

**REPORT OF THE 4th MEETING OF
THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP¹**

18-20 June 2019, Perth, Scotland, the United Kingdom

Hosted by Scottish Natural Heritage



¹ Report finalised after written consultation with the meeting participants.

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
Agenda item 2.	Adoption of agenda	The agenda (doc. AEWA/EGM IWG/4.2/Corr.1) was adopted with no amendments.	
Agenda item 3.	Admission of permanent observers to EGM IWG4	Already admitted permanent observers were welcomed and the Nordic Hunters' Alliance, being present at the meeting, was approved as permanent observer organisation to the EGM IWG.	
Agenda item 4.	Revision of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG	<p>The proposed changes to the Modus Operandi in Rule 3, paragraph 2 and Rule 32 were adopted and took effect immediately.</p> <p>The changes suggested to Rule 16 paragraph 2 were deferred for further discussion at EGM IWG5 in June 2020.</p> <p>The proposed change to Rule 23 was not accepted and the rule was not amended.</p>	The Secretariat will include the proposed change to Rule 16 in the agenda for EGM IWG5 in June 2020.
Agenda item 6.	Summary of National Reports 2019	The EGM IWG took note of the summary of EGMP national reports for 2019 and agreed to continue with a similar reporting format in the future.	<p>Prior to launching a new annual reporting cycle, the Secretariat will be sending out a revised national reporting format for consultation with the Range States including some additional (sub-)questions in the general section about Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose. The EGM IWG Chair will approve the final format.</p> <p>The Range States shall continue monitoring the effectiveness of management measures applied, share experiences with other countries regarding agricultural conflict and damage, for example via the Agriculture Task Force and consider the specific recommendations provided in document AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.4.15.</p> <p>The Range States of the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose shall continue to raise awareness, particularly amongst the</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			<p>local hunting communities, on their role and responsibility to participate in the management of the population.</p> <p>The Range States of the Taiga Bean Goose Eastern1&2 MU shall ensure the implementation of the activities of the biannual Taiga Bean Goose non-AHM workplan 2018-2020 and consider new projects in MUs for further development of a monitoring framework for population status assessment, pending availability of funding.</p> <p>The Range States of the Taiga Bean Goose Central and Western MU shall further strengthen the identification skills and raise awareness on the status of different goose species amongst hunters.</p> <p>The Secretariat will continue to seek funding for an EGMP communication strategy.</p>
<p>Agenda item 7.</p>	<p>Pink-footed Goose session</p>	<p>The recommendation to use the IPM for population size estimates was confirmed for the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose. The EGM IWG agreed to the recommended harvest quota for 2019 of 22,000 Pink-footed Geese.</p> <p>The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2019/2020 of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force as presented in Annex 4.</p>	<p>The harvest quota will be divided between Denmark and Norway according to an agreed 70:30 ratio – 15,400 for Denmark and 6,600 for Norway. The countries will implement national harvest regulation to regulate the harvest for the coming 2019-2020 hunting season.</p> <p>The Pink-footed Goose Task Force will elaborate a report on the new migration route of the Pink-footed Goose.</p> <p>The Pink-footed Goose Task Force will work on indicators for the evaluation of the ISSMP in 2022, which will be presented to the EGM IWG at its 5th meeting in June 2020.</p>
<p>Agenda item 8.</p>	<p>Taiga Bean Goose session</p>	<p>The Meeting agreed to continue using the constant harvest quota of 3% until next year, with the proviso that Sweden might not be able to adhere to the quota. The harvest quota for 2019 has been set at 1,740 individuals, with the aim to</p>	<p>Finland, Sweden and Denmark shall take the necessary steps to implement harvest regulations to adjust the harvest for the coming 2019/2020 hunting season and will focus on improved monitoring for input of data to the IPM, enabling more informed decision-making for 2020.</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
		<p>have the IPM ready to be implemented next year for setting the new quota.</p> <p>The EGM IWG agreed to keep the non-AHM workplan as previewed until 2020, adopted the workplan for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force (Annex 5) and agreed on the recommendations of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force.</p>	<p>Sweden specifically will endeavour to work on enhancing means to monitor harvest specific to the Taiga Bean Goose sub-species to enable better modelling with the IPM next year.</p> <p>The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will work on increasing the monitoring framework for the Western Management Unit, encouraging better international cooperation and timely data sharing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will support the development of the IPM for the Central Management Unit, including the reinforcement of the monitoring framework. Denmark and Sweden will improve provision of hunting monitoring, separated by types of hunting, with the proviso that Denmark will do so within the realms of limited financial possibilities.</p> <p>The Range States will seek funding possibilities for the project proposal on monitoring activities in Eastern 1&2 Management Units and put forward recommendations for a second coordinator for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force for the region.</p>
