

AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT PLATFORM



**7th MEETING OF THE
AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP**

21-23 June 2022, Helsinki, Finland



**REPORT OF THE 7th 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
PfG	Pink-footed Goose
RS	Range State
TBG	Taiga Bean Goose
TF	Task Force

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
Adoption of the agenda	The meeting agenda was adopted with no amendments.	
Admission of permanent observers and expert observers to EGM IWG7	The Range States accepted the participation of Dr Hans Baveco in the meeting as an invited expert.	
Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2021-2022)	The EGM IWG took note of the report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre for 2021-2022.	
Feedback questionnaire on the EGMP perception	The EGM IWG took note of the conclusions of the feedback questionnaire and Task Force meeting outcomes.	The TFs will discuss and agree on a set of actions to address the issues and needs identified during the brainstorming session.
EGMP Communication Plan	The EGM IWG took note of the preliminary overview of communication items and tools for EGMP communication.	An ad-hoc group including Mr Nick Warmelink, Ms Rae McKenzie, Ms Iben Hove Sørensen, Dr Gitte Høj Jensen, Dr Ingunn Tombre and the Secretariat was established which will discuss and suggest the way forward for improving EGMP communication work and report back to the EGM IWG and EGMP Task Forces.

<p>Progress report: Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the BG E. Greenland population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of Barnacle Goose and the proposed deadlines in 2022-2023.</p>	<p>The EGMP Data Centre will act as the assessor on the population model for the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of Barnacle Goose.</p> <p>The EGMP Data Centre will compile the damage impact report.</p> <p>Agreement on how to coordinate offtake will be discussed in the TF and presented at the EGM IWG8 in 2023.</p>
<p>Population Status and Assessment Report of the BG E. Greenland population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report of the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland population of the Barnacle Goose.</p>	<p>No decisions on management actions were taken at this meeting, as the next assessment informing decisions will take place in 2023 at EGM IWG8.</p>
<p>Report and Recommendations of the BG TF for E. Greenland population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the Greenland/Svalbard Barnacle Goose Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the annual workplan of the Task Force.</p>	<p>Following the EGM IWG7, the Task Force will organise a meeting to discuss the impact of avian influenza on the population.</p>

<p>Progress report: Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the BG Russia population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose and the important deadlines coming up in 2022-2023.</p> <p>The EGM IWG agreed that coordination of offtake will take place on a case-by-case basis for populations and management units that drop below the 200% threshold (as stated in the AFMP). Should a population or MU drop below this threshold, the role of the EGMP will be to facilitate dialogue, as appropriate and necessary, among the Range States.</p> <p>The RSs agreed that the Integrated Population Model should be run on an annual basis, given that it would not require additional resources. The model will be run by the Dutch Modelling consortium, up until at least 2024.</p> <p>The EC took note and agreed to consider the request from Finland to develop a guidance on the application of the Article 9 of the Birds Directive.</p>	<p>A trilateral discussion on how to coordinate offtake will take place between the Netherlands and German Federal States of Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein. The outcomes will be communicated to the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population and circulated to the EGM IWG.</p> <p>The EGMP Data Centre will compile the damage impact report.</p>
<p>Population Status and Assessment Report of the BG Russia population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands populations of the Barnacle Goose.</p>	

<p>Report and Recommendations of the BG TF for Russia Population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the report and recommendations of the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia/Germany & Netherlands population and adopted the TF workplan for 2022/2023.</p>	<p>The Secretariat and TF will continue the search for a TF coordinator.</p>
<p>Progress report: Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the GG population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose and acknowledged the upcoming deadlines in 2022/2023.</p>	<p>The EGMP Data Centre will compile the damage impact report.</p>
<p>Population Status and Assessment Report of the GG population</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose and acknowledged the requirements for the planned move to the model-based management of the population in 2023.</p> <p>No decisions on management actions were made, as the first assessment will take place in 2023.</p>	
<p>Report and Recommendations of the GG TF</p>	<p>The Range States took note of the Greylag Goose Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the Task Force workplan for 2022/2023.</p>	
<p>Impact Models for Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose</p>	<p>The Range States took note of the presentation on the status of impact models for Barnacle and Greylag Geese.</p>	

<p>Status of the ISSAP of the TBG</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the update on the status of the Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan and the scheduled revision of the ISSAP by 2025.</p>	
<p>Population Status and Assessment Report of the TBG</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report for the Taiga Bean Goose.</p>	
<p>Report and recommendations from the TBG Task Force</p>	<p>The Range States took note of the report and recommendations of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force and adopted the Task Force workplan 2022/2023.</p> <p>Range States agreed on a harvest quota of 3.000 individuals (Finland – 1.740; Sweden – 900; Denmark – 360) for the 2022-2023 hunting season.</p>	
<p>Status of the ISSMP of the PfG</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the status of the Pink-footed Goose International Single Species Management Plan and its scheduled revision in 2024.</p>	
<p>Population Status and Assessment Report of the PfG</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report of the Pink-footed Goose and agreed on a harvest quota of 19.400 individuals for 2022-2023 (5.820 for Norway and 13.580 for Denmark).</p>	

<p>Report and Recommendations of the PfG TF</p>	<p>The Range States took note of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the Task Force workplan for 2022/2023.</p>	
<p>Report and recommendations of the Agriculture TF</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the Agriculture Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the Task Force workplan for 2022/2023.</p>	
<p>Update on EGMP National Reporting process</p>	<p>The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed template and workflow for submission of EGMP National Reports to EGM IWG8 in 2023.</p>	<p>The RSs will submit National Reports on biannual basis, using a Sharepoint table on Microsoft Teams. In the interim period, the Task Forces will keep the information in the tables up to date.</p>
<p>Changes to the EGMP Modus Operandi</p>	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the proposed changes to the EGM IWG Modus Operandi.</p>	
<p>EGMP Finance Report for 2021/2022</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the EGMP finance report for 2020-2021.</p> <p>The Range States approved the use of ca. €20.000 by the Data Centre from the projected carry-over budget into 2023 for the synthesis report on impact models.</p> <p>The UK pledged contribution of £37.500 to the 2022 EGMP budget.</p> <p>Denmark confirmed €55.000 contribution to the 2022 EGMP budget.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will provide a guidance on the definition of in-kind contributions to facilitate reporting to EGM IWG8.</p> <p>The comments made by the Netherlands will be taken into consideration in the EGMP finance report for 2022-2023.</p>

EGMP budget and costed Programme of Work for 2023	<p>The Range States agreed on the proposed EGMP budget for 2023 and adopted the suggested costed Programme of Work for 2023.</p> <p>The Range States agreed on the indicative scale of voluntary contributions (Annex 3 of this report).</p>	
Election of the new Chair of EGM IWG/Date and Venue of the next EGM IWG meeting	<p>Sweden was conditionally elected the next Chair of the EGM IWG, until final confirmation has been made by the Swedish delegation.</p> <p>In case of non-confirmation by Sweden, the UK will continue chairing the EGM IWG until EGM IWG8.</p> <p>The dates for the EGM IWG8 were set for the week of 19-24 June 2023. The venue for the EGM IWG8 was not identified at the meeting; RSs were invited to contact the Secretariat with expression of interest for hosting.</p>	

Day 1 (21 June 2022)

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, gave the floor to the Finnish Minister of Environment, Ms Maria Ohisalo and to the State Secretary of Agriculture and Forestry, Ms Ann-Mari Kemell for opening remarks.
2. Ms Maria Ohisalo opened the meeting welcoming the participants to the Finnish Ministry of the Environment and wishing them fruitful discussions. She stressed the importance of the Platform in helping the countries to address the issues of agricultural damage caused by abundant goose populations.
3. In her opening speech, Ms Ann-Mari Kemell highlighted that the Finnish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry had been supporting the establishment of the EGMP since its very beginning in 2016. She commended the diligent work of the Platform aimed at meeting the varying expectations of society in transparent and ethical ways.
4. The AEWA Executive Secretary, Dr Jacques Trouvilliez, expressed his sincere appreciation to the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry for hosting the 7th meeting of the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG7). He brought to everyone's attention that despite the global COVID-19 pandemic, the work of the Platform has continued delivering priority actions for the conservation and management of goose populations in Europe.
5. The Chair thanked the Host Government and the Secretariat for the fantastic work undertaken in preparation for the meeting.
6. Ms Eva Meyers, Coordinator of the EGMP, introduced the housekeeping rules and the guidelines of the meeting. Despite the meeting taking place in-person, a number of participants who could not travel to Helsinki were given an opportunity to join virtually. Further information on the attendance in-person or virtually is available in the list of participants (Annex 4 of this report).

Adoption of the Agenda

7. Mr Sergey Dereliev, Head of the AEWA Secretariat's Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit, noted that the Secretariat had the pleasure of working together with Prof Des Thompson as a Chair. However, the term of UK's chairmanship was coming to an end. Mr Dereliev invited the delegations to consider the possibilities for chairing the EGM IWG for the next biannual period, before Thursday, 23 June 2022 when the election of a new Chair was to be discussed.
8. In the absence of further comments from the meeting participants, the proposed meeting agenda was adopted.

Decision:

The meeting agenda (*doc. [AEWA/EGM IWG/7.2/Rev.1](#)*) was adopted with no amendments.

Admission of Permanent Observers and Expert Observers to EGM IWG7

9. It was announced that the EGM IWG7 host had a large delegation, in accordance with the Modus Operandi, with its members rotating between respective meeting days and agenda items. In addition, Dr Hans Baveco,

member of the EGMP International Modelling Consortium, was participating in the meeting as an invited expert.

Decision:

The Range States accepted the participation of Dr Hans Baveco in the meeting as an invited expert.

Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2021-2022)

10. Introducing this agenda item (*doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.3](#)), Ms Meyers and the Head of the EGMP Data Centre, Prof Jesper Madsen provided a brief overview of the current structure of the Secretariat and the Data Centre, and the work conducted within the past year. In 2021, the Platform has expanded with Ireland joining as a participating Range State (RS). The Secretariat was also pleased to see Spain attending the meeting as an observer to the Greylag Goose (GG) ISSMP implementation process.

