

AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT PLATFORM



**6th MEETING OF THE
AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP**

21-23 June 2021, Online conference format



**REPORT OF THE 6th MEETING OF
THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP¹**

¹ Report finalised after written consultation with the meeting participants.

List of abbreviations

AEWA	Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds
AFMP	Adaptive Flyway Management Programme
AHM	Adaptive Harvest Management
BG E. Greenland population	East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland Population of the Barnacle Goose
BG Russia population	Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose
EGM IWG	European Goose Management International Working Group
EGMP	European Goose Management Platform
FRP	Favourable Reference Population
FRR	Favourable Reference Range
FRVs	Favourable Reference Values
GG	Greylag Goose
IPM	Integrated Population Model
ISSMP	International Single Species Management Plan
MU	Management Unit
NGR	National Government Representative
PfG	Pink-footed Goose
RS	Range State
TBG	Taiga Bean Goose
TF	Task Force

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
Adoption of agenda	The meeting agenda (doc. AEWA/EGM IWG/6.2/Rev.1) was adopted with no amendments.	
Admission of permanent observers and expert observers to EGM IWG6	The Range States accepted the participation of Ms Aimee McIntosh and Mr Hans Baveco in the meeting as invited experts.	
Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2020-2021)	The EGM IWG took note of the report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2020-2021).	The Secretariat and the Data Centre will assess the situation regarding capacity given the current workload and existing resources and provide an update to the Range States.
Summary of EGMP National Reports 2021	The EGM IWG took note of the summary of the EGMP national reports for 2021.	Recommendations and conclusions presented by the Secretariat will be considered by the Range States in the decision-making process.
Revised process and format for EGMP National Reports	The EGM IWG agreed to use an online shared table as a template for national reporting (Option 1B). In terms of periodicity, the Range States agreed on a two-year reporting cycle, Option 2B, on a trial basis until EGM IWG8 in 2023.	<p>The Secretariat and the Data Centre, with the collaboration of the Task Forces will prepare and present a new format and workflow for the national reporting at the EGM IWG7 in 2022. There will be no official submission of national reports in 2022 – the new reporting template will be filled out by the Task Forces.</p> <p>At EGM IWG8 in 2023, the first submission of national reports in the revised format and workflow will take place, with the EGMIWG making the final decision on reporting periodicity.</p>

<p>Introduction to the new format for species population status reports and assessments</p>	<p>The Range States took note and provided feedback on the new format for the species population status reports and assessments.</p>	<p>The Data Centre will amend document AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3 as requested by Germany and present a graphic overview of the information across species in the next species population status and assessment report to be submitted to EGM IWG7.</p>
<p>Report and recommendations from the PfG Task Force</p>	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the PfG TF report and recommendations and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.</p>	<p>The Range States will consider the implications of the foreseen cuts in the PfG monitoring programme from 2022 onwards.</p> <p>Norway and Denmark will meet with the Secretariat and the Data Centre to discuss further funding of the monitoring programme.</p>
<p>PfG population status report and harvest assessment</p>	<p>The Range States took note of the PfG population status and harvest assessment report. The Range States adopted the preferred management option for 2021/2022 – harvest quota of 28,000 individuals (8,400 for Norway and 16,800 for Denmark).</p>	
<p>Report and recommendations from the TBG Task Force</p>	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the TBG TF report and recommendations and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.</p>	<p>The Range States will proceed with May and November counts in the Central Management Unit. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will continue the search for a suitable candidate to fulfil the capacity of a second coordinator in the Eastern 1 Management Unit.</p> <p>To estimate the population and guide management decisions, final Integrated Population Model will be used which excludes the Tundra Bean Geese subspecies from the model.</p>

<p>TBG population status report and harvest assessment</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status and harvest assessment report.</p> <p>The Range States agreed on a harvest quota of 3,000 birds in the Central Management Unit to permit some additional growth in the population. The desired allocation of the quota is 1,740, 900, and 360 for Finland, Sweden, and Denmark, respectively.</p>	
<p>Report and recommendations from Greenland/Svalbard BG TF</p>	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the report and recommendations of Greenland/Svalbard BG TF and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.</p>	
<p>Status of the BG E. Greenland population and IPM development</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status report for BG E. Greenland population and the development of the Integrated Population Model.</p>	
<p>Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the BG E. Greenland population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the final draft of the AFMP for BG E. Greenland population, including the new and updated sections, and took note of the resources required for implementing the process.</p> <p>The Range States took note of the need to establish the process for coordination of hunting and derogation shooting.</p>	<p>Further discussions of the issue, including concerns regarding the 200% of the FRP threshold for triggering closer coordination between the RSs, will be held within the Greenland/Svalbard BG TF.</p> <p>The Greenland/Svalbard BG TF will discuss and address listing of habitat conservation measures in the annual workplans.</p>

Report and recommendations from the BG TF for Russia Population	The EGM IWG adopted the report and recommendations of the BG TF for Russia Population and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.	The Range States will consider nomination of candidates to fill in the position of the Coordinator of the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia Population.
Status of the BG Russia population and IPM update	The EGM IWG took note of the population status report for BG Russia population.	
Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the BG Russia population	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the BG Russia Population AFMP, including the new sections and updates, and took note of the resources required for the process.</p> <p>The RSs took note of the need to establish the process for coordination of hunting and derogation shooting of MU2.</p>	<p>Further discussions on the establishment of the process for coordination of hunting and derogation shooting to prevent the MUs from dropping below FRP will be held within the BG TF for Russia Population.</p> <p>The BG TF for Russia Population will discuss and address listing of habitat conservation measures in the annual workplans.</p> <p>The Secretariat and Data Centre will produce a briefing note providing policy summary of the BG Russia Population AFMP.</p>
Report and recommendations from the GG TF	The EGM IWG adopted the GG TF report and workplan for 2021-2022.	
Status of the NW/SW European GG population	The Range States took note of the GG population status report.	

<p>Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European GG population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG reviewed and adopted the GG AFMP, including the new sections and updates as well as amendments requested at the meeting, and took note of the resources required for the implementation of the process.</p>	<p>The RSs will consider the preconditions for the dynamic, model-based management of the population, planned to be ready in 2023.</p> <p>The GG TF will discuss and address the issue of listing habitat conservation measures in the annual workplans.</p> <p>The Secretariat will produce a briefing note providing policy summary of the AFMP.</p>
<p>Report and recommendations from the Agriculture TF</p>	<p>The Range States adopted the Agriculture TF report and workplan for 2021-2022.</p>	
<p>EGMP Finance Report for 2020/2021</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the EGMP finance report for 2020-2021.</p>	<p>The Range States will continue to seek funding for the contributions to the EGMP core budget.</p>
<p>EGMP costed Programme of Work and budget for 2022</p>	<p>The EGM IWG reviewed and approved the budget estimate for 2022 (Annex 1 of this report), took note of the indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2022 and approved the proposed cPOW for 2022 (Annex 2 of this report).</p>	
<p>Date and venue of the next EGM IWG meeting</p>	<p>The EGM IWG accepted the renewed invitation of Finland to host the 7th Meeting of the EGM IWG in Helsinki in 2022. The meeting will take place in the week of 20-24 June 2022.</p>	

Day 1 (21 June 2021)

Opening of the Meeting and Welcome

1. The Chair of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), Prof Des Thompson from the United Kingdom, opened the meeting welcoming the participants.
2. Dr Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary of AEWA, wished everyone a successful meeting highlighting the progress made by EGMP since its establishment in 2016.
3. Mr Sergey Dereliev, Head of the AEWA Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit, noted that the programme had expanded with the addition of the International Single Species Management Plans (ISSMPs) for the Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose. The meeting documents had been improved following the feedback received from Range States. Mr Dereliev wished the participants productive deliberations.
4. Ms Eva Meyers, Coordinator of the EGMP, introduced the guidelines for the online meeting as presented in document [AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.6.1](#).

Adoption of Agenda

5. Mr Øystein Størkersen representing Norway noted the importance of resuming face-to-face meetings as soon as circumstances allow again. He emphasised the significance of physical meetings for involving the policy makers in the process and expressed hope that, despite the dense meeting agenda, the Secretariat will allow sufficient time for discussions.
6. Following comments received from Range States (RSs), a number of meeting documents had been revised by the Secretariat. The list of documents (*doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.1/Rev.2](#)) and the provisional meeting agenda (*doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.2/Rev.1](#)) as well as documents [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#), [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.13/Rev.1](#), [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15/Rev.2](#) had been revised with the updated sections being highlighted. A new information document [AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.6.12](#) had been uploaded with additional explanations on methodology of calculating Favourable Reference Values (FRVs) for the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme (AFMP) for the NW/SW European population of Greylag Goose (GG).
7. In the absence of further comments from the meeting participants, it was agreed to adopt the proposed meeting agenda.

Decision:

The meeting agenda (*doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.2/Rev.2](#)) was adopted with no amendments.

Admission of Permanent Observers and Expert Observers to EGM IWG6

8. No new permanent observers attended the meeting. However, two invited experts – Ms Aimee McIntosh and Mr Hans Baveco – had been invited to participate in the meeting.

Decision:

The Range States accepted the participation of Ms Aimee McIntosh and Mr Hans Baveco in the meeting as invited experts.

Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2020-2021)

9. Ms Eva Meyers and Dr Gitte Høj Jensen representing the Data Centre introduced this item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.3](#)*). The platform officially consists of 14 RSs and the European Union. However, in the run-up to the meeting, the Secretariat received an official notification on Ireland joining the EGMP as a participating Range State. The Secretariat was delighted with the news and gave a warm welcome to Ireland. Ms Meyers was pleased that Spain was represented at the meeting as well and hoped they would consider joining the platform as an official Range State in the near future.

10. Mr Sean Kelly confirmed that Ireland was joining the platform as an official Range State. Ireland had been involved in the process in the last two years and was very much looking forward to continued engagement. Mr Kelly added that Ireland had a strong role to play in the EGMP with regard to the Barnacle Goose (BG).

11. Following the announcement, Ms Meyers and Dr Høj Jensen went on to provide an overview of the organisational structure of the platform and the activities carried out by the Secretariat and the Data Centre in 2020-2021.

12. Responding to a question from Norway on how the Secretariat was dealing with the increased workload, Mr Dereliev explained that the situation was far from ideal. In 2019, due to insecure funding, the position of the Programme Assistant was terminated. Currently, the Secretariat has found a temporary arrangement to cover the capacity gap through hiring a consultant. While the work has intensified with the addition of the BG and GG ISSMPs and establishment of new Task Forces (TFs), reopening of the position has not been possible as the financial situation remains volatile and unpredictable. However, even with the position filled, the capacity of both Secretariat and Data Centre is not sufficient to carry all responsibilities and implement all the expected services. The Secretariat noted that the situation would be assessed in view of the existing resources with an update to be provided to the RSs.

Decision and Action:

The EGM IWG took note of the report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2020-2021).

The Secretariat and the Data Centre will assess the situation regarding capacity given the current workload and existing resources and provide an update to the Range States.

Summary of EGMP National Reports 2021

13. Ms Meyers presented this agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.4/Corr.1](#)*) informing the participants that 12 out of 14 RSs submitted national reports, with submissions missing from Belarus and Denmark.

14. The Secretariat recommended revision of the national reporting format to include the workplans developed by the TFs and new sections for BG & GG. It was also recommended that the RS monitor the effectiveness of the management measures applied and share them through the Agriculture TF. Ms Meyers pointed out the urgent need to improve monitoring and data collection in the Eastern Management Units (EMUs) of Taiga Bean Goose (TBG).

Decision and Action:

The EGM IWG took note of the summary of the EGMP national reports for 2021.

Recommendations and conclusions presented by the Secretariat will be considered by the Range States in the decision-making process.

Revised Process and Format for EGMP National Reports

15. Referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.5](#), Ms Meyers provided a brief summary of this agenda item and the options presented. Due to a number of issues in the current national reporting template communicated by the RSs, the Secretariat has prepared and submitted to the EGM IWG a proposal for revised national format and process. Based on the options chosen by the RSs, the Secretariat proposed to develop the new format together with the Data Centre and EGMP TFs and to present it at the next meeting of the EGM IWG.

16. The following options were listed for the template used for reporting:

Option 1A: Use the template as used in the online reporting tool so far and update with new questions.

Option 1B: Use a shared online table (i.e. Google sheets/excel table) to report against each activity.

As for the periodicity of the reporting cycle, the RSs were presented with the following choices:

Option 2A: Every year a reporting cycle is launched, reports are analysed and presented for discussion at the EGM IWG meetings – status quo.

Option 2B: Every 2 years a reporting cycle is launched, reports are analysed and presented for discussion at the EGM IWG meetings.

Option 2C: Every 3 years a reporting cycle is launched, reports are analysed and presented for discussion at the EGM IWG meetings.

Option 2D: Alternate the reporting. In Year 1: reporting on Pink-Footed Goose (PfG) and Taiga Bean Goose (TBG); in Year 2: Reporting on Barnacle Goose (BG) and Greylag Goose (GG).

17. Norway voted for Option 1B, shared online template, providing that the access to fill in and edit the tables would only be given to certain people by approval. As for periodicity of national reporting, Norway chose to keep the annual reporting cycle (Option 2A).

18. Mr James Williams representing the United Kingdom also supported the idea of shared online template for national reporting (Option 1B). In terms of periodicity, the UK opted for keeping the reporting burden as low as possible, voting for Option 2C, a three-year reporting cycle.

19. Germany refrained from any comments on the item and put a reservation regarding the actions requested referring to the need to finalise consultations on the decision with the Federal States.

20. The Netherlands and Belgium indicated preference for the shared online template, Option 1B, and for keeping the status quo in terms of periodicity, Option 2A.

21. On behalf of Finland, Ms Nina Mikander supported switching to the online template (Option 1B), requesting that a clear deadline was set for filling in the template, following which they would be sent to the National Government Representatives (NGR) for approval. Finland supported the idea of involving the TFs in keeping the template up to date in intersessional period. Ms Mikander chose Option 2B for reporting periodicity.

22. France chose options 1A and 2C voicing their concern about data security in changing to an online reporting template.

23. Following the discussion, the RSs agreed on changing the national reporting template to a shared online table, Option 1B, under the condition that a reliable platform would be chosen providing assurance for data security. As for the periodicity, the EGM IWG agreed two-year reporting cycle, Option 2B, on a trial basis until EGM IWG8 in 2023. It was agreed that at EGM IWG7, the RSs will approve the new format and workflow developed by the Secretariat and the Data Centre with the support from the TFs. For EGM IWG8 in 2023, national reports will be submitted by the RSs for first time following the revised national reporting process, with the EGMIWG providing feedback on the new format and making a final decision on its periodicity.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG agreed to use an online shared table as a template for national reporting (Option 1B). In terms of periodicity, the Range States agreed on a two-year reporting cycle, Option 2B, on a trial basis until EGM IWG8 in 2023.

The Secretariat and the Data Centre, with the collaboration of the Task Forces will prepare and present a new format and workflow for the national reporting at the EGM IWG7 in 2022. There will be no official submission of national reports in 2022 – the new reporting template will be filled out by the Task Forces.

At EGM IWG8 in 2023, the first submission of national reports in the revised format and workflow will take place, with the EGMIWG making the final decision on reporting periodicity.

Introduction to the New Format for Species Population Status Reports and Assessments

24. Dr Høj Jensen presented the new format for the species population status reports and assessments (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#)*). Since its establishment, EGMP has taken on new species, now including four species and six populations of geese. To make the access to the latest information on species easier, starting this year, all population status reports and assessments have been compiled into one document. Table 1.1 summarises all main data issues. The conclusions on each population have been included in short summaries to be found on the first pages of the document. In addition, all datasets are being stored into a newly developed database which will be made accessible through the EGMP website in the near future. To provide for full transparency, the Data Centre also created a page on [Gitlab](#) where all scripts used to make the assessments are stored. Ms Høj Jensen welcomed any feedback from the meeting participants on the new format and platforms used.

25. Prof Jesper Madsen, Head of the EGMP Data Centre, acknowledged the work of all contributors of the report.

26. Mr Babak Miller from Germany requested to make an addition on page 31 of the document specifying that starting April 2020, all hunting on TBG had been banned in the Federal State of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, and an effective protection of the wintering population of TBG was in place in Germany.

27. The UK thanked everyone involved in the report compilation suggesting that a dashboard-overview of the information across species would be highly helpful. The Data Centre confirmed that the team was already working on a graphic overview for the report.

Decision and Action:

The Range States took note and provided feedback on the new format for the species population status reports and assessments.

The Data Centre will amend document [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#) as requested by Germany and present a graphic overview of the information across species in the next species population status and assessment report to be submitted to EGM IWG7.

Report and Recommendations from the Pink-footed Goose Task Force

28. The TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.7](#)*) was presented by Dr Høj Jensen, Prof Madsen and Dr Johnson representing the Data Centre. The main activities of the TF proposed for 2021-2022 included reviewing the PfG monitoring and harvest assessment reports, supporting initiatives on international exchange between hunting organisations, analysing the critical monitoring programme components and developing an assessment plan for revision of the ISSMP postponed to 2024.

29. Prof Madsen reported that with the population counts going back to 1980, PfG monitoring programme was one of the longest running and most consistent monitoring programmes for a waterbird population in Europe. However, the monitoring is costly, reaching up to € 117,000 every year, while the research funding covered by 95% by Aarhus University is ending in 2021. Therefore, in the view of the foreseen cuts in the monitoring programme, the Data Centre had been working on an assessment of the most critical components needed in the future monitoring, with a focus on the requirements for the Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM). Dr Johnson concluded that the preliminary conclusions of the study were as follows:

- Population counts in May are deemed as important, with November counts being relatively important.
- There is no compelling reason to continue the capture-mark-recapture for population/harvest management.
- Productivity survey could be scaled back while still providing useful information.

30. Norway and Denmark expressed interest in funding of the monitoring programme, requesting the Data Centre to present several scenarios for minimum and optimal funds necessary. It was agreed that a meeting will be arranged between Norway, Denmark, the Secretariat and the Data Centre to discuss further funding of the monitoring programme. Norway and Denmark will provide feedback on the possible timeline for the meeting by September 2021.

31. Responding to Norway, Prof Madsen noted that Aarhus University was in no position to allocate any additional funding to the monitoring programme.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the PfG TF report and recommendations and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.

The Range States will consider the implications of the foreseen cuts in the PfG monitoring programme from 2022 onwards.

Norway and Denmark will meet with the Secretariat and the Data Centre to discuss further funding of the monitoring programme.

Population Status and Harvest Assessment of the Pink-footed Goose

32. Dr Heldbjerg and Dr Johnson presented this agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6](#)*). The two established species population counts in May and November show sharp increase in population with a high proportion of juveniles. Due to very few days with temperatures above zero, the productivity is foreseen to be low in 2021.

33. Dr Johnson emphasised that the harvest objective was maintaining the spring population near the target of 60,000. According to the Data Centre assessment, fulfilling more of the harvest quotas may be necessary to reduce the population size, especially considering the continued warming in the Arctic. The suggested harvest quota for the 2021/2022 hunting season, based on the estimated population size of 78,300 and 3 days above freezing in Svalbard in May 2021, is 28,000, including an expected 4% crippling loss.

Decisions:

The Range States took note of the PfG population status and harvest assessment report. The Range States adopted the preferred management option for 2021/2022 – harvest quota of 28,000 individuals (8,400 for Norway and 16,800 for Denmark).

Report and Recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force

34. In his capacity as the TBG TF coordinator, Mr Mikko Alhainen outlined the summary of the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.8](#)*). Mr Alhainen highlighted the need for coordinated counts in the Eastern 1 MU, especially in Poland, in the following two years. A major achievement for the AHM was the finalisation of the IPM by the Data Centre, excluding the data on subspecies of Tundra Bean Geese.

35. Among the recommendations of the TF, particularly critical was nomination of a coordinator for the Eastern 1 MU. Mr Alhainen urged the RSs to consider submitting any potential candidates. The TF also recommended to continue both May and November population counts in Central MU and adopt the final IPM and the overall harvest quota needed to reach the population size of 70,000 within the following five years (preliminary estimate of 3,000 individuals)

36. Germany put a reservation on adoption of the TF report and recommendations due to the need to finalise consultations within the Federal States.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the TBG TF report and recommendations and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.

The Range States will proceed with May and November counts in the Central Management Unit. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will continue the search for a suitable candidate to fulfil the capacity of a second coordinator in the Eastern 1 Management Unit.

To estimate the population and guide management decisions, final Integrated Population Model will be used, which excludes the Tundra Bean Geese subspecies from the model.

Population Status and Harvest Assessment of the TBG

37. Dr Heldbjerg and Dr Johnson introduced this report referring to the document [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#). For the Central MU 67,000 birds were counted in March 2020 with the majority in Sweden, showing continuing increasing trend in the population; 1,200 birds were recorded in the Western MU while no consistent counts were held in Eastern 1&2 MUs. As for the harvest, the open hunting season for Bean Geese will be closed in Sweden from the hunting season 2021-2022 although conditional hunting and derogations will still be taking place.

38. The exclusion of the Tundra Bean Geese subspecies from the Central MU in the IPM has been a major development resulting in a lower population estimate compared to the previous years. The allowable harvest could be sustained at 5,700. However, as the population is reaching the carrying capacity, to reach the level of 70,000 by 2025, the harvest would need to be lowered to 2,000 (1,200 in Finland, 600 in Sweden, 200 in Denmark). Once the 70,000 target is reached, the harvest can be stabilised at about 4,800 birds.

Decisions:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status and harvest assessment report.

The Range States agreed on a harvest quota of 3,000 birds in the Central Management Unit to permit some additional growth in the population. The desired allocation of the quota is 1,740, 900, and 360 for Finland, Sweden, and Denmark, respectively.

Day 2 (22 June 2021)

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme Process for the East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland Population of the Barnacle Goose

39. Ms Meyers presented the structure of the AFMP process explaining the linkages between its different components. The first draft of the AFMP for BG E. Greenland Population was adopted at EGM IWG5 in 2020 pending a number of sections. This year, the Secretariat and the Data Centre have compiled the final draft of the AFMP including the population models. The evaluation and revision of the AFMP are planned for 2026.

Report and Recommendations from the Greenland/Svalbard Barnacle Goose Task Force

40. Introducing the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.9/Corr.1](#)*) in her capacity as the TF coordinator, Ms Rae McKenzie noted that establishment of the TF was an excellent way to drive forward the AFMP annual workplans. The key tasks of the TF have been revolving around supporting the delivery of the International Single Species Management Plan (ISSMP) for BG.

41. The development of an IPM for the Greenland population has been completed. In addition, the development of damage impact models for both populations is in planning. The models will be presented at the EGM IWG7 in 2022. Another achievement was the completion of a range-wide census of BG E. Greenland population. Ms McKenzie concluded that the E. Greenland population showed a slight decrease, and the RSs should be prepared to coordinate the derogations.

Decision:

The Range States adopted the report and recommendations of Greenland/Svalbard BG TF and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.

Status of the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of Barnacle Goose and Development of an Integrated Population Model

42. Presenting this agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#)*), Ms Aimee McIntosh from the Exeter University explained that the purpose behind developing the IPM was to understand the underlying population dynamics, to assess the cumulative impact of all offtake, including hunting and derogation shooting throughout the range, and to provide examples of population projections for harvest scenarios in the future and their impact on the population. Four main data types have been used in the IPM: count, productivity, survival and harvest data. The final model has the anniversary in March.

43. The results of the model suggest that the observed decline in flyway population is associated with increase in harvest rates since 2012. The harvest bag totals both in Islay and in Iceland have risen as well since 2012. In terms of productivity, the recent juvenile proportion has been fairly low (around 10%). It was noted that the decline of population on Islay and on flyway level coincided with increase of population in alternative wintering sites. As derogation shootings on Islay may be causing distributional shifts in wintering sites, the alternative sites are highly important. The model will be used to assess how future management strategies can affect the population.

44. Ms McIntosh thanked all the contributors to the report. The funding for the development of IPM has been generously provided by NatureScot and Irish government and supported by Wetlands and Wildfowl Trust (WWT). The modelling work conducted by the Exeter University with support from the Data Centre is to be published by autumn 2021.

45. Responding to the question from Ireland, Ms McIntosh noted that the reason for broad credible intervals was the uncertainty in data.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status report for BG E. Greenland population and the development of the Integrated Population Model.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of the Barnacle Goose

46. Ms Meyers elaborated on the final draft of the AFMP for BG E. Greenland Population (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/Rev.1](#)*). The early draft of the AFMP was circulated to the Greenland/Svalbard BG TF in early April 2021 for feedback before being published. The main sections added and updated were the introduction, tables 1 and 2, the updated FRVs, the annual workplans, the analysis of Box 1 report, the newly developed IPM and an update on development of impact models.

47. Dr Szabolcs Nagy provided a brief overview of FRVs which were set at 54,000 individuals based on the wintering populations. It was agreed with Iceland to set the Favourable Reference Population (FRP) at 2,000 pairs. The Favourable Reference Range (FRR) has been updated to 101 km², with a huge uncertainty concerning the breeding FRR in Greenland. Iceland and the UK have submitted updated FRV values.

48. To contribute to the implementation of the ISSMP, each EGM IWG entity uses the activities listed in the plan, including their priority and timescale, to compile its own workplan. The annual workplans are stored in the [Google Docs](#) as a living document and kept up to date.

49. Dr Heldbjerg, responsible for Box 1 analysis of the ISSMP concerning damage and site protection, reported that a questionnaire on agricultural damage and risk to air safety and other flora and fauna had been circulated and filled out by all Range States in 2020. The summary of the questionnaire results shows that the BG E. Greenland population is significantly increasing in long term but stabilising and even declining in short term. The airports along the migratory route had not recorded any conflicts concerning air safety.

50. Reporting on the assessment of cumulative impact and coordination of offtake, Dr Høj Jensen reminded the participants that the role of the AFMP was to prevent the population in any of the units from declining below the FRP. It has been agreed that if the population in any of the units falls below 200% of the FRP, this will trigger tighter coordination between the Range States. At the current stage, with the population standing at 73,000 which is 136% above the population size and below the 200% threshold, there is a need to launch this process. In view of this, the Secretariat and the Data Centre called on the RSs, EU and TF to discuss and agree on further steps in the process. The Data Centre underlined that 200% of the FRP was a precautionary approach and a safety net, to make sure that the population was not driven too low.

51. On behalf of Iceland, Mr Thrainsson voiced concerns regarding the threshold of below 200% of the FRP. The country had been considering increasing the offtake due to the pressure triggered by abundance of species, both in natural habitat and in agricultural areas. Mr Thrainsson suggested reevaluating the threshold or recognising the Icelandic population as a separate MU.

52. Responding to the raised concerns, the Secretariat alerted Iceland that the proposed options presented a number of implications. Defining Iceland as a separate MU would cause lack of feasibility to apply the AFMP and prevent Scotland from managing the species in the currently implemented manner. Mr Dereliev drew the

attention of the RSs to the fact that no targets had been agreed with respect to managing the species, and 200% threshold was only a warning about the risk of dropping below the legally required minimum of population size. At the current stage, the RSs would need to communicate and agree among themselves on management measures with regard to special and temporal obligations. The closer the population size gets to FRP, the higher is the risk to reach the point at which all offtake needs to be ceased completely. Despite the listed implications, the Secretariat acknowledged that in the adaptive process, reevaluation of agreed decisions should be possible, suggesting that the further discussion of the issue was arranged within the Greenland/Svalbard BG TF.

53. On behalf of the UK, Mr Williams agreed that the population should be managed from flyway perspective and supported the idea of continuing the discussion within the Greenland/Svalbard BG TF. He went on to highlight that according to the modelling work, remaining at the current level of management will provide for no further implications for the population.

54. Representing the EC, Mr Joseph van der Stegen stated that no guidance would be provided to the RSs on application of derogations unless specifically requested. He urged the governments not to set targets with regard to Barnacle Goose in the EU as the species is not huntable and any take should be done under derogations for certain reasons only (in the absence of other satisfactory solution, a.o. to prevent serious damage to crops), leaving the assessment of derogations granted by Member States to the EC. In addition, Mr van der Stegen stressed that no activities had been listed in the annual workplans targeting habitat conservation measures listed in the ISSMP. It was agreed that the issue would be raised and addressed at the upcoming TF meetings.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the final draft of the AFMP for BG E. Greenland population, including the new and updated sections, and took note of the resources required for implementing the process.

The Range States took note of the need to establish the process for coordination of hunting and derogation shooting.

Further discussions of the issue, including concerns regarding the 200% of the FRP threshold for triggering closer coordination between the Range States, will be held within the Greenland/Svalbard BG TF.

The Greenland/Svalbard BG TF will discuss and address listing of habitat conservation measures in the annual workplans.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme process for Svalbard Population of the Barnacle Goose

55. The Secretariat provided a brief update on the agenda item. The RSs are currently in negotiations regarding the funding and distribution of responsibilities for development of an IPM and an impact model for the Svalbard population of the BG.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme Process for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose

56. Ms Meyers acquainted the meeting participants with the structure of the AFMP and the outlined steps in the process. Similar to the BG E. Greenland AFMP, the final draft of the document has been prepared and submitted to the EGM IWG with new and updated sections. The evaluation and revision of the AFMP is envisaged in 2026.

Report and Recommendations from the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia/Germany and Netherlands Population

57. Ms Wilmar Remmelts, the coordinator of the BG TF for Russia Population, presented the report ([doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.10](#)) listing the main activities of the TF in the past year. Apart from developing its workplan based on the actions of the ISSMP, the TF defined the cross-cutting issues for collaboration with other EGMP TFs and produced national workplans for the RSs. Main TF activities focused on improving data gaps in monitoring – the need for data on mid-winter counts and counts from Schleswig-Holstein in Germany and summer surveys from the Baltic region. Monthly resolution of derogation data would be highly helpful in order to assign the offtake to different MUs, especially in the Netherlands where two MUs occur at the same time.

58. Ms Remmelts went on to announce that due to her retirement in October 2021, the position of the TF coordinator would become vacant. The RSs were invited to nominate their candidates to fill in the vacancy. The Secretariat alerted the EGM IWG that in the absence of a coordinator the work of the TF would have to come to a halt due to limited capacity at the Coordination Unit.

59. Commenting on the draft workplan of the TF on behalf of the EC, Mr van der Stegen noted that a recommendation to develop a guidance on the application of Article 9 of the EU Birds Directive had been marked as immediate and essential. He informed the participants that the EC was not planning on developing such guidance in the near future unless specifically requested. The Secretariat explained that although the prioritisation of this activity had been set in the adopted ISSMP and could therefore not be amended, the comment was taken into consideration, with no immediate action to be taken on this TF workplan item.

60. Germany put a reservation on adoption of the TF report and recommendations due to the need to finalise consultations within the Federal States.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the report and recommendations of the BG TF for Russia Population and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.

The Range States will consider nomination of candidates to fill in the position of the Coordinator of the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia Population.

Status of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose and an Integrated Population Model Update

61. Representing Sovon, Mr Kees Koffijberg provided a summary of the BG Russia population status ([doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#)). Information on winter surveys derived from international counts shows increase of the population since early 1980s. There is an uncertainty in the actual size of population due to the data gap from Germany in the last four years. Based on data submitted by the RS, the population has stabilised around 1,400,000 individuals. Information on summer surveys is missing from Sweden and Denmark. Summer counts show a tendency for decline in the past two years. Both MU 2 & 3 show a population size which is below the 200% of the FRP threshold. High level of derogation shooting has been reported from the Netherlands and Denmark.

62. Mr Koffijberg noted that monthly resolution of derogation data from the RSs would be highly helpful to evaluate the cumulative impact and assign the offtake to the MUs. In addition, earlier delivery of the derogation

data reported to the EU would considerably facilitate the work of the Data Centre. Mr Koffijberg went on to highlight the data gap from Germany for the period between 2017-2020.

63. The IPM for Arctic population is working smoothly. The MU 2 & 3 will be included in the IPM with the results being presented at the EGM IWG7 in 2022.

64. Responding to the listed data issues, Finland emphasised that it was not able to commit to delivering the monthly resolution of the derogation data, partly due to the cost implications.

Decision:

The Range States took note of the population status report for BG Russia population.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme Framework for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose

65. An earlier draft of the AFMP (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.14](#)*) was circulated in the BG TF for Russia Population in April 2021 with a tight timeline for initial comments. The final draft includes the updated FRR values, the TF workplans, the analysis of Box 1 and an update on the progress of the impact model.

66. Dr Nagy pointed out that the changes in the FRVs are relatively small. The FRP remains at 380,000 individuals for the wintering populations. The breeding FRPs had to be set at national level for MU 2& 3. These values have been provided by the Netherlands, Denmark and Finland, while national breeding FRPs are missing from Germany and Estonia. To fill in the missing information, current values from the latest Article 12 reporting of the EU Birds Directive have been used, both for FRPs and for FRRs. Concerning the FRR, breeding values have been reported from the Netherlands, Sweden and Finland. Distribution base data was provided by Denmark. The breeding range stands at 280,000 km² which was estimated based on the European Breeding Bird Atlas (139,000 km² for MU2 and 49,000 km² for MU3).

67. Similar to the Greenland BG AFMP, [annual workplans](#) have been developed, defining cross-cutting activities, TF plans and national plans against the actions of the ISSMP. The workplans are stored as a living document in Google Docs and periodically updated.

68. Presenting the outcomes of the Box 1 analysis of the BG ISSMP concerning damage and site protection, Dr Heldbjerg reported that a huge population increase has been detected in the long and short term. There is limited knowledge and data on the actual costs of agricultural damage in most RSs with high degree of uncertainty towards what methods can be effective. BG is one of the species more frequently reported in the air strikes. The management is clearly different between RSs.

69. With the MU 2 & 3 below the 200% of the FRP threshold and approaching the FRP, the Data Centre highlighted the need to launch the discussion on the coordination of offtake between the RSs, EU and TFs. The IPM can be used to answer a number of questions on the impact of management measures.

70. Germany put a reservation on all requested actions, explaining that they could not express any positions until consultations with the Federal States were finalised. Germany also reiterated that no FRVs are defined by Germany and data from Germany should not be interpreted as such.

71. Referring to the annual workplans, Mr van der Stegen pointed out that no activities had been listed in the annual workplans with regard to habitat conservation measures listed in the ISSMP. It was agreed that the issue would be put on the agenda of the BG TF for Russia Population and addressed at the upcoming meetings.

72. On behalf of Finland, Ms Mikander reported an exponential increase in the occurrence of the BG in the country over the recent years, particularly for the Arctic breeding birds. The costs of agricultural damage have reached € 3,500,000 for 2020. With the costs being covered by the funds for nature conservation, the situation for stakeholders is quite dire and politically difficult. Finland was therefore not in the state to limit the derogations while agreeing on the need to establish the process for assessment of the cumulative impact of derogations with other RSs. In this view, Ms Mikander requested the Secretariat to clarify the meaning of the word “coordination” with regard to coordination of derogation shooting in the document by specifying what it implies.

73. Denmark joined Finland’s remark stating that it was also increasingly facing issues with damage on farmland crops and conflicts around the airports. The awareness on the agreed limit of above 200% of the FRP is being raised through campaign efforts. If needed, the derogation permits could be reduced in the coming years. However, the increasing damage could complicate the situation.

74. The EC noted that there should not be any co-ordination mechanism for derogations but that EGMP data are useful to allow Member States to take informed decisions on derogations. The EC has no intention to limit the flexibility of its member states to apply the derogations when the necessary conditions are met. Mr van der Stegen noted that, if the agreed thresholds under the EGMP were crossed, the EC would probably alert the member states without setting any quotas.

75. The Secretariat agreed to provide the clarification on the definition of the use of the term “coordination” in the document. Mr Dereliev clarified that the main purpose of the discussion was set to pave out the process on limitation of derogations if the assessment proves the risk of going beyond legally required FRV. The Secretariat expressed an understanding for the challenges with the Arctic MU in Finland, adding that with the population 400% above the FRP, the issue of coordination only arises in the case of overlap with the Baltic breeding MU.

76. Finland thanked the Secretariat for the clarifications and called on the RSs and EC to work on setting up a transparent process that is applicable for any MU in the future. Ms Mikander urged the EC to develop a guidance on the application of Article 9 of the Birds Directive. The Secretariat agreed with Finland’s position underlining that the goal was working together to predict the implications of different management measures in order to take more informed decisions.

77. Dr Nagy brought to everyone’s attention that the current population size in MU2 is extremely close to the FRP, with the difference being around 2,000 pairs. Given that the population overlaps with MU1 and MU3 in the Netherlands, Germany and Belgium, the management of the unit is not a sole responsibility of Baltic countries. In this context, coordination would mean assuring that the population does not drop below the FRP.

78. In response to Finland’s comments, BirdLife International pointed out that the agricultural damage should be classified as an economic issue and handled by agricultural authorities, instead of spending the resources of depleted conservation funds. Mr Ariel Brunner proposed that the Secretariat advised all governments to move goose damage compensations from conservation to agriculture departments which could facilitate the situation.

79. Summarising the discussion, Ms Meyers suggested for the EGM IWG to give the mandate to the BG TF for Russia Population to agree on a common process to be implemented as a response to reaching the set threshold in population size.

80. Germany asked for amendment of two minor errors: on page twenty-four, changing “Federal State of Germany” to “Federal Republic of Germany” and on page 16, replacing “risk to air safety and public health” by “risk to air safety” in line with the ISSMP.

81. Representing the Netherlands, Ms Wilmar Remmelts requested adding the map of MUs to the document as done for GG AFMP. Noting that the document is highly technical, she highlighted the need for a summary of the document from policy perspective. In addition, Ms Remmelts proposed for all financial references in the document to be transferred to the finance documents. It was requested to revise the Box 1 analysis, including its conclusions, with an update to be submitted by the Netherlands in writing.

82. Finland also identified some ambiguities and minor errors, suggesting submitting it to the Secretariat in writing, including the proposed wording for clarification of the word “coordination” to be added as a footnote.

83. Ms Meyers confirmed that, as long as all RSs agree on the proposed amendments, the document will be revised accordingly. She clarified that the Secretariat did not envisage an additional round of comments and adoptions, and, following the amendments, the document would be uploaded on the website as a final version. As for the requested document summaries, it was agreed that the Secretariat together with the Data Centre will develop a series of separate briefing notes for each AFMP, with a reference to the ISSMPs.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the BG Russia Population AFMP, including the new sections and updates as well as the amendments requested at the meeting, and took note of the resources required for the process.

Further discussions on the establishment of the process for coordination of hunting and derogation shooting, to prevent MU 2 & 3 from dropping below the FRP, will be held within the BG TF for Russia Population.

The BG TF for Russia population will discuss and address listing of habitat conservation measures in the annual workplans.

The Secretariat and Data Centre will produce a briefing note providing policy summary of the BG Russia Population AFMP.

Day 3 (23 June 2021)

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme Process for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose

84. Outlining the main milestones in the GG AFMP, Ms Meyers reminded the participants that the process had been launched and the MUs agreed upon at EGM IWG4 in 2019. The first draft of the AFMP was adopted in 2020 at EGM IWG5 pending several updates and sections. The RSs also agreed on an info-gap analysis approach as a temporary solution allowing the launch of management in the absence of accurate data on the population.

Report and Recommendations from the Greylag Goose Task Force

85. The coordinator of the GG TF, Ms Iben Hove Sørensen, introduced a brief summary of the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.11](#)*). In the past year, the TF activities concentrated on supporting ongoing work in the Data Centre and drafting the TF workplan and the national workplans for each RS.

86. In its recommendations, the TF urged the RS to improve the population counts and provide data on offtake and population size as well as explore the summer counts and gps-tags for better understanding of the movements between MUs. Ms Sørensen stressed that the past year saw great collaboration between TFs which the GG TF hoped to continue. The TF also suggested organisation of further EGMP webinars as an effective way of experience exchange between all relevant stakeholders. In the following year, the TF planned to continue reviewing reports compiled by the Data Centre and supporting improvement of population counts and the data on offtake.

Decision:

The EGM IWG adopted the report of the GG TF and the TF workplan for 2021-2022.

Status of the NW/SW European Greylag Goose Population

87. Dr Heldbjerg summarised the main findings of the GG population status report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.6/Rev.3](#)*). He reported that the birds of the migratory MU1 and sedentary MU2 mixed in winter. The monitoring data was derived from the winter counts by the International Waterbird Census (IWC) and summer counts from MU2. Unfortunately, similar summer counts lack in MU1. The population shows a long-term increase; however, the growth rate has decreased and is only slightly positive at the moment. The number of birds is stabilising in all countries, except for the Netherlands. The offtake reaches approximately 100,000 birds, while the data for 2019 is missing from France and Germany. Derogation numbers reach a minimum of 155,000 birds, with missing information from Germany and two Dutch provinces. Mr Heldbjerg alerted the EGM IWG that in order to achieve AHM, the reporting system had to be improved in most RS.

88. Aiming to take lead on new monitoring activities in MU1, a Fennoscandian Initiative has been established. Members of the group are exploring the possibilities for developing a distribution model based on counts in stratified locations. Summer monitoring has been planned to be held in three regions of Norway in 2021 covering six specific locations. In addition, a project on tagging of geese to describe the movements between the RS is underway. The data from Norway and Denmark needs to be improved.

89. In conclusion, Dr Heldbjerg reminded the participants that the EGM IWG had agreed to move to a dynamic model-based management in 2023 which requires consistent population counts and data on breeding pairs, offtake, harvest, derogation and survival/crippling rates from all RS.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the GG population status report.

The RS discussed and considered the current data issues.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose

90. Presenting the agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.15/Rev.2](#)*), the Secretariat explained that the early draft of the document had been reviewed by the GG TF in April 2021. The main sections updated are the introduction, tables 1-3, the revised FRVs, the Box 1 analysis and the update on the modelling work.

91. As in the BG AFMPs, the GG TF with the support of the Secretariat and Data Centre used the activities listed in ISSMP to compile the TF as well as national workplans and define cross-cutting issues between TFs. The [annual workplans](#) are stored in Google Docs as a living document and periodically updated.

92. While the breeding and non-breeding FRPs have remained the same (31,000 pairs for MU1, 73,000 pairs for MU3), the FRR saw major updates, especially from Norway and France. For the non-breeding FRR, revised values have been submitted by all RS, except Germany and Spain. However, setting FRR is impossible without the input from these two countries.

93. Reporting on Box 1 analysis of the ISSMP concerning damage and site protection, Dr Heldbjerg noted that a questionnaire was sent out to the RS in 2020. According to the analysis, the GG population is increasing in the long-term and stabilising in the short-term. There is limited knowledge on the costs from agricultural damage in the RS. The species is one of the goose species most frequently reported to have been involved in bird strikes.

94. Dr Høj Jensen called on the RS to set up the monitoring network necessary to make the transition to the dynamic management of GG. Moreover, funding is needed to cover the development of population models. In terms of the offtake, data is missing from France and Germany. The Data Centre has to be able to distinguish the data on derogation and hunting on breeding and non-breeding grounds. Derogation data is missing from Germany and two provinces in the Netherlands. Thanks to the Fennoscandian Initiative, the data on summer counts is expected to flow in consistently in the coming years. As for MU2, there is lack of information from Germany and Spain. When it comes to resources, the Dutch research consortium has received government funding for development of an IPM model for MU2. Funding has to be secured also for the modelling for MU1. As the population is overlapping in winter, there is need for a spatially integrated model.

95. Birdlife International deemed the set FRV for population size as very low and expressed concerns about precedents for other species. Mr Dereliev clarified the raised concerns are best addressed by the RS since they are the ones to set the FRVs, while the Secretariat and Data Centre are only providing general guidance in the framework of the process. Dr Nagy added that the same principles as under the Article 17 of the EC Habitat Directive had been used according to which FRVs are set at national level for widespread species. In addition, setting the FRVs does not affect the management directly as the management targets are set above the FRP.

96. The EC once again highlighted that the habitat conservation measures listed in the ISSMP were left out in the TF workplan. It was agreed that the issue will be taken up by the GG TF. The EC made the same remark on the drafting of a guidance on the application of Article 9 of the Birds Directive as for the TF workplan for the Russia/Germany and Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose (§ 59 above).

97. Responding to a question from Norway, Prof Jesper Madsen, confirmed that in an optimistic timeframe, coordinated management of the population can be launched in 2-3 years. However, it would be impossible without commitment from the RS in terms of data delivery.

98. On behalf of Spain, Mr Guillermo Ceballos pointed out that the ratio of the favourable habitat had remained unchanged in the country in the last 20 years which lead to no need to sending in updated FRVs. In this context, he believed that the country depended on decisions of other RS in the management of the population.

99. Reacting to the statement of the Data Centre, Norway, Denmark and Sweden confirmed that they were working on filling in the data gaps and were optimistic that a reliable and consistent monitoring would be in place in 2-3 years. Germany reiterated not being part of the GG process, adding that in view of this, the questions of monitoring were not of priority, and no final decision had been made on sharing the available data. The Netherlands clarified that they were working on delivering the missing data from two provinces which was a data management issue since monitoring schemes were well established in the country.

100. On behalf of the Netherlands, Ms Rimmelts noted that a policy summary of the AFMP would be helpful due to highly technical nature of the document. As for BG AFMP, she suggested lifting all remarks on finances and transferring them to the finance documents. It was requested to revise the Box 1 analysis, including its conclusions, with an update to be submitted by Netherlands in writing. Ms Rimmelts asked for all requests on information such as Box 1 to be directed through NGRs in the future. She went on to thank the Secretariat for two bilateral meetings held with the Dutch delegation to address their comments on the EGM IWG6 documents.

101. Ms Meyers confirmed that the points raised by the Netherlands would be addressed and encouraged all participants to submit their comments and concerns on the documents in advance of the annual meeting in the future. Concluding the GG session, the Secretariat reminded the RS that the info-gap analysis approach was a temporary solution to fill in the monitoring gaps and only allowed management at population level, not MU level. As agreed at EGM IWG5, the model-based approach has to be initiated by June 2023. In view of this, the Secretariat invited the RS and the TF to further prioritise and activate the work on data collection and modelling.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG reviewed and adopted the GG AFMP, including the new sections and updates as well as amendments requested at the meeting and took note of the resources required for the implementation of the process.

The RS will consider the preconditions for the dynamic, model-based management of the population, planned to be ready in 2023.

The GG TF will discuss and address the issue of listing habitat conservation measures in the annual workplans.

The Secretariat will produce a briefing note providing policy summary of the AFMP.

Report and recommendations from Agriculture TF

102. In her capacity as Agriculture TF coordinator, Dr Ingunn Tombre provided information on the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.12](#)*). The TF has been compiling a metadata overview, a common database for all relevant scientific publications. Ms Tombre encouraged the participants to share information on newly published papers, reports or any ongoing studies where information and experiences can be shared. As a direct response to the objectives of the ISSMPs, the TF organised a webinar on agricultural damage in May 2021, with another webinar on damage management planned for autumn 2021. The format was very well accepted – the webinar generated high engagement and highly positive feedback from the attendees. Further information and presentations from the webinar are available on the [EGMP website](#). With some funding received from Sweden, the TF is also planning a face-to-face workshop. Moving forward, the TF is planning to continue identifying and addressing cross-cutting issues together with other EGMP TFs.

103. Finland and the UK commended Dr Tombre for her work, agreeing that webinars were extremely useful for information exchange. Responding to a request from Finland, Ms Tombre confirmed that the next webinar would be open to a wider group of stakeholders.

Decision:

The EGM IWG adopted the Agriculture TF report and workplan for 2021-2022.

EGMP Finance Report for 2020/2021

104. An overview of the report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.16](#)*) was presented by Mr Dereliev. The expenditures for 2020 reached €418,000, with savings made by the Secretariat, and the Data Centre slightly overspending due to a large amount of work. In terms of in-kind contributions, in 2020, the UK and Ireland funded the IPM for BG Greenland population, while Germany sponsored the work on Box 1 analysis for BG and GG.

105. As of June 2021, the Secretariat and the Data Centre received 52% of the agreed annual budget. If the pledges materialise, the Secretariat will end the year with no carryover and a small dent in the reserve, while the Data Centre will deplete its reserves.

106. Mr Dereliev concluded stressing that the Secretariat and the Data Centre have continuously been operating with less money than agreed in the budget. In 2019, due to a particularly dire funding situation, the position of the Programme Assistant in the Secretariat had to be terminated. In view of this, Mr Dereliev invited the RS to make their pledges and contributions as early as possible in the year in order to allow for a better planning and operation of the Secretariat and the Data Centre.

107. On behalf of the Data Centre, Prof Madsen thanked the RS for their continued support explaining that the overspending in 2020 was due to involvement in new TFs and setting up of the work process for new species. In 2021, the Data Centre was working on streamlining the reporting cycles as well as data management, which may lead to some delays in responses and lack of opportunity to support some of the TFs.

108. Belgium confirmed the pledge of €35,000 hoping that the money would be transferred in autumn 2021.

109. The Netherlands reported that a budget of €1,500,000 had been allocated for the Dutch research consortium, contributing to the work of the Data Centre, over the period of four years. However, the Dutch government would only be able to donate half of the amount on the indicative scale of voluntary contributions in terms of yearly contributions to the EGMP budget.

Decision and Action:

The EGM IWG took note of the EGMP finance report for 2020-2021.

The Range States will continue to seek funding for the contributions to the EGMP core budget.

EGMP costed Programme of Work and Budget for 2022

110. Presenting the document [AEWA/EGMIWG/6.17](#), the Secretariat reported that its estimated budget was €282,000, most of which was for staffing costs, small operating and contracting costs. Travel budget was allocated hoping that face-to-face meetings would become possible again with the ease of pandemic. The Data Centre budget estimate was set at the standard amount of € 184,000. It was highlighted that despite the overspending due to increased amount of work in 2021, the Data Centre always tried to remain within the budget and had made in-kind contributions to the process. Dr Høj Jensen, who is a post-doctoral candidate at the Aarhus University, had been volunteered to the EGMP, creating additional capacity for the Data Centre. As for the indicative scale, the Secretariat proposed scenario 5 with 15% cap that had already been approved at EGM OWG4 and applied in the past years.

111. The Netherlands expressed doubts whether using the indicative scale of contributions was still necessary, given that a number of countries had not been able to match the indicated contributions over the last years. Reiterating that the country will only be in the position to contribute half of the amount on the indicative scale (€35.000) in the coming years, Ms Remmelts suggested that budgeting this amount could provide a better overview of actual contributions for the Secretariat and the Data Centre.

112. The Secretariat noted that with Ireland joining the EGMP as a contributing RS, the indicative scale of contributions would be recalculated with the numbers readjusted for each country. It was agreed to keep the current scale of contributions, mindful of the fact that it was indicative and voluntary.

Decision:

The EGM IWG reviewed and approved the budget estimate for 2022 (Annex 1 of this report), took note of the indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2022 and approved the proposed cPOW for 2022 (Annex 2 of this report).

Date and Venue of the next EGM IWG meeting

113. Although due to the global COVID pandemic a physical meeting had not been possible for the past two years, Finland renewed its offer to host the EGM IWG7 in Helsinki, with a hope for a better situation in 2022. Ms Mikander stressed that some administrative work is pending, hoping to provide the final confirmation of the offer to the Secretariat in the near future.

114. The Secretariat and the Chair thanked Finland for the generous offer and proposed the week of 20-24 June 2022 for the meeting.

Decision:

The EGM IWG accepted the renewed invitation of Finland to host the 7th Meeting of the EGM IWG in Helsinki in 2022. The meeting will take place in the week of 20-24 June 2022.

Summary, next steps and closure of the meeting

115. Concluding the meeting, the Chair gave a detailed summary of the main topics covered in the meeting, noting some of the key areas agreed or noted. He expressed his heartfelt thanks to the Secretariat and the Data Centre for its great work, and to the participants for their contributions.

116. Mr Dereliev was glad to see the programme getting further strength. He expressed his thanks to Dr Thompson for excellent chairmanship.

117. Dr Trouvilliez congratulated the Secretariat, the Data Centre and the participants on the progress achieved and thanked Finland for renewing their invitation to host the next meeting. The Chair declared the meeting closed.

Annex 1

EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre Budget for 2022

EGMP Secretariat Budget for 2022 (in EUR)	
Object of expenditures	
Staff Costs	
EGMP Coordinator (100%; P2)	142,000
Programme Management Assistant (100%; G5)	80,000
Subtotal	222,000
Operating Costs	
Communication	5,000
Miscellaneous (e.g. office supplies and equipment, training)	5,000
Subtotal	10,000
Implementing Partner Direct Costs	
Small Scale Funding Agreements	15,000
Subtotal	15,000
Travel	
Travel (staff, experts and funded delegates)	30,000
Subtotal	30,000
Contractual Services (Meetings)	
EGM IWG meeting (catering, venue if hosted in Bonn)	5,000
Subtotal	5,000
Total Budget, incl Programme support cost	282,000

EGMP Data Centre Budget for 2022 (in EUR)	
Object of expenditures	
Staff Costs	
Goose Monitoring Coordinator (100%)	
Population Modelling Expert (50%)	
Lead Compiler (22,5%)	
Subtotal	174,000
Operating costs	
Travel, meetings, miscellaneous	10,000
Subtotal	10,000
Total Budget	184,000

Annex 2. EGMP Costed Programme of Work for 2022

EGMP Costed Programme of Work for 2022

Activity No.	Activities	Priority ranking*	Timeframe	Total Budget (€) Secretariat & Data Centre	AEWA Secretariat Budget (€)	Data Centre Budget (€)
A Overall EGMP coordination and programme management						
1	Provide overall coordination of the EGMP	core	rolling		-	-
2	Undertake administrative and financial management of the EGMP	core	rolling		-	-
3	Coordinate the work of the International Modelling Consortium	core	rolling		-	-
4	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR	core	rolling		-	-
5	Undertake fundraising activities (project proposals, identify and approach potential donors)	core	rolling		-	-
6	Maintain the rolling costed Programme of Work for 2021	core	rolling		-	-
7	Develop and revise a draft costed Programme of Work for 2022	core	spring/autumn		-	-
8	Represent the EGMP at relevant meetings, conferences and workshops	core	rolling		-	-
9	Staff travel on official business	core	rolling	20,000	15,000	5,000
10	Consultancies and SSFAs	core	rolling	15,000	15,000	-
11	Other operational costs e.g. procurement, office supplies, office equipment, telephone, etc.	core	rolling	4,000	4,000	-
	Sub-total			39,000	34,000	5,000
B EGMP Meetings and Workshops						
1	Organise and support the EGMP International Goose Modelling Consortium Meetings	core	spring	5,000	-	5,000
2	Organise and support the EGMP Task Force Meetings	core	rolling	-	-	-
3	** Organise the 7th Meeting of the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG7)	core	June	5,000	5,000	-
4	Travel funded experts and delegates to EGMP related meetings (travel, visa, DSA, etc.)	core	rolling	15,000	15,000	-
5	Prepare meeting documents for EGM IWG7	core	rolling	-	-	-
6	*** Organise other meetings and workshops as necessary	medium	as required	-	-	-
	Sub-total			25,000	20,000	5,000
C National Reporting						
1	Develop a revised National Reporting format according to the decisions made at the EGM IWG meetings	core	Jan/Feb	-	-	-
2	Adapt and maintain National Reporting System	core	rolling	-	-	-
3	Undertake the analysis and summary of National Reports	core	May	-	-	-
	Sub-total			-	-	-
D International Single Species Action and Management Plans under the EGMP						
Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP						
1	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Taiga Bean Goose	core	rolling			
2	Produce Population Status and Assessment Report for Taiga Bean Goose	core	Jan-May			
3	Coordinate and support the work of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-
Pink-footed Goose ISSMP						
	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Pink-footed Goose	core	rolling			
4	Produce Population Status and Assessment Report for Pink-footed Goose	core	Jan-June			
5	Coordinate and support the work of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-
Barnacle Goose ISSMP						
6	Coordinate the Implementation of Adaptive Flyway Management Programmes for the Barnacle Goose	core	rolling	-	-	-
7	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Barnacle Goose	core	rolling			
	Produce Population Status and Assessment Report for Barnacle Goose	core	Jan-April			
8	Coordinate and support the work of the two Barnacle Goose Task Forces	core	rolling			
Greylag Goose ISSMP						
9	Coordinate the implementation of Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Greylag Goose	core	rolling			
10	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Greylag Goose	core	rolling			
	Produce Population Status and Assessment Report for Greylag Goose	core	Jan-April			
11	Coordinate and support the work of the Greylag Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-
Crosscutting						
12	Coordinate and support the work of the Agriculture Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-
	Sub-total			-	-	-
E Communications and information management						
1	Produce and Maintain website and social media content	core	rolling	-	-	-
2	Maintain EGMP workspaces	core	rolling	-	-	-
3	Maintain EGMP Contact Database	core	rolling	-	-	-

4	Maintain EGMP Database	core	rolling			
5	Maintain EGMP GitLab	core	rolling			
6	Develop and produce publications and information materials (design, printing)	medium	rolling	5,000	5,000	-
	Sub-total			5,000	5,000	-
F	Further management and administrative processes according to UN rules					
1	Provide staff management, including regular team meetings	core	rolling	-	-	-
2	Trainings, staff meetings, stand-in and other tasks within the AEWA Secretariat	core	rolling	1,000	1,000	-
	Sub-total			1,000	1,000	-
G	Staff Costs					
1	AEWA Secretariat staff costs			222,000	222,000	
2	Data Centre staff costs	core		174,000		174,000
	Sub-total			396,000	222,000	174,000

Grand Total				466,000	282,000	184,000
				including programme support costs (13%) and overheads	including programme support costs (13%)	including overheads

- * Priorities: Core = included in agreed EGMP Budget ; High-Low = additional funding needed
- ** Budget to host the meeting in Bonn, in case no host can be identified
- *** Activities and projects not included in the EGMP core budget, for which additional funding is needed

Annex 3

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹

Participating Range States		
Representative	Position/Organisation/Institution	Contact Information
Belgium		
Mr Floris Verhaeghe (NGR)	Species Policy Expert Agency for Nature and Forest Flemish Government Koning Albert I - laan 1/2 bus 74 8200 Brugge Belgium	Tel.: +32 479 89 01 09 Email: floris.verhaeghe@vlaanderen.be
Dr Frank Huysentruyt (NE)	Researcher Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO) Wildlife Management and Invasive Species Havenlaan 88 1000 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 499 865 340 Email: frank.huysentruyt@inbo.be
Denmark		
Mr Søren Egelund Rasmussen (NGR)	Biologist Danish Environmental Protection Agency Tolderlundsvej 5 5000 Odense Denmark	Tel.: + 45 93 58 79 60 Email: soera@mst.dk

¹ NGR – National Government Representative / NE – National Expert

Prof Jesper Madsen (NE) <i>(Coordinator Pink-footed Goose Task Force)</i>	Head of the AEWA EGMP Data Centre Department of Bioscience Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønne Denmark	Tel.: +45 294 402 04 Email: jm@bios.au.dk
Ms Iben Hove Sørensen (NE) <i>(Also representing CIC)</i> <i>(Coordinator Greylag Goose Task Force)</i>	Danish Hunters' Association Molsvej 34 8410 Rønne Denmark	Tel.: +45 817 716 64 Email: ihs@jaegerne.dk
Estonia		
Mr Hanno Zingel (NGR)	Advisor Nature Conservation Unit Ministry of Environment Narva mnt 7a 15172 Tallinn Estonia	Tel. : + 376 6260720 Email: hanno.zingel@envir.ee
Mr Tõnu Talvi (NGR)	Senior Conservation Officer Nature Conservation Department Environmental Board Narva mnt 7A 15172 Tallinn Estonia	Tel. : + 376 19621010 Email: tonu.talvi@keskkonnaamet.ee
European Union		
Mr Joseph van der Stegen	Policy Officer European Commission DG Environment, Nature Unit Avenue de Beaulieu 5 1160 Brussels Belgium	Tel. : + 32 29 96 902 Email: joseph.van-der-stegen@ec.europa.eu

Finland		
Ms Nina Mikander (NGR)	Senior Specialist Ministry of the Environment Department of the Natural Environment, Biodiversity FI-00023 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: + 358 50 5710992 Email: nina.mikander@ym.fi
Mr Janne Pitkänen (NGR)	Senior Specialist Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Natural Resources Department Unit for Game and Recreational Fishing P.O. Box 30 FI-00023 Government Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +35 829 516 2338 Email: janne.pitkanen@mmm.fi
Mr Mikko Alhainen (NE) <i>(Coordinator Taiga Bean Goose Task Force)</i>	Senior Planning Officer Finnish Wildlife Agency Sompiontie 1 00730 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358 (0) 509 11 12 88 Email: mikko.alhainen@riista.fi
Mr Jorma Pessa (NE)	Senior Adviser Center for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment Nature and Land Use Unit Veteraanikatu 1 90101 Oulu Finland	Tel.: +358400250040 Email: jorma.pessa@ely-keskus.fi
France		
Mr Charles de Barsac (NGR)	Ministry of Ecological and Inclusive Transition (MTES) 92000 La Défense CEDEX France	Tel.: +33 1408 131 90 Email: charles-henri.de-barsac@developpement- durable.gouv.fr

Dr Léo Bacon (NE)	French Agency for Biodiversity (OFB) La Tour du Valat, Le Sambuc 13200 Arles France	Tel.: +33 (0) 689 18 26 63 Email: leo.bacon@ofb.gouv.fr
Germany		
Mr Babak Miller (NGR)	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety Division N 5 – International Species Conservation Robert-Schumann-Platz 3 53175 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 22899 305 2655 Email: babak.miller@bmu.bund.de
Dr Heinz Düttmann (NGR)	Ministry of Environment of Lower Saxony Archivstr. 2 30169 Hannover Germany	Tel.: +49 511 120 3538 Email: heinz.duettmann@mu.niedersachsen.de
Iceland		
Mr Sigurdur Thrainsson (NGR)	Head of Division Department of Land and Natural Heritage Ministry for the Environment and Natural Resources Skuggasundi 1 IS-101 Reykjavik Iceland	Tel.: +354 8402419 Email: sigurdur.thrainsson@uar.is
Mr Bjarni Jónasson (NE)	The Environment Agency of Iceland Hjallalundur 3 600 Akureyri Iceland	Tel.: +354 8610058 Email: bjarnij@ust.is

Ireland		
Dr Sean Kelly (NGR)	Waterbird Ecologist National Parks and Wildlife Service Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht 90 King Street North, Smithfield D07 N7CV Dublin Ireland	Tel.: +353 85 872 8714 Email: sean.kelly@chg.gov.ie
Latvia		
Mr Vilnis Bernards (NGR)	Senior Desk Officer Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development Nature Protection Department Peldu 25 LV1494 Riga Latvia	Tel.: +371 67026524 Email: vilnis.bernards@varam.gov.lv
Dr Oskars Keiņš (NE)	Researcher University of Latvia Institute of Biology Jelgavas iela 1 Latvia	Tel.: +37 129 236 300 Email: oskars.keiss@lu.lv
Netherlands		
Ms Willemina Remmelts (NGR)	Senior Policy Advisor Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality Directorate of Nature and Biodiversity P.O. Box 20401 2500 EK Den Haag Netherlands	Tel.: +31 638 825 338 Email: w.j.remmelts@minlnv.nl
Mr Gerben Mensink (NGR)	Policymaker Ecology Province of Friesland P.O. Box 20120 8900 HM Leeuwarden Netherlands	Tel.: +31 582 928 955 Email: g.mensink@fryslan.frl

Mr Kornelis Koffijberg (NE)	Researcher Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland Department of Monitoring P.O. Box 6521 6503 GA Nijmegen Netherlands	Tel.: +31 247 410 463 Email: kees.koffijberg@sovon.nl
Norway		
Mr Øystein Størkersen (NGR)	Norwegian Environment Agency P.O. Box 5672 Torgarden 7485 Trondheim Norway	Tel.: +47 7358 0500 Email: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no
Dr Ingunn Tombre (NE) <i>(Coordinator Agriculture Task Force)</i>	Senior Researcher Norwegian Institute for Nature Resarch (NINA) Arctic Ecology Department The Fram Centre 9007 Tromsø Norway	Tel.: +4793466723 Email: ingunn.tombre@nina.no
Mr Ove Martin Gundersen (NE)	Project Manager Norwegian Farmers Union Jernbanegata 34C 7600 Levanger Norway	Tel.: +47 922 90 491 Email: ove.martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no
Mr Paul Shimmings	Senior Consultant Conservation Science Department BirdLife Norway (Norsk Ornitologisk Forening) Sandgata 16 B 7012 Trondheim Norway	Tel.: +47 91163115 Email: paul@birdlife.no
Sweden		
Mr Urban Johansson (NGR)	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Forskarens väg 5 10648 Stockholm Sweden	Tel.: +46 106 98 11 33 Email: urban.johansson@naturvardsverket.se

Mr Per Risberg (NGR)	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Forskarens väg 5 10648 Stockholm Sweden	Tel.: + 46106981734 Email: per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se
Dr Johan Månsson (NE)	Researcher Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences Grimsö Wildlife Research Station S-730 91 Riddarhyttan Sweden	Tel.: + 46706638883 Email: johan.mansson@slu.se
Ukraine		
Dr Olesya Petrovych (NGR)	Chief Specialist Ministry of Ecology and Environmental Protection of Ukraine Department of Protected Areas Vasilya Lipkivskogo Street 35 03035 Kyiv Ukraine	Tel.: +38 067 784 1153 Email: petrovych.o@gmail.com
United Kingdom		
Prof. Des Thompson (NGR) (EGM IWG CHAIR)	Principal Adviser on Science and Biodiversity NatureScot Silvan House, 231 Corstorphine Road EH127AT Edinburgh United Kingdom	Tel: +44 7774161251 Email: des.thompson@nature.scot
Mr James Williams (NGR)	Biodiversity Indicators Manager Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) International Advice Team Monkstone House, City Road PE1 1JY Peterborough United Kingdom	Tel: +44 1733 866868 Email: James.Williams@jncc.gov.uk

Ms Rae McKenzie (NE) <i>(Coordinator Greenland/Svalbard Barnacle Goose)</i>	Policy & Operations Manager Scottish Natural Heritage Wildlife Management Unit Main Street, Bowmore PA437JJ Bowmore, Isle of Islay United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 07717547291 Email: rae.mckenzie@nature.scot
Ms Morag Milne (NE)	Wildlife Policy Officer Scottish Natural Heritage Battleby, Redgortan PH1 3EW Perth United Kingdom	Tel.: + 44 (0) 1738 458625 Email: morag.milne@nature.scot
Mr Donald Fraser (NE)	Head of Wildlife Management NatureScot Great Glen House, Leachkin Road Inverness IV38NW Inverness United Kingdom	Tel.: + 44 (0) 7990561963 Email: donald.fraser@nature.scot

Observer Range States

Spain

Mr Guillermo Ceballos Watling <i>(observer to the Greylag Goose process)</i>	Director Andalusian Hunting and Inland Fishing Institute Hunting and Fishing Department Manuel Siurot nº 50 41071 Valencina de la C Spain	Tel.: +34 671 592912 Email: guillermo.ceballos@juntadeandalucia.es
---	--	---

Permanent Observers		
Representative	Position	Contact Email
Birdlife International		
Mr Ariel Brunner	Senior Head of Policy BirdLife Europe and Central Asia Avenue de la Toison d'Or 67 1060 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 491 904 653 Email: ariel.brunner@birdlife.org
International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)		
Ms Iben Hove Sørensen (<i>also a member of Danish delegation</i>)	Danish Hunters' Association Molsvej 34 8410 Rønne Denmark	Tel.: +45 817 716 64 Email: ihs@jaegerne.dk
Copa Cogeca		
Mr Klaus Borde	Copa-Cogeca Oldendorperstrasse 12 26844 Jemgum Germany	Tel.: + 4902 915777 Email: borde-oldendorp@ewetel.net
FACE²		
Mr Cy Griffin	Senior Conservation Manager FACE Rue Belliard 205 1040 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 2 4161619 Email: cy.griffin@face.eu

²The representatives participated in the meeting separately, on different meeting days as the participation of permanent observer organisations in EGM IWG meetings is to be limited to one representative per organisation according to Rule 10 of EGMP [Modus Operandi](#).

Mr Stanislas Sibille	Conservation Policy Assistant FACE Rue Belliard 205 1040 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 2 472199210 Email: stanislas.sibille@face.eu
Nordic Hunters' Alliance		
Mr Johan Svalby	Senior Advisor for International Affairs Nordic Hunters' Alliance Rue Belliard 205 B-1040 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 478817468 Email: johan.svalby@jagareforbundet.se
OMPO		
Mr Alexandre Czajkowski	Director OMPO 59 rue Ampère 75017 Paris France	Tel.: +33 (0) 6 80 20 97 92 Email: vanneau@ompo.org
Wadden Sea Forum		
Dr Frank Ahlhorn	Managing Director Wadden Sea Forum Virchowstr. 1 26382 Wilhelmshaven Germany	Tel.: +49 4421 9108 18 Email: ahlhorn@waddensea-forum.org
Wetlands International		
Dr Szabolcs Nagy	Wetlands International P.O. Box 471 6700AL Wageningen Netherlands	Tel.: +31 628554823 Email: szabolcs.nagy@wetlands.org

Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust		
Mr Richard Hearn	Policy and Advocacy Manager Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust GL2 7BT Gloucester United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 1453 891185 Email: richard.hearn@wwt.org.uk

Invited Experts		
Representative	Position	Contact Email
Ms Aimee McIntosh	University of Exeter Centre for Ecology and Conservation, College of Life and Environmental Sciences Penryn Campus, Treliever Road TR10 9FE Penryn United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 1326 371800 Email: am1036@exeter.ac.uk
Dr Hans Baveco	Senior Researcher Wageningen Environmental Research P.O. Box 47 6700 AA Wageningen Netherlands	Tel.: +31317486095 Email: hans.baveco@wur.nl

AEWA EGMP Data Centre		
Representative	Position	Contact Email
Dr Jesper Madsen	Head of the AEWA EGMP Data Centre Department of Bioscience Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 294 402 04 Email: jm@bios.au.dk
Dr Fred Johnson	Senior Researcher Aarhus University 711 SW Truluck Terrace 32038 Ft. White United States	Tel.: +1 352 494 4611 Email: fred.johnson@bios.au.dk
Dr Gitte Høj Jensen	Post-Doctoral Researcher EGMP Data Centre Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 22461504 Email: ghj@bios.au.dk
Dr Henning Heldbjerg	Goose Monitoring Coordinator AEWA EGMP Data Centre Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 242 732 50 Email: hh@bios.au.dk

UNEP/AEWA Secretariat		
Representative	Position	Contact Email
Dr Jacques Trouvilliez	Executive Secretary UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 815 2414 Email: jacques.trouvilliez@un.org
Mr Sergey Dereliev	Head of Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 815 2415 Email: sergey.dereliev@un.org
Ms Eva Meyers	Coordinator EGMP UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 815 2457 Email: eva.meyers@un.org
Ms Jeannine Dicken	Programme Management Assistant UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +492288152455 Email: jeannine.dicken@un.org
Ms Shenay Huseynova	EGMP Consultant UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 815 2464 Email: shanay.huseynova@un.org

Annex 4

Comments on the meeting documents submitted by Germany after EGM IWG6, following finalisation of national consultation (29.09.2021)

1. Document 6.5 - PROPOSAL FOR REVISED PROCESS AND FORMAT FOR EGMP NATIONAL REPORTS

Regarding the template used for reporting, Germany prefers option 1A to keep the existing reporting format and update with new questions. Regarding periodicity of each reporting cycle, Germany prefers option 2C since goose management in individual countries does not change continuously and at short notice (if the reporting cycle is changed to three years, this must also be adjusted in Doc. 6.14 on p. 16 ("annually by 1 April")).

2. Document 6.8 - REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TAIGA BEAN GOOSE TASK FORCE AND DRAFT WORKPLAN FOR 2021/2022

Germany withdraws its reservation and agrees to the adoption of the report.

3. Document 6.10 - REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BARNACLE GOOSE TASK FORCE FOR RUSSIA/GERMANY & NETHERLANDS POPULATION AND DRAFT WORKPLAN FOR 2021/2022

With regard to the provision of data from Germany, we consider the scope of our previous activities to be sufficient and want to maintain this, which is why we reject the recommendation on p. 3 under item 1 ("Provision of German midwinter counts in January from 2017 onwards (now 4 years missing in the current assessment)."). For the rest, Germany lifts its reservation.

4. Document 6.14 - ADAPTIVE FLYWAY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME FOR THE RUSSIA/GERMANY & NETHERLANDS POPULATION OF THE BARNACLE GOOSE

- Annex 2 (p. 23, Box 1 of the ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose)

The summary contains the following statement:

“The Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population is significantly increasing on the long-term and short-term.”

Although this finding is not wrong, it is now outdated. The following should be added: "However, the short-term increase rate has levelled off from 2014 onwards (see Koffijberg et al. 2020)."

- Wintering birds (p. 29)

We refer to the following statement:

“The winter flyway population has increased significantly at long-term as well as at short term with no sign of stabilisation (Fig. 4; see more details in Koffijberg et al. 2020).”

This is no longer the latest status. An adjustment as described above is imperative here, as there are clear signs of stabilisation of the stock.

– Air safety (pages 32-43)

From our point of view, the design of the questionnaire had the serious deficiency that the survey did not ask the airports what proportion of the total expenditure of the airports is spent on measures against geese to prevent bird strikes and what proportion of the total number of collisions is accounted for by collisions with geese. Hence, it remains unclear what the number of collisions should indicate, e.g. whether the goal is to completely avoid collisions with geese at airports.