<p>Agenda item 9.</p>	<p>Greylag Goose session</p>	<p>The EGM IWG agreed to continue the process of implementation of the Greylag Goose ISSMP under the condition that all Range States adhere to the agreed principles under the EGMP framework.</p> <p>The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline of the AFMP for the Greylag Goose and took note of the proposed timeline and steps, as well as data and resources needed.</p> <p>The EGM IWG agreed on setting two Management Units for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose (migratory</p>	<p>The EGM IWG will decide on the length of the cycle for data provision after the establishment phase of the process for development of the AFMP has been concluded.</p> <p>The Secretariat will add a section on cumulative impact of derogations and legal hunting to the AFMP.</p> <p>The Range States of the Greylag Goose will endeavour to support the necessary monitoring of the two Management Units of the Greylag Goose, with the proviso that summer counts are extremely difficult in some countries.</p> <p>Germany will not take part in the management of the species but will make efforts to contribute monitoring data to the process.</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
		<p>MU1 and MU2 as one unit and resident birds in MU3 as another unit).</p> <p>The Range States agreed to a revision of the document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.16/Rev.1 by the Secretariat, on which they will endeavour to agree.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will circulate a revised version of document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.16/Rev.1 by 31 July 2019 to the Range States.</p> <p>The Secretariat will send an amended timeline for the definition of the FRVs for the Greylag Goose.</p> <p>The Range States of the Greylag Goose will send the national FRVs for the breeding population to the Secretariat by 12 July 2019.</p> <p>The Range States of the Greylag Goose will endeavour to agree on the FRVs as soon as possible. If the FRVs cannot be agreed beforehand, the process for the Multi-criteria Decision Analysis for setting a population target will run in parallel to the decision-making process on the FRVs.</p>
<p>Agenda item 10.</p>	<p>Barnacle Goose session</p>	<p>The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline and content of the AFMP for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & the Netherlands population and took note of the proposed timeline and steps, as well as data and resources needed.</p> <p>The EGM IWG agreed to base the AFMP on three Management Units for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & the Netherlands population (MU1, MU2 and MU3 as described in document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.15 and already specified in the ISSMP).</p> <p>The Range States agreed on a revision of the document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.17/Rev.1 by the Secretariat concerning Favourable Reference Values, on which they will endeavour to agree.</p>	<p>The EGM IWG will decide on the length of the cycle for data provision after the establishment phase of the process for development of the AFMP has been concluded.</p> <p>The Secretariat and Range States of the Greenland and Svalbard populations will organise a meeting in autumn 2019 to initiate AFMP development processes for these two populations.</p> <p>The Range States of the Barnacle Goose will endeavour to support the necessary monitoring for the three Management Units of the Barnacle Goose, with the proviso that summer counts are extremely difficult in some countries.</p> <p>The Range States of the Barnacle Goose will send comments on the revision of the document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.17/Rev.1 to the Secretariat by 31 July 2019.</p> <p>The Secretariat will amend the document on FRVs for the Barnacle Goose taking into account the comments received and will aim at</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			<p>having a final version consulted and approved by the Range States by the end of the year.</p> <p>The Secretariat will endeavour to make documents of complex content available as soon as possible to give time for intra-national consultations before decision-making at the EGM IWG meeting.</p>
<p>Agenda item 11.</p>	<p>Report and recommendations from the Agriculture Task Force</p>	<p>The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2019/2020 of the Agriculture Task Force as presented in Annex 6.</p>	
<p>Agenda item 12.</p>	<p>EGMP Finance Report for 2018/2019</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the finance report for 2018/2019.</p>	<p>Range States will make all efforts to secure funding to fill the gap in the 2019 EGMP budget and ensure continued operations of the platform.</p> <p>The Secretariat will enquire with each Range State and agree on an individual way of invoicing for voluntary contributions towards the annual core budget.</p> <p>If full information is available from the Range States, the Secretariat will include in-kind contributions made by Range States outside the EGMP core budget for activities that provide a direct input into EGMP processes.</p>
<p>Agenda item 13.</p>	<p>EGMP budget and costed Programme of Work for 2020</p>	<p>The presented budget estimate for 2020 (Annex 1) and indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2020 (remaining the same as for 2019) (Annex 3) was approved with one reservation from Germany.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will provide additional information on the UN staffing costs to the Range States, as requested.</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
		The Range States also approved on the cPOW for 2020 as presented (Annex 2).	
Agenda item 15.	Date and venue of the next AEWA EGM IWG meeting	The EGM IWG accepted the offer of Finland to host the 5 th annual meeting of the EGM IWG (EGM IWG5) in Helsinki. The EGM IWG agreed on the tentative dates for EGM IWG5, to be held back-to-back with EGMP Task Force meetings within the week of 15-19 June 2020.	The Range States will communicate potential clashes of the envisaged dates with important meetings and conferences they are planning to attend to facilitate a final decision on the dates. The Secretariat will consult with the Range States before a final decision on the dates is taken.

Agenda item 1. Opening of the meeting and welcome

1. The Chair of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), Ms Camilla Uldal from Denmark, opened the meeting, giving a short introduction, outlining activities of the EGMP during the last year, as well as the main objectives of this fourth annual Meeting of the AEWA EGM IWG (EGM IWG4). Ms Uldal stressed that this meeting signifies the entry into a new phase of the European Goose Management Platform (EGMP) with double the number of species under the umbrella of the platform.
2. Ms Rae McKenzie, Goose Policy Manager at Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) welcomed the meeting participants.
3. Dr Jacques Trouvilliez, the Executive Secretary of AEWA, thanked the Chair and SNH as the host of the meeting, and welcomed the participants to the EGM IWG4.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of agenda

Decision:

The agenda (document AEWA/EGM IWG/4.2/Corr.1) was adopted with no amendments.

Agenda item 3. Admission of permanent observers to EGM IWG4

4. The following admitted specialised observer organisations were represented at the Meeting:
 - The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)
 - BirdLife International
 - Copa-Cogeca
 - The European Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation (FACE)
 - Migratory Birds of the Western Palearctic (OMPO)
 - Wetlands International
 - Wadden Sea Forum
5. One further specialised observer organisation requested to be admitted to the process:
 - The Nordic Hunters' Alliance
6. The Chair invited the admission of the Nordic Hunters' Alliance, which was present in the room, as a permanent observer to the EGM IWG. There were no objections from the EGM IWG members. The Nordic Hunters' Alliance was admitted as permanent observer organisation to the EGM IWG.

Decision:

Already admitted permanent observers were welcomed and the Nordic Hunters' Alliance, being present at the meeting, was approved as permanent observer organisation to the EGM IWG.

Agenda item 4. Revision of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG

7. Referring to the document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.3](#) the Secretariat presented the proposed changes to the Modus Operandi of the EGMP submitted by the Netherlands (on 29 March 2019), Denmark (on 4 April 2019) and Norway (on 8 April 2019) within the 70-day deadline. The proposals had been circulated to the Range States for comments, which had been appended to the document.

Rule 3 – The Netherlands

8. The change proposed by the Netherlands applied to Rule 3 paragraph 2 of the document, requesting changing the wording “*adaptive harvest management*” to “*adaptive flyway management*”. Belgium

commented in writing, suggesting changing the wording to “*adaptive (harvest) management on the flyway level*”, since AHM is the main activity of the EGMP along the flyways.

9. Range States took the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes, with the Netherlands expressing that the word “harvest” can have implications in their country and a suggestion from Norway to delete “*which contain provisions for adaptive flyway/harvest management*” altogether. The Secretariat clarified that the wording had been added to distinguish between the ISSMPs, which include AHM provisions, and the International Single Species Action Plans (ISSAPs), that may or may not contain harvest provisions; ISSAPs not containing harvest provisions are coordinated outside the EGMP through stand-alone international working groups.

10. With other countries supporting the Belgian proposal for wording, an agreement was reached by the Range States to adopt the wording suggested by Belgium, expressing the fact that not all species under the EGMP are huntable in all Range States or regions. The change took effect immediately.

Rule 32 - Denmark

11. The change proposed by Denmark applied to Rule 32, requesting the extension of the reporting requirements of the Range States also to “*other agreed tasks and decisions taken by the EGM IWG*”. Germany objected to this proposal in writing and in plenary to state the concern about more administrative burden of reporting obligations, however, agreeing to the proposal suggested, following other Range States’ approval. The proposal was adopted by all Range States with the Chair reiterating that the reporting burden for Range States will be kept to a minimum. The change took effect immediately.

Rule 16 - Norway

12. Norway suggested the addition of a paragraph to Rule 16 reading as follows: “*Only the Range States that are contributing towards the EGMP core budget on a regular annual basis are entitled to taking decisions on institutional and financial matters. The remaining Range States shall be entitled to take decisions on substantive matters only*”. A number of comments had been submitted in writing by Range States, including requests for clarifications on the implementation of the proposal and the level of payment to be considered sufficient. The Secretariat offered clarification on “*regular annual basis*”, which would apply not in retrospective to a Range State starting payments and after a break in contributions taking effect again in the second year of consecutive payments. On the level of payments necessary, the Secretariat suggested a (close) match of the indicative scale of contributions.

13. A further clarification was elaborated on the date of the payment. It was suggested that a pledge should be made by Range States before the annual EGM IWG meeting in June. Norway’s suggested change to the Modus Operandi was in principle supported by the UK, Denmark, France and Belgium, stating however, that it needs to be ensured not to discourage participation or exclude any Range States from the platform. The EC, Germany and Iceland opposed the proposal for amendment on the basis that any contributions to the EGMP are voluntary and indicative, therefore no conditions should be attached to payments.

14. Norway reiterated that the proposal aimed at encouraging payments from the Range States to keep staffing in the EGMP secured. Reinforcing the importance of regular contributions close to the level of the scale of contributions for operations of the EGMP, as well as the need for cash flow to extend contracts specifically in the Secretariat.

15. It was agreed to redraft the text for the change to Rule 16, clarifying the discussed point on date and level of payment and other details and bring it back to plenary.

16. The text was redrafted as follows and circulated to the Range States for comments, with one comment received:

“All Range States shall be entitled to take decisions on substantive matters. Only the Range States that are contributing towards the EGMP core budget, i.e. the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre, on an annual basis

are entitled to taking decisions on [institutional and] financial matters. Annual contributions or, as a minimum, formal pledges for contributions, ideally matching the established scale of contributions, should reach the Secretariat and/or the Data Centre before the date of the opening of the annual meeting.

A Range State that has not contributed previously, will be entitled to take decisions on all matters already upon its first annual contribution. A Range State that has interrupted its annual contributions, will be entitled to take decisions on all matters only after its second consecutive renewed annual contribution.”

17. Sweden requested to state a percentage threshold in the text of Rule 16 from above which a contribution will be counted as payment. A percentage could help National Government Representatives to leverage funding of that amount from their Ministries. To give a figure, Mr Dereliev suggested 95%, which would allow operations of the EGMP without cuts to activities and/or staffing.

18. Range States expressed different views on the issue if the change to Rule 16 would exclude and discourage Range States from the process. Finland, France and UK stated that since decision-making on substantive matters is not affected by the change, all Range States participate in the core work of the platform. The change to the Rule could also serve as an incentive to pay up to the threshold set, balancing the burden of contribution between the Range States more equally.

19. Belgium proposed to exclude non-paying Range States from the decision-making process but include them in voting. Norway suggested to remove the brackets on “[institutional and]” in the redrafted text.

20. The proposal for changes to Rule 16 was not supported by the European Commission (EC), Germany and Iceland.

21. The EGM IWG reached the decision that due to the lack of support for the changes to Rule 16, the proposal will be brought to the next meeting (EGM IWG5) in June 2020, when hopefully more consistent funding will be provided by the Range States. The Chair reinforced that resources are still lacking, and the financial burden is borne unevenly by the Range States. Solutions need to be found in the next annual cycle on how to bring all Range States on board not only on substantive matters, but also with regards to the EGMP budget.

Rule 23 - Norway

22. Norway proposed a second amendment of the Modus Operandi with an addition of the following sentence to Rule 23: “Range States that are not contributing towards the EGMP core budget on a regular annual basis are not eligible for election as Chair country”. Since this proposal was interlinked to an extent with the proposal on Rule 16, it was agreed to redraft the text as well and bring it back to plenary.

23. The text was redrafted as follows and circulated to the Range States for comments, with one comment received:

“The EGM IWG Range States shall, amongst themselves elect a Chair country, represented by its designated national government representative to the Working Group. The term for the Chairmanship shall last for two consecutive years, with the elected Range State chairing two consecutive meetings of the EGM IWG. The Chair country shall thus be elected at the end of every second meeting of the EGM IWG, and the newly elected Chair shall assume their functions upon election. A country cannot serve as a Chair for two consecutive terms. Only the Range States that are contributing towards the EGMP core budget, i.e. the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre, on an annual basis are eligible for election as Chair country”.

24. Sweden brought a suggestion to the EGM IWG that Chairs from non-paying countries could still be elected. The view was supported by Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Belgium and the Netherlands making strong statements not wishing to exclude countries from Chairmanship.

25. The proposed change to Rule 23 was not accepted and the rule will not be amended.

Decisions and Action:

The proposed changes to the Modus Operandi in Rule 3, paragraph 2 and Rule 32 were adopted and took effect immediately.

The changes suggested to Rule 16 paragraph 2 were deferred for further discussion at EGM IWG5 in June 2020.

The proposed change to Rule 23 was not accepted and the rule was not amended.

The **Secretariat** will include the proposed change to Rule 16 in the agenda for EGM IWG5 in June 2020.

Agenda item 5. Reports by the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre

26. Referring to the document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.4](#), *Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2018/2019)*, Ms Eva Meyers, Coordinator of the EGMP, gave a short summary of the activities of the platform since the last meeting of the EGM IWG in June 2018, complemented by specific reporting on the Data Centre activities from Prof. Jesper Madsen, Head of the EGMP Data Centre.

27. The EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre have concluded the first full year fully staffed. In the Secretariat Ms Eva Meyers coordinates the EGMP with assistance from Ms Christina Irven and Mr Sergey Dereliev, Head of the Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit, overseeing the programme. The Data Centre is headed by Prof. Jesper Madsen. Until January 2019 Ms Gitte Høj Jensen was part of the team as full-time Goose Monitoring Coordinator and was replaced by Dr Henning Heldbjerg from February 2019 onwards. A 50% staffing allocation for modelling work was shared by Dr Fred Johnson, Professor Anthony Fox and Mr Kevin Kuhlmann Clausen. Under the coordination of the EGMP Data Centre, the International Modelling Consortium has been established, bringing together research expertise to support the development of population models. The three Task Forces for the Taiga Bean Goose, Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose and for Agriculture have continued their work in their respective work areas.

28. The EGMP currently comprises 15 Range States; 14 countries and the European Commission (EC). Further Range States along the flyways are still to be brought into the process, with Spain having expressed interest to become involved in the EGMP recently. Poland also has recently communicated interest in the processes of the EGMP and joined the face-to-face meeting of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force on 17 June 2019 by remote connection. Ireland showed interest participating in the EGM IWG4 meeting but had to cancel last minute. Ms Camilla Uldal on behalf of Denmark currently chairs the EGM IWG.

29. Since the ISSMPs for the Barnacle Goose and the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose have been adopted at the 7th meeting of the Parties of AEWA (MOP7) in December 2018, in Durban, South Africa, the species have been incorporated under the framework of the EGMP.

30. Online meetings of the Task Force have taken place throughout the year and on 17 June 2019 face-to-face for the three Task Forces, as well as in person for the International Modelling Consortium on 21-22 March in Kalo, Denmark, with discussions on the way forward for the development of the AFMPs for the Greylag Goose and the Barnacle Goose.

31. Professor Jesper Madsen gave an overview on the activities of the Data Centre in the last year, including monitoring, population status reports and harvest assessment reports for the Pink-footed Goose and Taiga Bean Goose with a change to the Integrated Population Model (IPM) for the Pink-footed Goose. The Data Centre also coordinated the International Modelling Consortium activities, setting the stage for much ease of monitoring work in the future and had the possibility to attend various international meetings and workshops, presenting the work and activities of the EGMP. Some further proposals are potentially to be started in the coming year: The IPM for the Taiga Bean Goose has been fully funded by Finland and work is about to start. A further proposal for improvement of monitoring in the Eastern 1&2 Monitoring Units (MUs) of the Taiga Bean Goose has been sent out with funding from Range States pending. A third proposal for the development

of a Multi-criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) for the Greylag Goose has been sent out with some funding provided by Norway and co-funding outstanding before work can start.

32. Further work on the EGMP website, as well as password-protected workspaces for the EGM IWG's members, the three Task Forces and the International Modelling Consortium was finalised and the workspaces were launched just before EGM IWG4. Moreover, the EGMP launched its own Facebook, Twitter and Instagram accounts commencing posting on the activities of the platform.

Agenda item 6. Summary of National Reports 2019

33. A presentation was given by Ms Eva Meyers on the basis of document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.5 Summary of EGMP National Reports 2019](#), outlining the scope of activities implemented in the period by the Range States.

34. 12 of 14 participating countries (86%) submitted national reports in 2019; Iceland and Belarus did not submit their national reports.

35. The exchange between Range States, specifically on measures to manage agricultural conflicts, is coordinated by the Agriculture Task Force, encouraging sharing of experience and information flow. The national reporting of Range States on this topic has been incorporated in document [AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.4.15 An overview of the management measures for geese in Range States of the European Goose Management Platform](#), and was also presented by Dr Ingunn Tombre reporting on the activities of the Agriculture Task Force under Agenda item 11.

36. The Secretariat suggested to keep the EGMP national reporting format for the following cycle, to ensure the regular provision of data for monitoring the implementation of the ISSAP and ISSMPs and identifying major gaps. The EGMP national reporting for 2020 however, will include additional species-specific (sub-) questions relating to the Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose in the general section. The revised format will be circulated for comments to the Range States before adoption.

37. FACE enquired about the audience of the envisaged EGMP communication strategy, as well as commenting that major stakeholders, in particular hunting organisations should be invited by all Range States to participate in the national working groups; currently not being the case in all countries. The Secretariat clarified that the communication strategy for the EGMP was pending funding and therefore not yet in the development stage.

38. The Range States took note of the summary of EGMP national reports for 2018/2019 and agreed to continue with a similar reporting format in future cycles, ensuring continuity of data to monitor implementation of the management plans and identify major implementation gaps. Prior to launching an annual reporting cycle, a round of consultation with the Range States will take place to comment on the format, which will consecutively be approved by the Chair of the IWG.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the summary of the 2019 EGMP national reports and agreed to continue with a similar reporting format in the future.

Prior to launching a new annual reporting cycle, the **Secretariat** will be sending out a revised national reporting format for consultation with the Range States including some additional (sub-)questions in the general section about Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose. The **EGM IWG Chair** will approve the final format.

Range States took note of the recommendations provided in the document, as follows:

The **Range States** shall continue monitoring the effectiveness of management measures applied, share experiences with other countries regarding agricultural conflict and damage, for example via the Agriculture Task Force and consider the specific recommendations provided in document AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.4.15;

The **Range States of the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose** shall continue to raise awareness, particularly amongst the local hunting communities, on their role and responsibility to participate in the management of the population;

The **Range States of the Taiga Bean Goose Eastern1&2 MU** shall ensure the implementation of the activities of the biannual Taiga Bean Goose non-AHM workplan 2018-2020 and consider new projects in MUs for further development of a monitoring framework for population status assessment, pending availability of funding;

The **Range States of the Taiga Bean Goose Central and Western MU** shall further strengthen the identification skills and raise awareness on the status of different goose species amongst hunters.

The **Secretariat** will continue to seek funding for an EGMP communication strategy which was noted to be particularly helpful to communicate the activities and results achieved by the EGMP.

Agenda item 7. Pink-footed Goose session

7.1 Pink-footed Goose (Svalbard population) status update

39. Referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.6](#) the *Pink-footed Goose Population Status Update 2018/2019*, Prof. Jesper Madsen presented the summary of the population status for the Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose. The compilation of the annual monitoring data is a collaboration of many researchers, as well as the Pink-footed Goose Task Force, who reviewed the report.

40. Regarding Tundra degradation a new programme has been started by the Norwegian Research Councils, called COAT (Climate-ecological Observatory for Arctic Tundra). The effect of grubbing of geese is observed in this study and put in relation to climate-relevant data. It is hoped that in the coming years the project will provide an assessment of the trends in the grubbing intensity and extent, feeding into the revision of the ISSMP.

41. A new migration route has been documented for the population, leading via Sweden to north-western Finland. GPS tags have provided data of birds tagged in Oulu migrating via the mountains over to northern Norway and Svalbard and others carrying onwards to the north-east and to Novaya Zemlja. This route has been documented in 2018 and 2019, giving reason to believe a new migration route and maybe new breeding areas are being established. A relatively big proportion of the population is taking this route via Oulu. It is still open how this will feed into the revision of the ISMP in 2022.

7.2 Pink-footed Goose (Svalbard population) AHM update and recommendations

42. Making reference to the *Adaptive Harvest Management for the Svalbard Population of the Pink-footed Goose. 2019 Progress Summary* ([Document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.7](#)), Dr Fred Johnson, outlined the current progress on the development and implementation of AHM measures for maintaining Pink-footed Goose near their target level population of 60,000.

43. The Integrated Population Model (IPM) first introduced in 2018 has been presented to the EGM IWG for adoption at this meeting. The model replaces the AHM programme implemented since 2013, using nine different models to set harvest quotas. The nine models in recent years had shown a tendency to underpredict population figures, giving justification for development of the IPM, incorporating all available data into a single analysis, offering more reliable estimates of abundance and predictions of change in population size. .

44. Looking at the population estimates derived from the IPM for May and November, it becomes clear that the population seems to stabilise in the last decade; a good indicator of the success of management practices applied, aiming at the population target set in the ISSMP of 60,000 birds.

45. With the IPM the harvest quota recommendation for 2019 is 22,000 birds, based on the May population estimate of 76,500 birds. The quota breaks down to 6,600 geese for Norway and 15,400 geese for Denmark. The harvest quota is the maximum recommended harvest for the season, whereas the level of actual harvest

determines, how quickly the population target can be reached. Once the population level of 60,000 birds is reached, the harvest quota is expected to stabilise around 8,000-10,000.

46. The IPM can also be used to evaluate existing monitoring programmes. By integrating multiple sources of data, an assessment can be made on various sources of monitoring data's consistent inferences about population and show if there are biases in the data. With this information, the IPM can help to minimise monitoring activities, balancing management objectives against costs of monitoring. This work can inform the revision of the ISSMP in 2022.

47. Denmark's question relating to the effect the observed new breeding areas on the new migration route will have on the harvest quota and subsequently the population size, was replied to by Dr Johnson with caution. If data on the new breeding area is available and included in the IPM, no problem will arise, however, if the monitoring information is very specific to the Svalbard population, problems could arise. The new migration route is to be observed and decisions to be made accordingly in the future.

48. The IPM for the Pink-footed Goose is currently undergoing the last stages of peer review, including but not limited to requesting the Pink-footed Goose Task Force for review of the work. The initial feedback has been very positive.

49. The EGM IWG agreed on the recommended harvest quota of 22,000 birds for the 2019/2020 season, split into 6,600 for Norway and 15,400 for Denmark.

Decision and Action:

The recommendation to use the IPM for population size estimates was confirmed for the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose. The EGM IWG agreed to the recommended harvest quota for 2019 of 22,000 Pink-footed Geese.

The harvest quota will be divided between **Denmark** and **Norway** according to an agreed 70:30 ratio – 15,400 for Denmark and 6,600 for Norway. The countries will implement national harvest regulation to regulate the harvest for the coming 2019/2020 hunting season.

7.3 Report and Recommendations from the Pink-footed Goose Task Force

50. Prof. Jesper Madsen, Coordinator of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force, presented the Task Force's work and recommendations to the EGM IWG, referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.8](#) (*Report and recommendations of the EGMP Pink-footed Goose Task Force and draft workplan for 2019/2020*). The Task Force's membership has representation from the Range States with governmental, NGO and scientific affiliations. An overview on key activities, as well as recommendations to the EGM IWG was given.

51. A note has been prepared by Ms Iben Hove Sørensen and Mr Ove Martin Gundersen on the needs for better harvest organisation in Denmark and Norway. As seen in the presentation on AHM for the Pink-footed Goose, there is still a need to increase harvest in order to bring the population down to the target of 60,000 birds. The recommendation is to improve the collaboration between landowners, hunters and managers via local meetings and campaigns further, but also to bring stakeholders together in an international workshop on hunting organisation, sharing lessons learned, exchanging best practices, eventually leading to the preparation of a set of guidelines to be used nationally and between countries. This work could pave the ground for larger international processes applicable to other species like the Greylag Goose or the Barnacle Goose in the future.

52. A second note on grassland habitat restoration was prepared by the Belgian delegation represented by Mr Floris Verhaeghe, prepared in collaboration with Mr Eckhart Kuijken and Ms Christine Verscheure. Whilst only a part of the Pink-footed Goose population moves to Belgium in winter, the habitat is very important for the species, since it is one of the few cold winter havens available for roosting and foraging. Whilst geese have been known to move to agricultural sites, these are subject to agricultural policy and grasslands habitats are needed to provide the stable environment the geese can turn to. The example from Belgium shows a well implemented practice of integrating goose conservation management into wider ecosystem conservation.

53. Furthermore, the Pink-footed Goose Task Force elaborated a number of indicators to be used in the forthcoming evaluation and revision of the Pink-footed Goose ISSMP in 2022, contained in the document made available to the EGM IWG. The preparation of the indicators has been supported by data provided in the national reporting for each of the fundamental objectives of the plan. The EGM IWG took note of the indicators on which basis a revision workplan for the ISSMP will be presented next year.

54. The Pink-footed Goose Task Force elaborated key activities for the workplan for 2019/2020 in the face-to-face meeting on 17 June 2019. The workplan proposal was presented to the EGM IWG and is included as Annex 4 to this document

55. FACE voiced support for the activities of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force and suggested to look into the opportunity to convene the international harvest organisation workshop around the goose specialist meeting in the Netherlands to take place next year.

56. The 2019/2020 workplan for the Pink-footed Goose Task Force, as well as the recommendations put forward by the Pink-footed Goose Task Force were adopted as presented.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2019/2020 of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force as presented in Annex 4.

The **Pink-footed Goose Task Force** will elaborate a report on the new migration route of Pink-footed Goose.

The **Pink-footed Goose Task Force** will work on indicators for the evaluation of the ISSMP in 2022, which will be presented to the EGM IWG at its 5th meeting in June 2020.

Agenda item 8. Taiga Bean Goose session

8.1 Taiga Bean Goose population status update

57. Referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.9](#), *Taiga Bean Goose Population Status Report 2018/2019*, Dr Henning Heldbjerg from the EGMP Data Centre presented an update on the Taiga Bean Goose population in the four MUs (Western, Central, Eastern1 and Eastern2).

58. The Taiga Bean Goose population status report was compiled in collaboration with external experts and reviewed by the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force. The Western and Central MUs are showing signs of a stabilising population, whilst the trends for the Eastern 1&2 remain unknown.

59. Accounting for the lack of data from Germany in January, additional counts in October and March have been added to increase accuracy of population numbers. The annual monitoring cycle for the Central MU of the Taiga Bean Goose now consists of three annual counts in January, March and October, leading to the estimation of population size and consecutively to the modelling of the optimal harvest strategy in May/June. The majority of the Taiga Bean Goose are found in Sweden throughout the year.

60. For the harvest report the constant harvest rate of 3% is used instead of the actual hunting bag, since the estimations and actual numbers are not accurate due to a lack of data from some countries (especially in the Eastern 1&2 MUs) and delayed information in other Range States.

61. In the Eastern 1&2 MUs consistent lack of monitoring and harvest data has largely prevented assessments. However, two positive examples in the last year give hope for better data in the future. In the Eastern 1 MU GPS tagging on the German border to Poland has taken place in the autumn of 2018 (led by Mr Thomas Heinicke), monitoring birds migrating through Belarus to the Ural. Whereas in the Eastern 2 MU a tagging project has taken place in the Eastern part of Yamal Peninsula in Russia in the spring of 2018 (led by Ms Sonia Rozenfeld), showing that the Taiga Bean Goose winters in NW China. This data is extremely important for population management, showing movements along the flyway, within MUs and other population data.

8.2 Taiga Bean Goose AHM update and recommendations

62. Dr Fred Johnson presented on the *Harvest Assessment for Taiga Bean Geese in the Central Management Unit: 2019* (document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.10](#)) to the Meeting.

63. The constant adult harvest rate of 3% was adopted in 2017, with the intent of allowing recovery of the population while providing limited hunting opportunity. In 2018 the EGM IWG decided at EGM IWG3 to keep the constant harvest rate for the interim period until an IPM for the Taiga Bean Goose has been developed. Funding for the IPM has now been secured by Finland.

64. The main ongoing tasks for the Taiga Bean Goose are first to improve monitoring of population sizes and harvest, develop an IPM to guide harvest decisions, discuss management objectives and ultimately develop a truly adaptive harvest management process. