs: Face; Nordic Hunters Alliance; Birdlife International, Wetlands International**

Meetings

- Task Force was established in 2020
- 5 online meetings





Main Activities

- Developing the **workplan** for the Task Force itself,
- Defining the cross-cutting issues with the work of other Task Forces
- Defining the national workplans for each individual country (Doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.14)

- using Google Doc's spreadsheet:

See workplan for the priorities on flyway and national levels

Type of action	Activities from the ISMP	Priority	Timescale	Activities carried out by	Barnacle Goose Task Force	Belgium	Denmark	Estonia	Finland
1.1	Provide adequate protection and management to key sites of international importance under Article 1(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	High	Short / Rolling	Maintain and update Box 1 reporting from Range States		No sites have been designated for this species in BE. The area with important concentrations of barnacle geese nesting with the sites that have been designated for other nesting waterfowl species in the adequate protection of the sites is covered.	Adequate protection and management of key sites of international importance is provided.	Adequate protection and management of key sites of international importance is provided.	Adequate protection and management of key sites of international importance is provided.
1.2	Promote goose-based eco-tourism at selected key sites	Medium	Medium	Collect information on people enjoying watching BG (indicator 1.1)		In BE goose-based eco-tourism is neither based on protected and substantial areas.	No need to promote further existing ecotourism sites attract visitors anyway. For example the Wadden Sea National Park.	Main goose staging sites are well-known and visited regularly by birding guides providing adequate services for birdwatchers from different countries.	
2.1	Take key sites for geese into account in land-use planning and growing of sensitive crops[2]	High	Mid/short / Rolling			Not relevant. Crops are most sensitive during the growing season, when only small numbers of (fall-wild) breeding barnacles are present.		First geese management plan in Estonia is under discussion among participating geese at the moment. There are proposals to designate take into account the geese staging sites into land use planning.	On-going. Finland is under discussion among participating geese at the moment. There are proposals to designate take into account the geese staging sites into land use planning.
2.2	Provide accommodation areas to reduce risks and conflicts at sensitive areas through e.g. subsidies[2]	Medium	Mid/short / Rolling	Maintain and update Box 1 reporting from Range States		In designated areas for wintering waterbirds, scaring is not needed as a condition to receive a compensation for crop-damage from wintering geese.	Accommodation areas provided (and under further development) in the vicinity of Copenhagen airport. Scientific project on the subject is currently being carried out in EE (Denmark) by A. Kukk. However, the practice is described in new geese management plan in Estonia in connection of scaring the geese from sensitive fields.	On-going. Finland is under discussion among participating geese at the moment. There are proposals to designate take into account the geese staging sites into land use planning.	On-going. Finland is under discussion among participating geese at the moment. There are proposals to designate take into account the geese staging sites into land use planning.
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 water bodies[2]	High	Short / Rolling	Maintain and update Box 1 reporting from Range States		Scaring is needed in order to reduce a competition for the crop-damage, but only outside the accommodation areas.	Scaring is needed to comply with conditions for designation. Scientific project on the subject is currently being carried out in EE (Denmark) by A. Kukk. However, the practice is described in new geese management plan in Estonia in connection of scaring the geese from sensitive fields.	The scaring of geese from sensitive areas without compensating the geese is not allowed in Estonia. However, the practice is described in new geese management plan in Estonia in connection of scaring the geese from sensitive fields.	Previous. Finland is under discussion among participating geese at the moment. There are proposals to designate take into account the geese staging sites into land use planning.

Key Recommendations: Monitoring – Data Gaps:

- Make sure that all midwinter counts are included (in the current assessment 4 years from Germany are missing)
- Expansion of summer counts in July in Germany (Schleswig-Holstein), to achieve full coverage of MU3.
- Summer surveys in the Baltic (BG MU2) (are planned)
- Preferably timely provision and monthly resolution of derogation data, (to assign offtake to the respective Management Units, (not possible at all with only one figure per year), for the IPM. Especially if 2 Mu's mix.
- FRV's: Submission of national range and FRP by majority of countries

Key Recommendations: Communication

- Recommendation to look into communication to the several stakeholders
- BG TF agreed on the value of exchanging info through thematic webinars



- **Needed new Task Force Coordinator!**