11. Both the Secretariat and the Data Centre have experienced staff changes over the past year. Ms Tara Goodbody, an intern at the Secretariat, who supported the communications work and preparations to the EGM IWG7, has left as her internship came to an end. Ms Shenay Huseynova, previously an EGMP consultant, has joined the Secretariat in her new role as a Programme Management Assistant for the Platform. At the Data Centre, Dr Henning Heldbjerg has left his role as Goose Monitoring Coordinator. His tasks were taken over by Dr. Gitte Høj Jensen who previously held a position as a postdoctoral candidate at Aarhus University.

12. Ms Meyers thanked the EGMP Task Force (TF) coordinators for their dedicated work throughout the year, noting that one of the most successful initiatives put forward last year – EGMP webinar series – was put forward by TFs. The meeting participants were invited to propose topics of interest for the upcoming EGMP webinars.

13. The Data Centre has developed a [database](#) containing an overview of all information used for the annual assessments. The database can also be accessed through the [EGMP website](#), under the tab "Data". One of the most extended datasets in the database is the one for the Pink-footed Goose (PfG). All the scripts used for modelling work conducted both by the Data Centre and by the Dutch Modelling Consortium are readily available on the database.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre for 2021-2022.

Feedback Questionnaire on the EGMP perception

14. Presenting this agenda item, Ms Meyers explained that in the preparations to the EGM IWG7, the Secretariat had sent out a questionnaire to the EGM IWG to find out the preferences for the organisation of the meeting, including the length of meeting days and presentations, clarity of meeting documents, etc. The questionnaire also contained enquiries on the overall perception of the EGMP and processes within the Platform. 33 participants submitted their responses to the questionnaire. An overview of the responses is available in *doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.7.13](#).

15. The majority of respondents agreed that the meeting documents were well-written and comprehensible though there could be greater clarity of the decisions taken. The Secretariat invited the participants to ask for clarification if any of the discussion points or decisions remained unclear. The respondents confirmed good

understanding of the EGMP and its concepts as well as the processes. One of the weak points in EGMP, according to the questionnaire, is the limited nature of wider communications around the important work undertaken. Ms Meyers agreed that given the increasing importance of the Platform's work more capacity had to be invested into this area.

16. The Secretariat noted that one of the main moving forces behind the EGMP were the six TFs functioning under the Platform. During the Joint Meeting of the EGMP TFs on 20 June 2022, a brainstorming session took place to discuss the ways to improve their work. Ms Morag Milne and Mr Matt Parsons from the UK kindly volunteered to report on the outcomes of the session. It was agreed that the webinars and inclusive online meetings were among the things that worked well within the TFs. The TFs successfully connect people, information and science. However, the participants believed that the workload was not evenly spread between the TF members, which placed a significant burden on TF coordinators and the Secretariat. In addition, the TFs are not collaborating well enough despite overlapping agendas and numerous cross-cutting topics in their work. Academic findings need to be made accessible in a less technical format. Moreover, there is a lack of trust in the adaptive management process with a number of governments unable to commit resources.

17. In order to address the listed issues, it was suggested to strengthen the connection between TFs by coordinating the TF workplans, better collate and share information about the topics of priority for governments, creating active networking between science and policy representatives. The results of academic findings could be disseminated more effectively. Moreover, there is lack of capacity to analyse and interpret population and impact models. The TF members encouraged establishment of a pool of analysts for this purpose. **The TFs will take the discussion forward within their upcoming meetings and agree on an action plan to address the identified issues and needs.**

18. Commenting on the issue of mistrust in some quarters regarding 'adaptive management', Prof Madsen suggested this could be addressed through explanation of the basic underpinning concepts and ideas. While this is already being done through webinars, the Secretariat and Data Centre will place even more emphasis on such efforts.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the conclusions of the feedback questionnaire and Task Force meeting outcomes.

The TFs will discuss and agree on a set of actions to address the issues and needs identified during the brainstorming session.

EGMP Communication Plan

19. Introducing *doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.6](#)* which provided an overview on the variety of communication tools and approaches used in the EGMP, Ms Meyers asked the Working Group for guidance on the priorities for communication and their implementation as well as resources that could be directed towards this work.

20. The coordinator of the Agriculture TF, Dr Ingunn Tombre presented a summary of the communication discussion from the Joint Meeting of the EGMP TFs on 20 June 2022. It was agreed that considering the overlap in the membership of the TFs, some of the TF activities could be merged. Round tables presenting latest developments in the RSs have proven to be extremely useful. Moreover, webinars are seen as an effective tool for engaging stakeholders. The TF members believed that highlight documents such as briefing notes and fact sheets could be another way of boosting communication and engagement.

21. Prof. Madsen informed the participants about a goose theme day (focused on the Barnacle Goose (BG)) held in Denmark, recommending it as an excellent initiative giving an opportunity for multiple stakeholders to share latest knowledge and information on the topic.

22. On behalf of the Netherlands, Mr Nick Warmelink thanked the Secretariat for drafting the document and underpinned the importance of a clear communication strategy to improve communication work. Mr Warmelink offered to provide input from local/national context back to the EGMP where needed and stressed that the meeting should be mindful of Secretariats' capacity when further determining communication activities. He went on to confirm that the webinars as well as communication materials such as fact sheets and briefing notes could be very useful for the Netherlands for raising awareness and to improve understanding of the EGMP in general.

23. On behalf of Finland, Ms Nina Mikander seconded the need in communication materials produced by the Secretariat and suggested getting more relevant people engaged into the work of the TFs as another way of strengthening communication work.

24. Representing the European Commission (EC), Mr van der Stegen proposed potential topics for future EGMP webinars such as a webinar on estimating damage, accommodation areas and collection of bag and derogation data as a key for good monitoring.

25. The Secretariat thanked the countries for their input and called for concrete decisions to determine the ways forward. Some of the potential efforts such as a new website or advanced design for communication materials may require additional funding. Production of communication materials and organisation of webinars required active participation and support from the TFs and the EGM IWG.

26. It was agreed that an ad-hoc group including Mr Nick Warmelink, Ms Rae McKenzie, Dr Gitte Høj Jensen, Dr Ingunn Tombre and the Secretariat will be formed to discuss the communication issues and present the results and potential solutions to the TFs and EGM IWG. The Chair suggested for the ad-hoc group to also determine the target audience for the EGMP communication work.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the preliminary overview of communication items and tools for EGMP communication.

An ad-hoc group including Mr Nick Warmelink, Ms Rae McKenzie, Dr Gitte Høj Jensen, Dr Ingunn Tombre and the Secretariat was established which will discuss and suggest the way forward for improving EGMP communication work and report back to the EGM IWG and EGMP Task Forces.

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

27. The Secretariat presented the agenda item (*doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.7](#)), outlining AFMP elements and related deliverables and status of the work for the current six-year cycle (2020-2026).. The AFMP was adopted by the EGM IWG in 2021, moving the process to the implementation phase. The final version of the AFMP is available on the [EGMP website](#).

28. Dr Høj Jensen informed the participants on the status of the AFMP implementation. Damage impact models are underway in Norway (with data from both Islay, UK, and Vesterålen, Norway) and finalised in Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands. The Data Centre is putting in place the protocols for data collection.

One of the indicators to be collected in 2025 is the habitat damaged by GG. The RSs will need to collect it twice between 2020 – 2026.

29. The first assessment will take place in 2023; however, it is already known that the population size is below the 200% threshold as compared to the Favourable Reference Population (FRP). The RSs need to take note of this population estimate.

30. The EGM IWG was requested to acknowledge the proposed timeline for the following deadlines in 2022-2023:

- For the population model, an assessor must be appointed. In addition, an agreement on the interval of the production of the model estimates has to be reached by EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- Compilation of the impact models report and evaluation of use before EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- EGMP National Reports 2022-2023, to be submitted for EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- Agreement reached on how to “coordinate” offtake when needed by EGM IWG8 in 2023.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of Barnacle Goose and the proposed deadlines in 2022-2023.

The EGMP Data Centre will act as the assessor on the population model for the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of Barnacle Goose.

The EGMP Data Centre will compile the damage impact report.

Agreement on how to coordinate offtake will be discussed in the TF and presented at the EGM IWG8 in 2023.

Population Status and Assessment Report of the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland Population of the Barnacle Goose

31. Representing the UK, Ms Jessica Shaw elaborated on this agenda item (doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.10/Rev.2](#)). The FRP is 54.000 wintering individuals while the 200% threshold stand at 108.000 wintering individuals. As an Annex 1 species of the EU Birds Directive, the AFMP does not aim for a target population size. Current management strategy on Islay is aimed at reducing serious agricultural damage over a 10-year period (2014-2024).

32. The Integrated Population Model (IPM) was completed in 2022 with the first population assessment to take place in 2023. For 2022, only an update on the raw data is available. Work on an impact model is underway.

33. Last full census reported 72.000 birds in March 2020 with the next census approaching in March 2023. Annual counts on Islay over the past two years show lowest number of birds since 1994-1995; however, Islay mid-winter counts are higher than they have been for the past three years, averaging just under 37.000 birds.

34. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) was confirmed in the East Greenland population in Ireland in January 2022 and on Islay in February 2022 due to which derogation shooting on Islay was suspended in early

February 2022. The estimated losses to date are circa 1.000 birds on Islay and 1.700 birds in Ireland with no reports of confirmed HPAI-related losses elsewhere in the wintering range.

35. When it comes to reproduction, the proportion of juveniles on Islay in 2020 was 16.7% which is second highest on record.

36. Estimates from the IPM suggests a population decline, with 65.000 individuals which is below the 200% FRP value so RSs should agree on the level of allowable offtake.

Decisions:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report of the East Greenland/Scotland and Ireland population of the Barnacle Goose.

No decisions on management actions were taken at this meeting, as the next assessment informing decisions will take place in 2023 at EGM IWG8.

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

37. In her capacity as Greenland/Svalbard BG TF Coordinator, Ms Rae McKenzie presented the summary of *doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.13](#)* listing the aims of the TF such as assisting the implementation of the ISSMP for the BG and its corresponding AFMP and monitoring and reporting on the implementation of these activities to the EGM IWG. The TF has a good representation across the RSs and NGOs and is starting a closer collaboration with other EGMP TFs. TF members have contributed to the Agriculture TF meetings over the past year and have joined a number of webinars.

38. Work is underway with Scotland and Norway on the development of an impact model. Regarding the HPAI, there is no overview of the situation in Iceland. In Scotland, the avian influenza went through the Svalbard population really quickly, whereas there was not such a substantial impact on Islay. **The TF will take forward the discussions on the avian influenza situation after the meeting.**

39. Iceland reported that the survey conducted in the north of the country in April 2022 found no signs of avian influenza. No sick birds were discovered – they might have not made it all the way to Iceland. However, there is no clear answer.

40. Prof Madsen noted that the population assessment will be more complicated due to the situation with the avian influenza. More data needs to be gathered to determine its impact.

41. Concerning the development of IPM for the Svalbard population, the Data Centre did not see an imminent need for the population model for the BG Svalbard population and recommended focusing on getting the assessment for the East Greenland population first. Prof Madsen highlighted the importance of maintaining tight monitoring of the Svalbard population in view of the impact of avian influenza.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the Greenland/Svalbard Barnacle Goose Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the annual workplan of the Task Force.

Following the EGM IWG7, the Task Force will organise a meeting to discuss the impact of avian influenza on the population.

Progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose

42. Presenting the report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.8](#)*), the Secretariat explained that the purpose of the document was to keep an overview of the AFMP implementation status and reminded the RSs that the AFMP for the Russian BG population was up for revision in 2026. In addition to this 6-year cycle of the AFMP, there is a 12-year cycle of the ISSMP. The elements in the AFMP aim at fulfilling the overall goals of the ISSMP.

43. The Data Centre reported that national level impact models showing the relationship between goose numbers and damage have been developed. However, human resources are lacking to compile the synthesis report (due 2023) and plan its application in practice.

44. The first assessment of population size and offtake was done in 2022 by the Dutch Modelling Consortium. It is still unclear who will conduct the assessment in 2025 when it is due again. Although currently the assessment is done every 3 years, Dr Høj Jensen noted that it would be useful to run the model yearly in order to obtain an estimate and invited the RSs to express their opinion on the suggestion.

45. The EGM IWG was requested to take note of the following deadlines in 2022-2023:

- Compilation of the impact models report and evaluation of use before EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- EGMP National Reports 2022/2023, to be submitted for EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- Agreement on how to “coordinate” offtake when needed by EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- Systematic monitoring in place and development of fact sheets by the Data Centre and collaboration with Sovon and RSs by EGM IWG8 in 2023. It is important to note that some monitoring activities are still missing from some RSs. The Table 2 or the EGMP Population Status and Assessment Report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.10/Rev.2](#)*) provides a full overview of data availability.

46. Coordination of offtake is one of the main discussion points for the population. The Secretariat called on the EGM IWG to address the issue of the coordination of offtake in the light of the assessment outcomes for the Management Unit 3 (MU3). With the ISSMP not defining any management objective for the population of any MU, the decision of implementing derogations remained the sole responsibility of the individual RSs. The countries were reminded that the role of the AFMP was to prevent the population or any of its MUs from declining below the FRP. At EGM IWG6, the term “coordination²” was further defined, and the EC was asked to develop a guidance for the implementation of the Article 9 of the Birds Directive. The issue has been on the agenda of every BG TF meeting with no concrete outcome.

47. The EC clarified that a useful outcome of the yearly EGM IWG meeting would be to set a maximum number of birds at MU level (MU ceiling) that can be taken under derogations so that the population will be kept above the FRP. Then, it is up to the Range States to decide how to make sure that they will not collectively go beyond the ceiling. Coordination between those Range States to reach that objective would be useful. In

² As agreed at EGM IWG6, “coordination” in this context does not mean that RSs will be expected to *de facto* coordinate their use of derogations under the EGMP. EU Member States, in particular, maintain their full rights to make use of derogations as provided under the EU Birds Directive.

any case, the requirements of Article 9 of the Birds Directive need to be respected for any derogation. If the offtake would go beyond the ceiling, it could trigger an infringement.

48. The Secretariat clarified the following points as being the role of the EGMP in this process:

- EGM IWG Range States provide the data on offtake (hunting and derogation) to the EGMP Data Centre periodically;
- EGMP Data Centre / Modelling Consortium runs the annual assessments;
- Results (population trends, consequences of decisions / recommendations) are provided and discussed periodically at EGM IWG;
- EGM IWG is made aware of results, scenarios, legal obligations and consequences;
- EGM IWG Range States make decisions on actions to take (bilaterally or within the EGM IWG);
- **EGMP role: Facilitate a dialogue, as appropriate and necessary.**

49. The Secretariat was ready to facilitate the dialogue between the concerned RSs in line with all other legal obligations and principles of the Platform as well as analyse the effects of the measures applied by RSs and present the outcomes at the following EGM IWG meeting.

50. The EC pointed out that having the assessment framework allowing for different scenarios was extremely helpful to avoid going below the FRP, which would result in legal consequences for the Member States to the EC.

51. Speaking on behalf of the Netherlands and the Federal States of Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein, Mr Warmelink supported the need for coordination on BG in MU3. Since there are no examples on how to arrange this type of coordination, time is needed to explore the best practices for shaping and formalising this coordination. A trilateral meeting with the two German Federal States will therefore be planned with the outcomes to be reported to the BG TF and circulated to the EGM IWG.

52. Given that the Belgian breeding population is small and not naturally occurring, Belgium saw no role in the aforementioned coordination process. However, as an MU3 country, the Netherlands and Germany will keep Belgium informed on the coordination process.

53. Mr Warmelink went on to specify that the countries would request assistance from the AEWA Secretariat, and that the process may require moderation or specific knowledge. Since coordination arrangements are a new practice for BG, the Netherlands will strive for an adaptive and iterative approach, allowing for adjusting and refining along the way if needed, to ensure the effectiveness of the arrangements. Considering that goose management is delegated to the 12 Dutch provinces, there is also a need to develop coordination arrangements at the regional level. The Goose Task Force under the Association of Provinces in the Netherlands (IPO) will be in the lead for developing coordination arrangements among the provinces. Ahead of these provincial coordination arrangements which will take into account the MU3's current status, it was reported that the Province of Noord-Holland had already decided to halt derogation permits for MU3 of BG in Noord-Holland, in response to the population numbers presented by the EGMP.

54. The Secretariat was pleased to see progress on the issue and was ready to respond to any requests within the limits of the capacity. Mr Dereliev highlighted that this case would not set precedents for any future need of coordination on any other population, but nevertheless presented an interesting example to take note of.

55. On behalf of the German Federal States, Mr Babak Miller expressed full agreement with the statements from the Netherlands. Germany aimed to reach a formalised coordination in nearest future, without the pressure of having it as a precedent, and saw it as a valuable learning experience.

56. As a part of the wider discussion on the use of derogations, Finland reiterated the need for a specific guidance from the EC on the application of the Article 9 of the Birds Directive, pointing out that it would help ensuring compliance of the EC Member States. The EC agreed to consider the request noting that a document had been developed on the Great Cormorant, common principles of which could be applied to the BG.

57. Ms Mikander from Finland supported the suggestion to run the population model on an annual basis given that no additional funding would be required and reported that efforts were underway to collect more productivity data for MU2. The Data Centre confirmed that no resources would be needed for the yearly assessment until 2024 when the project was coming to an end.

58. In the view of foreseen decrease in derogations, Mr Cy Griffin from FACE invited the RSs to discuss and consider alternative ways of reducing the damage such as scaring techniques. The Data Centre seconded the suggestion noting that it would be an excellent webinar topic.

59. Mr Koffijberg explained that the derogations in the Netherlands can easily be reduced just by doing less catches of breeding birds during moult.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose and the important deadlines coming up in 2022-2023.

The EGM IWG agreed that coordination of offtake will take place on a case-by-case basis for populations and management units that drop below the 200% threshold (as stated in the AFMP). Should a population or MU drop below this threshold, the role of the EGMP will be to facilitate dialogue, as appropriate and necessary, among the Range States.

A trilateral discussion on how to coordinate offtake will take place between the Netherlands and German Federal States of Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein. The outcomes of will be communicated to the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population and circulated to EGM IWG.

The RSs agreed that the Integrated Population Model should be run on an annual basis, given that it would not require additional resources. The model will be run by the Dutch Modelling consortium, up until at least 2024.

The EGMP Data Centre will compile the damage impact report.

The EC took note and agreed to consider the request from Finland to develop a guidance on the application of the Article 9 of the Birds Directive

Population Status and Assessment Report of the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose

60. On behalf of Sovon, Mr Kees Koffijberg outlined the main conclusions for the agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.10/Rev.2](#)*). The FRP is 380.000 individuals. The management strategy is aimed to prevent the flyway population to level below FRP, with caution measures to be taken when population is below 200% of the FRP. The assessment made through IPM mainly focuses on identifying the derogation efforts implemented in the RSs and the impact of hunting in Russia on the population. An integrated approach is in use meaning that all MUs are part of the same structure. An IPM for the Russia population was presented in 2021 and has now been extended to MUs 2&3. The offtake data is mainly based on derogation data. The collection of data is a combined effort of an extensive network of people.

61. The flyway population is estimated at 1.4 million individuals with 90% of flyway population being of Russian origin. Within Europe, more than 73.000 individuals were subject to derogation in 2020, of which 67% accounts for the Netherlands. With respect to reproduction, the population shows a large fluctuation and an overall decline in breeding success in the long term.

62. The current level of the derogation would not affect the MU 1&2 and the Baltic populations; however, the North Sea population (MU3) is expected to drop below the 200% of FRP threshold in the next years. Avian influenza will have an additional impact on the population – some preliminary estimates on its effects have been run in the IPM. In order to keep MU3 population above FRP, derogation effort needs to be halved to stop decline and more than halved to recover to a level well above FRP.

63. Mr Koffijberg pointed out the current data issues. For MU2, there are no summer counts or productivity estimates from Sweden, but also no annual coverage in Norway and Denmark. The MU3 is mainly based on data from the Netherlands. Since derogation data is difficult to assign to MUs, it would be helpful to have estimates for July-January and January-July periods. The IPM will be reviewed in autumn 2022 with the accuracy of the results depending on the level of precision in derogation data.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands populations of the Barnacle Goose.

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

64. In the current absence of a TF coordinator, Mr Warmelink from the Netherlands has kindly volunteered to draft and present the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.14](#)*). There have been some changes in the TF membership, with the TF coordinator Ms Wilmar Remmelts, Dr Henning Heldbjerg from the Data Centre and Mr Esko Hyvarinen from Finland leaving the TF and new members joining the TF to represent the Dutch provinces, Norway and Nordic Hunters' Alliance. The TF had three online meetings with rotating chairs in the period 2021-2022.

65. Among the key activities of the TF, Mr Warmelink listed implementation and update of the TF workplan, work on the impact models and monitoring activities as well as discussions on habitat conservation measures and coordination of derogations. The TF is planning to start collecting examples of successful habitat conservation measures and projects to benefit BG conservation and management.

66. The TF recommendations include expansion of summer counts, with particular focus on Sweden and expansion of productivity data in Sweden and Denmark. The TF also encouraged the EGM IWG to allow for annual intermediate population assessment on the basis of available data to improve understanding of the population trends. Furthermore, timely provision of the monthly resolution of data to assign the offtake to MUs would be very helpful.

67. Ms Meyers alerted the Working Group about the urgent need for a TF coordinator offering different options such as rotating temporary coordination of the TF or a one-year term for the coordinator. Without the coordinator, the Secretariat would not have the necessary capacity to continue coordinating the activities of the TF.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the report and recommendations of the Barnacle Goose Task Force for Russia/Germany & Netherlands population and adopted the TF workplan for 2022/2023.

The Secretariat and TF will continue the search for a TF coordinator.

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

68. Reporting on *doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.9](#)*, the Secretariat explained that the GG AFMP followed the same process as the two other AFMPs while the objectives of the management were different than for BG. The information gap decision model was adopted, with the AFMP being in the implementation phase this year and the revision coming up in 2026. Funding has been secured for the decision model including both MUs, which is being developed by Dr Fred Johnson from the Data Centre. 2023 would be the first year to do the assessment based on the flyway decision model. The EGM IWG was expected to make a recommendation in terms of optimal harvest strategies. Another decision had to be made on the way to run the modelling on an annual basis. It is yet to be defined who was to run the process.

69. The RSs were requested to take note that help was needed for a flyway model of population dynamics, a set of decision alternatives (i.e. varying levels of offtake in each MU) and a value model. Fiscal and personnel resources are needed to compile the report and evaluate the use of the impact models in goose management.

70. The EGM IWG was also requested to acknowledge the proposed timeline for the following deadlines in 2022-2023, in addition to the routine tasks:

- Flyway decision model, including population models developed by EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- Compilation of the impact models report and evaluation of use before EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- EGMP National Reports 2022/2023, to be submitted for EGM IWG8 in 2023;
- Systematic monitoring in place and development of factsheets by the Data Centre in collaboration with RSs by EGM IWG8 in 2023.

71. The Data Centre alerted the participants that some monitoring data was still missing from some RSs. The Table 2 or the [EGMP Population Status and Assessment Report](#) provides an overview of data availability and current gaps.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the progress report on the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose and acknowledged the upcoming deadlines in 2022/2023.

The EGMP Data Centre will compile the damage impact report.

Population Status and Assessment Report of the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose

72. Referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.10/Rev.2](#), the Data Centre reported that the FRP was 31.000 breeding pairs for MU1 and 72.980 breeding pairs for MU2. The management strategy and assessment protocol has been based on information gap decision model. The RSs agreed on the management criteria of 15% reduction of the flyway population over the next 10 years.

73. The population has stabilised in the recent years with some uncertainties. The overall population is estimated at above one million individuals while, excluding the estimates from Spain, it stands at around 865.000 individuals. Given the data gaps, it is difficult to conclude if the population trend is decreasing or increasing. In this light, Ms Høj Jensen emphasised the importance of a better monitoring data from Spain. The Data Centre has approached Ms Serrano Ruiz de Dulanto, the Spanish observer to the EGM IWG, hoping to identify ways of addressing the data gap.

74. Dr Høj Jensen outlined the establishment of the summer counts and submission of a reliable up-to-date offtake data (both derogation and harvest) as preconditions for moving to dynamic model-based population management. She went on to specify that the derogation data had to be assignable to the MUs.

75. For MU1, establishment of summer counts is currently being explored in Norway (partly and at irregular intervals), Finland, Sweden and Denmark. The frequency of summer counts (three- or six-year cycle) is still to be decided. Summer counts for MU2 are already taking place in the Netherlands and Belgium. France has also started a project which will provide the breeding population numbers every six years.

76. The Data Centre pointed out a gap in the data from Germany needed to calculate the breeding bird index which shows the population trends in the area. In terms of mortality, hunting bag data from the recent years is missing from Germany. No survival rates have been calculated since the ISSMP, but work is ongoing in France and the Netherlands. Dr Høj Jensen concluded by thanking all the data providers.

77. As a summary, the Data Centre presented the following requirements for the dynamic model-based management of the population:

1. Summer counts to estimate the population size at the MU level
 - Interval of summer counts remain to be agreed upon plus counts from other regions in Germany;
 - Breeding bird index from Germany (and Belgium).
2. Reliable and up-to-date offtake data (both derogation and harvest) which, in terms of derogation, can be assigned to MUs
 - Hunting bag from Germany and France (1 year time lag);
 - Biannual derogation (and hunting bag) information (April-June and August-March);

- Bias in estimates of offtake.

78. With regard to the offtake bias, the Netherlands acknowledged that the quality of the Dutch derogation data for GG could be improved. The Wildlife Management Unit Noord-Holland has conducted research on potential causes for decreased quality of derogation data for GG. It is unclear to what degree the different potential causes have contributed to divergent derogation data. For the majority of potential causes found, it is not possible to reconstruct derogation data from the past. With these research results in hand, the Dutch National and Provincial governments will again discuss the options for improving the system that currently produces derogation data.

79. On behalf of the EC, Mr van der Stegen highlighted the importance of the population model urging the countries to be cautious when it comes to the take of the migratory birds. He raised a concern about the management of MU1. The Spanish population is not well estimated but might be decreasing. The management of MU1 should not put into danger that part of the population. This would need to deserve attention in the future.

80. The Data Centre endorsed the suggested cautionary approach and informed the participants that projects on differentiating the two MUs were underway in the Netherlands with the aim of making sure management targets the right population.

81. Dr Nagy from Wetlands International alerted the EGM IWG about the need for a separate discussion on the differentiation of the two populations.

Decisions:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose and acknowledged the requirements for the planned move to the model-based management of the population in 2023.

No decisions on management actions were made, as the first assessment will take place in 2023.

Report and Recommendations of the Greylag Goose Task Force

82. Introducing *doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.15](#)*, Ms Iben Hove Sørensen, in her capacity as GG TF coordinator, informed the EGM IWG on the main activities of the TF over the past year. The TF membership is represented by seven RSs and five NGOs. The TF has been supporting the ongoing work by providing feedback to updates from the Secretariat, Data Centre, Modelling Consortium and Fennoscandian Greylag Goose Initiative (FGGI), supporting monitoring programmes and modelling work, participating in EGMP webinars and helping the Secretariat to produce the GG briefing note and EGM IWG documents.

83. The TF presented the following recommendations to the EGM IWG:

- All RSs to strive to provide the necessary data to switch from the current information gap analysis to a dynamic model-based decision-making in 2023, including:
 - Submitting International Waterbird Census data before 1 March (the following year);
 - Collecting and submitting hunting data at MU-level to the EGMP Data Centre;
 - Providing derogation data to the EU or the EGMP Data Centre (also at MU-level);

- Submitting annual summer counts and Common Breeding Bird Index to the EGMP Data Centre.

- The EGM IWG to strive to define utility (stakeholder satisfaction) as a function of population size.

84. The recommendations also included strengthening the exchanges and collaboration between TFs and promotion of EGMP communication efforts by GG TF.

85. The TF workplan, among other actions, suggested for the TF to investigate GG crippling rates and seek collaboration on reducing crippling rates of goose species, keep the online [workplan](#) active and updated between meetings and participate and contribute to the EGMP webinars.

Decision:

The Range States took note of the Greylag Goose Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the Task Force workplan for 2022/2023.

Impact Models for Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose

86. Prof Madsen from the Data Centre gave the participants an update on the development of impact models for GG and BG. The work on the impact models is conducted to address the requirements for AFMP concerning damage and site protection listed in Box 1 of the BG and GG ISSMP, in particular point 4 – “*understanding of the link between population level damages or risk*”. So far, the main focus has been on the BG, with the GG impact model being at a less advanced stage.

87. Prof Madsen went on to provide an overview of the research work for the impact models by RSs. Sweden was very fast in providing validation of the work, thanks to work by Johan Månsson and co-workers. The analysis was finalised in 2018 and is based on data up to 2015. In Denmark, there is a derogation system in place. Thus, the research looked at the distribution of BG across Denmark and the issuing of derogation licenses. The research was published in 2022 and is available publicly. In the Netherlands, the work was picked up by the Dutch Modelling Consortium and applied both comparison of compensation against abundances as well as predictive modelling. Observational methods based on exposure experiments were used in Scotland. The work is to be finalised by the end of 2023. Norwegian research is based on exclosure experiments from the Vesterålen. Impressive work has been going on in Lower Saxony in Germany – exclosure experiments have been conducted there since 1990s, making it the strongest observational dataset showing evolution of goose numbers and damage.

88. Synthesis of the work across RSs will be done in 2023, one year behind the schedule. Funding is needed for this research to be done by the Data Centre. The final report will be presented at EGM IWG8 in 2023.

89. In conclusion, Prof Madsen presented the table below with an overview of research approaches and status of work per RS and asked the participants to contact the Data Centre if they know of any datasets that were not on the list.

Country	Species	Approach	Habitat	Status	Note
<u>Sweden</u>	BG, GG	<u>Observational; Time series; compensation costs vs abundances</u>	All <u>agricultural</u>	<u>Published (2019)</u>	<u>Can potentially be updated</u>
Denmark	BG	<u>Observational; spatial; derogations permits vs abundances</u>	All <u>agricultural</u>	<u>Published (2022)</u>	
Denmark	BG, GG	<u>Predictive; Agent-based model</u>	All <u>agricultural but focus on grass</u>	<u>In prep</u>	
<u>The Netherlands</u>	BG	<u>Observational; time series; compensation costs vs abundances</u>	Grass	<u>In prep</u>	
<u>The Netherlands</u>	BG	<u>Predictive; individual-based model</u>	Grass	<u>In prep</u>	
<u>Scotland (Islay)</u>	BG	<u>Observational; exclusions with time series</u>	Grass	<u>In prep</u>	
<u>Norway (Vesterålen)</u>	BG	<u>Observational; time series of sward height vs abundances; exclusions</u>	Grass	Some of the data published in 2021	
<u>Germany (Lower Saxony)</u>	BG	<u>Observational; exclusions with time series</u>	Grass	<u>In review</u>	

90. The EGM IWG was asked to take note of the progress report, decide whether further impact models should be developed for agricultural damage and come up with a decision on the funding of the work on impact models.

Decision:

The Range States took note of the presentation on the status of impact models for Barnacle and Greylag Geese.

Day 2 (22 June 2022)

Presentation from the host – Taiga Bean Goose (TBG) Conservation in Finland

91. Mr Pitkanen acquainted the meeting participants with the timeline of TBG conservation efforts in Finland. The first concerns about disappearing geese from traditional breeding mires was raised in 2005. Local hunters reported the situation. While the first monitoring efforts were not successful, in 2010 a local Game Management Association from Pelkosenniemi, Lapland, proposed a hunting ban of TBG for its own area which was a wake-up call for the rest of the country. From 2011-2013, hunting seasons were gradually shortened year by year by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, which now regulated the hunting legislation instead of the districts. In years 2014-2016, the hunting of Bean Goose was totally banned by (annual) Ministerial Decrees. 2017 saw a substantial hunting reform assigning quotas per hunter and banning certain hunting devices and methods, among other measures. Making Adaptive Harvest Management for TBG possible was an important motivation for the reform. In 2020-2021, the hunting was allowed again in breeding areas of Lapland, after six years of moratorium. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry places emphasis on engaging hunters in regional workshops and, given that the population trends allow for hunting, it acknowledges the value of the traditional hunting culture in the Northern mires important for breeding geese.

92. Responding to a question from FACE on the cycles for setting hunting seasons, Mr Pitkanen noted that the tendency in Finland was to give preference to an adaptive management of hunting and set the seasons on an annual basis. Receiving the monitoring data in summer allows time to do the legislative process in autumn.

Status of the ISSAP of the TBG

93. Mr Dereliev reminded the EGM IWG that revision was coming up for the ISSAP for TBG and the ISSMP for PfG. The TBG ISSAP, which was adopted in 2015, is up for evaluation and revision in 2025. Mr Dereliev noted that having to revise two plans within a triennium was not a small task, but Secretariat expected close support and engagement of the respective TFs in this work. It was planned to discuss the resources and further planning for the revision of the plans with the TF coordinators after the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties to the AEWA (26-30 September 2022).

94. The TBG TF coordinator, Mr Mikko Alhainen reported that a proposal had been submitted to AEWA MOP8 to change the population delineation of the Taiga Bean Goose. The MUs of the ISSMP satisfy the requirement for separate flyway populations (according to criteria established by the AEWA Technical Committee and approved by the Contracting Parties). The possible change to flyway populations of the Taiga Bean Goose would lead to conceptual changes in the structure of the ISSAP while the status quo would be kept in the practical implementation. Preparation of the revision, including fundraising, is planned for 2023-2024 while the revision itself will take place in 2024-2025.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the update on the status of the Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan and the scheduled revision of the ISSAP by 2025.

Population Status and Assessment Report for the Taiga Bean Goose

95. Presenting this agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.10/Rev.2](#)*) on behalf of the Data Centre, Dr Fred Johnson discussed the status of the Western, Central, and Eastern Management Units. For the Western Management Unit (WMU), mid-winter is deemed the best time for the annual census. A population increase was observed in the WMU in 2022, but this was likely due to better survey coverage in Denmark. This

population remains far below its short-term target of 4.000 individuals. The productivity count done in October-December of 2021 in Scotland suggested 12% young, which is similar to previous years, but lower than that seen historically.

96. For the Central Management Unit (CMU), corrections and revisions to some historical data, along with the annual update of the Integrated Population Model (IPM), led to some changes in estimates of abundance and demographic parameters from previous years. The interim harvest strategy is to prescribe allowable quotas that would permit the population to reach its median goal (70.000) by March 2025. Quotas allocations are: 58% for Finland, 30% for Sweden, and 12% for Denmark (the Russian harvest is unknown and is subsumed in natural mortality). The population is estimated three times a year – in March, October and January. The CMU population has shown an increase in all months since the introduction of hunting restrictions in Finland.

97. In terms of mortality in the CMU, harvest rates below 10% are associated with increasing population size. As for productivity, the average proportion of young in the autumn of 2021 was 24%. Total harvest has averaged 2.955 during the years of interim harvest strategy (2017-2021). Harvests have declined in Finland and Denmark due to hunting restrictions. The interim strategy suggests a harvest quota of 2.000 (Finland – 1.160; Sweden – 600; Denmark – 240).

98. There is no new information available on the status of the Eastern Management Unit (EMU) since 2020. Thus, there is insufficient basis to support a harvest strategy in the EMU.

99. Based on the presented conclusions, the RSs were recommended to:

- Confirm standing recommendation of no hunting for the WMU;
- Agree on total harvest quota and allocation for the 2022-2023 hunting season for CMU. Considering that the interim strategy is to reach 70.000 in spring by 2025, the suggested interim harvest quota is 2.000 (Finland – 1.160; Sweden – 600; Denmark – 240).

100. Mr Alhainen noted that a quota of 3.000 individuals would as well allow for population growth, but without a set timeline to reach the target of 70.000 individuals.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report for the Taiga Bean Goose.

Report and recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force

101. As reported by the TBG TF Coordinator, Mr Alhainen the TF has had fewer meetings in the past year due to the absence of urgent issues and tasks. The TF supported the development of the TBG briefing note, the proposal to AEWA MOP8 to change the population delineation of the Taiga Bean Goose as well as EGM IWG8 documents, including the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.12](#)*).

102. In consistency with the recommendations from the EGM IWG6, the implementation status of the non-AHM workplan has been presented in the report. In addition, TBG counts in Poland and Germany have been strengthened and an improved understanding of the population size is foreseen to be available in near future. October and March counts have been continued as far as possible under the COVID-19 restrictions.

103. The recommendations of the TF included:

- Continuing and strengthening January counts for population size estimates and the delineation of MUs in overlapping wintering areas;
- Continue October and March counts in the CMU for the data generation for the IPM and prepare to extend the coordinated counts to Finland and Denmark by 2023.

104. In terms of AHM, Mr Alhainen alerted the Working Group that the population was at target size, and it was therefore important to avoid any decline. The TF supports the recommendation of the Data Centre to agree the harvest level of 2.000 allowing the population to reach 70.000 in 2025.

105. Sweden reported that there was no open season for hunting in the country; however, hunting TBG is allowed for farmers with the sole intention of protecting crops. The country noted that there was no guarantee that they would stay within the suggested quota, given that Bean Geese can cause serious damage to certain crops. In response to Sweden's statement, Mr Alhainen explained that it would not be critical if the quota was exceeded in some years as long as it could be balanced out in previous/following years.

106. Taking into consideration Sweden's intervention, the RSs agreed on a quota of 3.000 individuals (Finland – 1.740; Sweden – 900; Denmark – 360) for the 2022-2023 hunting season.

107. On behalf of the EC, Joseph van der Stegen enquired about the reasons justifying that the proposed quota (3.000) was higher than the recommended quota (2.000) based on the model (for reaching the previously agreed interim objective of 70.000 ind. by 03/2025). Mr Alhainen explained that the higher quota was adopted due to Sweden's comments alerting the RSs that the country cannot guarantee staying within the quota of 2.000 individuals.

108. Mr Alhainen went on to explain that the technical capacity was there to move to dynamic harvest strategy. This leads up to the need of a discussion and decision on the trade-offs between population and harvest management objectives. He invited the RSs to start the discussion as part of the ISSAP revision process. The work is foreseen to take place within next three years.

109. According to the suggested workplan, the TF would continue supporting the implementation of the ISSAP, the non-AHM workplan and other recommended activities.

110. Representing Wetlands International, Dr Nagy noted that the discussion concerning the move to dynamic harvest strategy should be given sufficient time. The population target has not been set based on proper assessment of FRVs for population size and habitat. This is a task to be considered in preparation for the revision of the ISSAP. Dr Nagy also reported that there was a discrepancy between taxonomies which would be discussed with BirdLife International following AEWA MOP8.

111. Mr Alhainen hoped to be able to keep the simplicity of the TBG ISSAP despite the foreseen complex discussions on derogation.

Decisions:

The Range States took note of the report and recommendations of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force and adopted the Task Force workplan 2022/2023.

Range States agreed on a harvest quota of 3.000 individuals (Finland – 1.740; Sweden – 900; Denmark – 360) for the 2022-2023 hunting season.

Status of the Pink-footed Goose International Single Species Management Plan (PfG ISSMP)

112. The head of EGMP Data Centre and PfG TF coordinator, Prof Madsen informed the participants that the ISSMP was up for revision in 2024 while the process for evaluation and revision of the plan had to be set up immediately. He added that overall, the plan had demonstrated success achieving several key objectives, but the system was rapidly changing, and geese were developing new breeding grounds and migratory pathways out of the box. Due to resource restrictions, the monitoring program has been cut with consequences for the Data Center's ability to track the changes, however, not significantly affecting the performance of assessments in the shorter term. It is important to communicate the EGMP work to gain public and political awareness and attention. The PfG is a good candidate in this context, with many compelling stories from the flyway and a descriptor of the EGMP process and results.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the status of the Pink-footed Goose International Single Species Management Plan and its scheduled revision in 2024.

Population Status and Assessment Report of the Pink-footed Goose

113. Dr Johnson from the Data Centre introduced this agenda item (*doc.* [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.10/Rev.2](#)), reporting that the population size has generally been stable since the implementation of the AHM in 2013. Following poor reproduction in 2021, the population declined from 79.122 in May 2021 to 71.393 in May 2022. In terms of productivity, the proportion of young in the autumn of 2021 was 15%, compared to a long-term average of 20%. Adult harvest rates were increasing prior to AHM in 2013, but have been relatively stable since, and annual survival (all causes) has generally been declining during the period of record.

114. Relying on the reported information, the Data Centre suggested the EGM IWG adopt an optimal harvest quota of 19.400 individuals based on a population size of 71.393 individuals and 11 days above freezing in May 2022 in Svalbard (5.820 for Norway and 13.580 for Denmark). Realised harvest has averaged 12.900 individuals during the last five years, which is 66 % of this year's quota.

115. On behalf of Norway, Ms Tombre pointed out that the production of young was quite low and the hunters had reported that most of the geese shot were adult. Alerting the Data Centre that this trend will eventually affect the population, she inquired whether this had been reflected in the assessment. Responding to Norway, Dr Johnson said that the model did not account for tracking harvest rates separately for adults and young. The model assumes that the relative vulnerability of young and adults to harvest does not change from year to year, when in fact it likely does. That is something that can be looked into in the future.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the population status and assessment report of the Pink-footed Goose and agreed on a harvest quota of 19.400 individuals for 2022-2023 (5.820 for Norway and 13.580 for Denmark).

Report and Recommendations of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force

116. The PfG TF coordinator, Prof Madsen started his presentation on the agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.11](#)*) by thanking the TF participants for their commitment. It was a quiet year for the TF in terms of decisions, which is expected to change in the coming year 2022/2023. The TF activities in the previous year revolved around the internal review of annual monitoring and review of the draft manuscript regarding challenges of the use of autumn age counts to assess annual productivity. Efforts were continued to improve international exchange between hunting organisation and hunters and their contribution to data collection. As an outcome of the last activity, Norwegian contribution has been submitted on the aging of shot geese in 2021-2022.

117. The TF recommendations suggested planning the input for the forthcoming revision of the ISSMP. This involved setting up the process to assess the attainment of population target/objectives of the current Plan, development of an AFMP and a decision on the newly established flyway. The TF had to decide whether the new flyway could be regarded as a new MU or qualified to be a new population. In addition, the TF had to address the monitoring taking into account the reduced funding. When it came to communication initiatives, the TF will be involved in development of the concept of a visitors' centre under construction focusing on geese in Western Jutland, Denmark. Further communication initiatives include an article on communicating science to be published in the Norwegian Hunters' Magazine. Also a film reportage have been produced within the "goose project", by Ove M Gundersen (Norwegian Farmers' Association). The film aims to highlight the use of science to inform management decisions, with PfG as an example.

118. The TF workplan included the plan for assessment to be used for the ISSMP revision in 2024. In 2023, the TF will go through preparing the evaluation and revision.

119. Wetlands International confirmed that based on the discussions on flyways in the AEWA Technical Committee, the new PfG migration route corresponded to the criteria for a new flyway.

120. In regard to the communications work, it was suggested that the TF got in touch with Wetlands International to find out about their initiative on migratory birds and people network.

121. Replying to the question about crippling data, Prof Madsen said that there had not been an opportunity to catch geese in the last years. The Data Centre has received a sample this year, based on a catch of PfG in Trøndelag, Norway, April 2022.

122. In response to the question from EC on whether setting FRVs and a FRP target for PfG will be reflected in the revised ISSMP, Prof Madsen confirmed that this was envisioned under the revision, but had to be discussed within the TF and with the Secretariat first.

Decision:

The Range States took note of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the Task Force workplan for 2022/2023.

Report and recommendations of the Agriculture TF

123. As documented by the TF coordinator, Dr Ingunn Tombre, in the TF report (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.16](#)*), the TF has organised three webinars over the past year, dedicated to the topics of agricultural conflict and goose-friendly initiatives to mitigate agricultural conflicts. The work continued on updating the metadata overview of all scientific projects and research in the field. It was also planned to transfer all the collected data to a Google document and sort the database according to the kind of activities.

124. The TF workplan particularly focused on the liaison with the farmers affected by goose damage to reduce agricultural conflicts. The TF has stakeholder groups and is expecting for them to communicate to their networks. It was noted that the webinars were an effective tool to involve stakeholders such as farmers.

125. The TF planned to continue assisting the EGM IWG, other TFs and processes under the EGMP and continue organising webinars.

126. The Netherlands reported that discussions were underway in Friesland on a project using satellite imagery to estimate damage caused by geese.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the Agriculture Task Force report and recommendations and adopted the Task Force workplan for 2022/2023.

Day 3 (23 June 2022)

Update on EGMP National Reporting Process

127. Presenting document [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.5](#), Ms Meyers reminded the participants that at EGM IWG6 the Working Group agreed on the use of a shared online table for national reporting. An updated table is to be extracted periodically and presented to the EGM IWG. It was also agreed that the progress of activities would be closely monitored by the respective TFs as well as the Secretariat and the Data Centre. This will reduce the reporting burden for RSs since the workplans are constantly kept up to date. The RSs agreed on a two-year reporting cycle.

128. The Secretariat suggested to agree on a shared online table for national reporting using Sharepoint in a common Microsoft Teams folder. The RSs would report against the activities of the workplans developed for the species-specific action and management plans. Additional questions can be added to the tables if necessary. The columns of the table would include information on the type of, priority, timescale, actions implemented by the Data Centre and Modelling Consortium, cross-cutting actions, TF workplans and national workplans.

Decisions and Actions

The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed template and workflow for submission of EGMP National Reports to EGM IWG8 in 2023.

The RSs will submit National Reports on biannual basis, using a Sharepoint table on Microsoft Teams. In the interim period, the Task Forces will keep the information in the tables up-to-date.

Changes to the EGMP Modus Operandi

129. Referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.4](#), the Secretariat explained that the UK and Germany had submitted proposals for changes to Rule 31 of EGMP Modus Operandi.

130. The proposed changes by the UK (in red) on 6 April 2022 were as follows:

FINANCING

Rule 31

The annual running costs for the European Goose Management Platform, including for the EGM IWG, will be provided by the Range States to the Platform, as decided by the EGM IWG, on the basis of an indicative scale of voluntary contributions adopted by the EGM IWG.

Contributions made by countries that become new participating Range States to the EGM IWG after the beginning of a financial period shall be made pro rata temporis for the balance of that financial period. Consequent adjustments shall be made at the end of each financial period for other Range States.

The proposed changes submitted by Germany on 4 May 2022 apply to the same Rule:

FINANCING

Rule 31

The annual running costs for the European Goose Management Platform, including for the EGM IWG, will be provided by the Range States to the Platform, as decided by the EGM IWG, on the basis of an indicative scale of voluntary contributions adopted by the EGM IWG, with the exception for those Range States that put in a reservation regarding the indicative scale of voluntary contributions.

Contributions made by countries that become new participating Range States to the EGM IWG after the beginning of a financial period shall be made pro rata temporis for the balance of that financial period. Consequent adjustments shall be made at the end of each financial period for other Range States.

131. After reviewing the proposed modifications, the EGM IWG agreed to adopt them.

Decision:

The EGM IWG adopted the proposed changes to the EGM IWG Modus Operandi.

EGMP Finance Report 2021-2022

132. Introducing this agenda item (*doc. [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.17/Rev.1](#)*), Mr Dereliev noted that just above €318.000 was spent in 2021, which is €150.000 less than the agreed budget. Most of the savings made were by the Secretariat. The projected expenditure for 2022 is € 383.026.

133. Mr Dereliev explained that there was an established reserve in order to allow the Secretariat and the Data Centre to function in the first months of the year before the contributions start flowing. The Secretariat started 2022 with a full reserve and a head start of €86.654.

134. The post of the EGMP Programme Assistant has been filed which will be generating stable expenses and elevating expenditures in 2022/2023.

135. Mr Dereliev concluded saying that annual contributions provided continued being short of reaching the full agreed budget – 10% short in 2021 and projected 54% in 2022; however, the Secretariat was working to bridge the gap. The current funding gap for 2022 against the agreed budget was €250.243.

136. By the end of 2022, the Secretariat and the Data Centre expect further contributions to the EGMP budget amounting to over €100.000. This will provide for fully replenished reserves both at the Secretariat and the Data Centre and an additional €80.000 – 90.000 head start into 2023. The Head of the EGMP Data Centre, Prof Madsen suggested to use €20.000 from this estimated carry-over budget into 2023 for the project on synthesis of impact models. The work on the synthesis report is done in collaboration with the Agriculture TF. The RSs were asked to inform the Data Centre if they knew of additional data that can be used for the project.

137. The UK confirmed an additional contribution of £37.500 for 2022, taking the total contribution to 2022 to £50.000. The RS approved the use of the suggested amount for the synthesis project from the projected carry-over budget into 2023.

138. Denmark pledged a contribution of €55.000 to the EGMP 2022 budget.

139. The Netherlands thanked the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre for drafting the finance report and development of the in-kind contribution forms. The Netherlands has plead for acknowledgement and clear registration of these type of contributions and the developed forms seem as a good instrument for achieving this.

140. The Netherlands asked for a slight adaptation in the text of the finance report. In chapter three, page four of the finance report, it is noted that the Dutch Ministry and provinces are in discussions with the Dutch Research Consortium on continuing and funding their work for the BG and GG for the period 2021-2024. The revised report should reflect that the funding of these activities has already been secured through an arrangement between the provinces and national government for the aforementioned period. Furthermore, the RSs asked to add in the same chapter the amounts which the Netherlands had contributed in 2020/2021, similar to the descriptions made of the German, Irish and Danish contributions. As provided in writing to the Secretariat, the Dutch in-kind contributions for 2022 amounted to roughly €240.000.

141. Mr Warmelink from the Netherlands went on to support the proposal of using carry-over funds from the Data Centre budget on implementation of the impact model synthesis report.

142. Commenting on the topic of in-kind contributions, Ms Meyers said that they had been added to the finance report for the first time. The Secretariat will continue circulating a request for RSs to report the in-kind contributions as it provided a helpful overview of the funded projects. It was also noted that the funds invested into domestic implementation were not to be considered in-kind contributions. The Secretariat agreed to provide a guidance on in-kind contribution reporting to EGM IWG8.

143. In response to the remarks from the Netherlands, Mr Dereliev noted that the finance report is a document that cannot be adapted at or after the EGM IWG meeting. He therefore suggested for the proposed changes to be reflected in the meeting report and in the next EGMP Finance report 2022/2023 to be submitted to the EGM IWG8. The Netherlands agreed on the suggestion.

Decisions and Actions:

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

The Range States approved the use of ca. €20.000 by the Data Centre from the projected carry-over budget into 2023 for the synthesis report on impact models.

The UK pledged contribution of £37.500 to the 2022 EGMP budget.

Denmark confirmed €55.000 contribution to the 2022 EGMP budget.

The Secretariat will provide a guidance on the definition of in-kind contributions to facilitate reporting to EGM IWG8.

The comments made by the Netherlands will be taken into consideration in the EGMP finance report for 2022-2023.

EGMP budget and costed Programme of Work (cPOW) for 2023

144. Based on document [AEWA/EGMIWG/7.18](#), the Secretariat put forward a suggestion for a budget of €466.000 (Annex 1 of this report) as in previous years. The scale of contributions has been amended adding Ireland which had officially joined the Platform in 2022. In addition, the latest UN scale of assessment has been applied to update the voluntary scale of contributions as it has not been done since its adoption at EGM IWG3. However, the changes to the scale are not significant. Mr Dereliev invited the RSs to agree on the updated scale, with the exception of countries that have reservations such as Germany.

145. In regard to the cPOW for 2023 (Annex 2 of this report), the Secretariat has reflected allocation of funds for the communication and information management work. As decided on the first day of EGM IWG7, an ad-

hoc group has been established to discuss the potential efforts for boosting communication work and report back to the EGM IWG. The possibility of further allocation of funds from the balance for communication has been outlined in the document.

146. The EGM IWG was requested to review the proposal for the 2023 budget, agree on the revised scale of contributions and review and approve the proposed cPoW 2023, taking into account the possible funding of communication initiatives.

147. The Netherlands agreed on the indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2023 but emphasised that they will continue to deliver a part of the requested financial contribution for the EGMP via in-kind contributions. Since the EGMP's establishment their direct funding has been accompanied by extensive in-kind contributions consisting of financial support for EGMP projects mandated by AEWA as part of the EGMP Data Centre and/or the International Modelling Consortium, executed by Dutch research organisations. Netherlands' direct and in-kind contributions are predetermined by an arrangement between the Dutch provinces and national government and are set for the period from 2021 until 2024. For the year 2023, the in-kind contributions will amount to roughly €150.000.

Decisions:

The Range States agreed on the proposed EGMP budget for 2023 and adopted the suggested costed Programme of Work for 2023.

The Range States agreed on the indicative scale of voluntary contributions (Annex 3 of this report).

Election of new Chair / Venue for the next EGM IWG meeting

148. As the UK reached the end of the biennial period for which they were elected as chair of the EGM IWG, Sweden has expressed interest in taking over the role of the Chair, indicating the need for more information and an internal discussion before final decision. The Secretariat therefore suggested to conditionally elect Sweden, providing that they could confirm in the near future that they are able to take that role. In the unlikely event of Sweden not confirming the chairmanship, the United Kingdom kindly offered to continue chairing the Working Group until 2023 when hopefully the kind offer from Sweden would be confirmed. The Secretariat explained that it would be a deviation from the Modus Operandi which the RSs may decide to accept in these exceptional circumstances.

149. It was proposed for the EGM IWG8 to take place in the week of 19-24 June 2023. As for the venue for the EGM IWG8, there was not a clear invitation from any RS. The Secretariat invited the RSs to consult internally and get in touch may a defined interest in hosting the next meeting arise.

Decisions:

Sweden was conditionally elected the next Chair of the EGM IWG, until final confirmation has been made by the Swedish delegation.

In case of non-confirmation by Sweden, the UK will continue chairing the EGM IWG until EGM IWG8.

The dates for the EGM IWG8 were set for the week of 19-23 June 2023. The venue for the EGM IWG8 was not identified at the meeting; RSs were invited to contact the Secretariat with expression of interest for hosting.

Summary, next steps and closure of meeting

150. Concluding the meeting, the Chair provided a summary of the main topics discussed and key decisions made (see table 1 for a full overview). He went on to express heartfelt thanks to the Secretariat and the Data Centre for their fantastic work, and the RSs and observers for their important contributions.

151. In turn, Dr Trouvilliez thanked the Chair for the tremendous work and guidance. He noted that it was in the spirit of AEWA bringing stakeholders together to decide the future of waterbird conservation.

152. The Chair declared the meeting closed.

Annex 1

EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre Budget for 2023

EGMP Secretariat Budget for 2023 (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 – design and printing services	5,000
Miscellaneous (e.g. office supplies and equipment, training)	5,000
Subtotal	10,000
Implementing Partner Direct Costs and Consultancies	
Small Scale Funding Agreements/ Consultancies substantive work	10,000
National Reporting analysis	5,000
Communication – website and social media services	5,000
Subtotal	20,000
Travel	
Travel (staff, experts and funded delegates)	25,000
Subtotal	25,000
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 2023 (in EUR)	
Object of expenditures	
Staff Costs	
Goose Monitoring Coordinator (100%)	96,000
Population Modelling Experts (50%)	48,000
Lead Compiler (22,5%)	38,000
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 2023

EGMP Costed Programme of Work for 2023						
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 2022	core	rolling		-	-
7	Develop and revise a draft costed Programme of Work for 2024	core	spring/autumn		-	-
8	Represent the EGMP at relevant meetings, conferences and workshops	core	rolling		-	-
9	Staff travel on official business	core	rolling	25,000	15,000	10,000
10	Consultancies and SSFAs	core	rolling	10,000	10,000	-
11	Other operational costs e.g. procurement, office supplies, office equipment, telephone, etc.	core	rolling	4,000	4,000	-
	Sub-total			39,000	29,000	10,000
B EGMP Meetings and Workshops						
1	Organise and support the EGMP International Goose Modelling Consortium Meetings	core	spring	-	-	-
2	Organise and support the EGMP Task Force Meetings	core	rolling	-	-	-
3	** Organise the 8th Meeting of the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG8)	core	June	5,000	5,000	-
4	Travel funded experts and delegates to EGMP related meetings (travel, visa, DSA, etc.)	core	rolling	10,000	10,000	-
5	Prepare meeting documents for EGM IWG8	core	rolling	-	-	-
6	*** Organise other meetings and workshops as necessary	medium	as required	-	-	-
	Sub-total			15,000	15,000	-
C National Reporting						
1	Coordinate the biannual EGMP National Reporting process	core	Jan/Feb	-	-	-
2	Undertake the analysis and summary of National Reports	core	May	5,000	5,000	-
	Sub-total			5,000	5,000	-
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						
Russian/Germany and Netherland population (in collaboration with Sovon, the Neherlands)						
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			
8	Produce Population Status and Assessment Report for Barnacle Goose	core	Jan-April			
9	Coordinate and support the work of the two Barnacle Goose Task Forces	core	rolling			
Greenland/Scotland and Ireland population (in collaboration with NatureScot, UK)						
10	Coordinate the Implementation of Adaptive Flyway Management Programmes for the Barnacle Goose	core	rolling			
11	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Barnacle Goose	core	rolling			
12	Produce Population Status and Assessment Report for Barnacle Goose	core	Jan-April			
13	Coordinate and support the work of the Barnacle Goose Task Force	core	rolling			
Greylag Goose ISSMP						
14	Coordinate the implementation of Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Greylag Goose	core	rolling			
15	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			
16	Coordinate and support the work of the Greylag Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-
Crosscutting						
17	Coordinate and support the work of the Agriculture Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-
	Sub-total			-	-	-
E Communications and information management						
1	Produce, maintain and update website and social media content	high	rolling	5,000	5,000	-
2	Maintain EGMP workspaces (sharepoint)	core	rolling	-	-	-
3	Maintain EGMP Contact Database	core	rolling	-	-	-
4	Maintain EGMP Database	core	rolling	-	-	-

5	Maintain EGMP GitLab	core	rolling			
6	Organise EGMP webinars	medium	rolling			
7	Develop and produce publications and information materials (design, printing)	medium	rolling	5,000	5,000	-
	Sub-total			10,000	10,000	-
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

Indicative Scale of Voluntary Contributions towards the EGMP annual budget

The initial indicative scale of voluntary contributions was agreed by the EGM IWG at EGM IWG4 in June 2019, in Perth, Scotland, UK. The scale was calculated based on scenario 5 (50% UN scale of assessment / 50% number of populations per country) and with a 15% cap. With the proposed new Range States joining the EGMP, i.e. in this case Ireland, the scale was recalculated and updated. In addition, the current UN scale of assessment was applied.

Scenario 5 50% by population / 50% by UN scale 15% cap- 10 states	
Range State	full budget
(Belarus)**	
Belgium	53,644 €
Denmark	53,056 €
(Estonia)**	
(EU)**	
Finland	48,497 €
France	43,580 €
Germany***	
Iceland	9,836 €
Ireland	23,345 €
Latvia**	
(Lithuania)*	
Netherlands	60,839 €
Norway	57,279 €
(Poland)*	
(Russia)*	
(Spain)*	
Sweden	63,715 €
UK	52,209 €
(Ukraine)**	
Total	466,000 €
<p>* non-member range states ** non-paying range states *** Germany has a reservation on the proposed budget and the scale of contribution and will decide on its contributions on the basis of a Cpow</p>	

Annex 4

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.: +32479 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.: +32499 865 340 Email: frank.huysentruyt@inbo.be
Denmark		
Mr Søren Egelund Rasmussen (NGR) <i>*participated virtually</i>	Biologist Danish Ministry of Environment Tolderlundsvej 5 5000 Odense Denmark	Tel.: +4593587960 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 Ecoscience Aarhus University C. F. Møllers Allé 8, Building 1110 8000 Aarhus Denmark	Tel.: +4529440204 Email: jm@ecos.au.dk
Ms Iben Hove Sørensen (NE) <i>(Also representing CIC)</i> <i>(Coordinator Greylag Goose Task Force)</i>	Biologist Danish Hunters' Association Molsvej 34 8410 Rønne Denmark	Tel.: +4581771664 Email: ihs@jaegerne.dk
Estonia		
Mr Tõnu Talvi (NGR)	Senior Conservation Officer Nature Conservation Department Environmental Board Palmse 45435 Lääne-Viru Estonia	Tel. : +3765016869 Email: tonu.talvi@keskkonnaamet.ee
European Union		
Mr Joseph van der Stegen <i>*participated virtually</i>	Policy Officer European Commission DG Environment, Nature Unit Avenue de Beaulieu 5 1160 Brussels Belgium	Tel. : + 322996902 Email: joseph.van-der-stegen@ec.europa.eu

Finland²		
Mr Jukka Forsman (NGR)	Natural Resources Institute Finland Paavo Havaksen tie 3 90014 University of Oulu Finland	Tel.: +358504280707 Email: jukka.forsman@luke.fi
Mr Esko Hyvärinen (NGR)	Ministry of the Environment P.O.Box 35 FI-00023 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358400143876 Email: esko.o.hyvarinen@gov.fi
Ms Heidi Krüger (NGR)	Project Manager Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Natural resources / Game and Fisheries Gårdskulla 113 02570 Siuntio Finland	Tel.: +358400226716 Email: heidi.kruger@gov.fi
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@gov.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 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +35 829 516 2338 Email: janne.pitkanen@mmm.fi

²In accordance with EGMP Modus Operandi, as EGM IWG7 host country, Finland was allowed to have a larger delegation with its members rotating between different meeting days and agenda items.

Ms Henna Väyrynen (NGR)	Specialist Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Game and Recreational Fisheries PO Box 30 FI-00023 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +350295162014 Email: henna.vayrynen@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 Ere Grenfors (NE)	Wildlife Management and Conservation Manager Finnish Hunters' Association PL 91, Kinturinkuja 4 11101 Riihimäki Finland	Tel.: +358505698916 Email: ere.grenfors@metsastajaliitto.fi
Mr Teemu Lehtiniemi (NE) <i>*participated virtually</i>	BirdLife Finland Annankatu 29 A 16 00100 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358 400 749 786 Email: teemu.lehtiniemi@birdlife.fi
Ms Matleena Louhisalmi (NE) <i>*participated virtually</i>	Senior Officer Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for Southwest Finland Unit for Nature Conservation Itsenäisyydenaukio 2 20800 Turku Finland	Tel.: +358295023072 Email: matleena.louhisalmi@ely-keskus.fi
Mr Markku Mikkola-Roos (NE)	Senior Coordinator Species and Habitat Types Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) Latokartanonkaari 11 FI-00790 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358 295 251 429 Email: markku.mikkola-roos@syke.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
Mr Markus Piha (NE)	Senior Scientist Natural Resources Institute Finland Latokartanonkaari 9 00790 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358295322726 Email: markus.piha@luke.fi
Mr Antti Piironen (NE)	University of Turku Department of Biology Vesilinnantie 5 20500 Turku Finland	Tel.: +350503112306 Email: antti.p.piironen@utu.fi
Mr Mika Pirinen (NE)	Species Damage Coordinator ELY Centre for North Karelia Torikatu 36 A 80100 Joensuu Finland	Tel.: +350405475028 Email: mika.pirinen@ely-keskus.fi
Mr Tuomas Seimola (NE)	Specialist Natural Resources Institute Finland Käpyläntie 1 00610 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +350405285911 Email: tuomas.seimola@luke.fi
France		
Mr Charles-Henri de Barsac (NGR) <i>*participated virtually</i>	Ministry of Ecological and Inclusive Transition (MTES) 92000 La Défense CEDEX France	Tel.: +331408131 90 Email: charles-henri.de-barsac@developpement- durable.gouv.fr

Dr Léo Bacon (NE) <i>*participated virtually</i>	French Agency for Biodiversity (OFB) La Tour du Valat, Le Sambuc 13200 Arles France	Tel.: +33 689182663 Email: leo.bacon@ofb.gouv.fr
Latvia		
Mr Vilnis Bernards (NGR)	Senior Desk Officer Ministry of Environmental Protection and Nature Protection Department Peldu 25 LV1494 Riga Latvia	Tel.: +37167026524 Email: vilnis.bernards@varam.gov.lv
Mr Oskars Keiņš (NE)	Researcher University of Latvia Institute of Biology Jelgavas iela 1 Latvia	Tel.: +37129236300 Email: oskars.keiss@lu.lv
Netherlands		
Ms Patty Laan-Olij (NGR)	FBE Noord-Holland Spaarne 17 2011 CD Haarlem Netherlands	Tel.: +310655544922 Email: p.laan@fbenoordholland.nl
Mr Gerben Mensink (NGR)	Policymaker Ecology Province of Friesland P.O. Box 20120 8900 HM Leeuwarden Netherlands	Tel.: +31582928955 Email: g.mensink@fryslan.frl
Mr Nick Warmelink (NGR)	Policy Officer International Species Protection Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality Directorate-General for Nature, Fisheries and Rural Affairs 20401 / Bezuidenhoutseweg 73 2500 EK The Hague Netherlands	Tel.: +31629636059 Email: n.g.warmelink@minlnv.nl

Mr Kornelis Koffijberg (NE)	Researcher Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland Department of Monitoring P6525 ED Nijmegen Netherlands	Tel.: +31247410463 Email: kees.koffijberg@sovon.nl
Norway		
Mr Arild Espelien (NGR)	Norwegian Environment Agency 1008 Bratsbergvegen 7039 Trondheim Norway	Tel.: +4741512396 Email: ares@dirnat.no
Mr Ove Martin Gundersen (NE)	Project manager Norwegian Farmers Union Jernbanegata 34C 7600 Levanger Norway	Tel.: +4792290491 Email: ove.martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no
Ms Ingunn Tombre (NE) <i>(Coordinator Agriculture Task Force)</i>	Senior Researcher Norwegian Institute for Nature Resarch (NINA) Arctic Ecology Department 9296 Tromsø Norway	Tel.: +4793466723 Email: ingunn.tombre@nina.no
Sweden		
Ms Malin Åhl (NGR)	Administrator Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Natural Environment Department Virkesvägen 2, Hammarby Sjöstad 12030 Stockholm Sweden	Tel.: +46106981675 Email: malin.ahl@naturvardsverket.se
Mr Per Risberg (NGR)	Senior Officer Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Forskarens väg 5 10648 Stockholm Sweden	Tel.: + 46106981734 Email: per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se

Mr 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
United Kingdom		
Prof. Des Thompson (NGR) (EGM IWG CHAIR)	Principal Adviser on Science and Biodiversity Scottish Natural Heritage Silvan House, 231 Corstorphine Road EH127AT Edinburgh United Kingdom	Tel: +447774161251 Email: des.thompson@nature.scot
Mr Matt Parsons (NGR)	Senior International Advisor, Migratory Birds Joint Nature Conservation Committee (UK) International Advice Team Baxter Street AB11 9QA Aberdeen United Kingdom	Tel: +447810532865 Email: matt.parsons@jncc.gov.uk
Mr Donald Fraser (NE)	Head of Wildlife Management Scottish Natural Heritage Great Glen House, Leachkin Road Inverness IV38NW Inverness United Kingdom	Tel.: + 4407990561963 Email: donald.fraser@nature.scot
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.: +4407717547291 Email: rae.mckenzie@nature.scot

Ms Morag Milne (NE)	Wildlife Policy Officer NatureScot Wildlife Management Team Brookside, Bamff Road PH11 8DS Alyth United Kingdom	Tel.: + 4401738 458625 Email: morag.milne@nature.scot
Ms Jessica Shaw (NE) <i>*participated virtually</i>	Scottish Natural Heritage Main Street, Bowmore PA437JX Isle of Islay United Kingdom	Email : Jessica.Shaw@nature.scot

Observer Range States

Spain		
Ms Mencia Serrano Ruiz de Dulanto <i>(observer to the Greylag Goose process)</i>	Head of Service Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Hunting Department Almagro 33 28071 Madrid Spain	Tel.: +34913471536 Email: mpserrano@mapa.es

Permanent Observers		
Representative	Position	Contact Email
Birdlife International		
Mr Ariel Brunner <i>*participated virtually</i>	Senior Head of Policy BirdLife Europe and Central Asia Avenue de la Toison d'Or 67 1060 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32491904653 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.: +4581771664 Email: ihs@jaegerne.dk
Copa Cogeca		
Mr Klaus Borde <i>*participated virtually</i>	Copa-Cogeca Oldendorperstrasse 12 26844 Jemgum Germany	Tel.: + 4902 915777 Email: borde-oldendorp@ewetel.net
FACE		
Mr Cy Griffin	Senior Conservation Manager FACE Rue Belliard 205 1040 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +3224161619 Email: cy.griffin@face.eu

Nordic Hunters' Alliance		
Mr Johan Svalby <i>*participated virtually</i>	Senior Advisor for International Affairs Nordic Hunters' Alliance Rue Belliard 205 B-1040 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32478817468 Email: johan.svalby@jagareforbundet.se
OMPO		
Mr Alexandre Czajkowski <i>*participated virtually</i>	Director OMPO 59 rue Ampère 75017 Paris France	Tel.: +330680209792 Email: vanneau@ompo.org
Wadden Sea Forum		
Dr Frank Ahlhorn <i>*participated virtually</i>	Managing Director Wadden Sea Forum Virchowstr. 1 26382 Wilhelmshaven Germany	Tel.: +494421910818 Email: ahlhorn@waddensea-forum.org
Wetlands International		
Dr Szabolcs Nagy	Wetlands International P.O. Box 471 6700AL Wageningen Netherlands	Tel.: +31628554823 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.: +441453891185 Email: richard.hearn@wwt.org.uk

Invited Experts		
Representative	Position	Contact Email
Dr Hans Baveco <i>*participated virtually</i>	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 Ecoscience Aarhus University C. F. Møllers Allé 8, Building 1110 8000 Aarhus Denmark	Tel.: +45 294 402 04 Email: jm@ecos.au.dk
Dr Fred Johnson <i>*participated virtually</i>	Senior Researcher Aarhus University 711 SW Truluck Terrace 32038 Ft. White United States	Tel.: +1352494 4611 Email: fred.johnson@ecos.au.dk
Dr Gitte Høj Jensen	Goose Monitoring Coordinator EGMP Data Centre Aarhus University C. F. Møllers Allé 8, Building 1110 8000 Aarhus Denmark	Tel.: +4522461504 Email: ghj@ecos.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.: +492288152414 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.: +492288152415 Email: sergey.dereliev@un.org
Ms Eva Meyers	Coordinator EGMP UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +492288152457 Email: eva.meyers@un.org
Ms Shenay Huseynova	Programme Management Assistant EGMP UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +492288152464 Email: shanay.huseynova@un.org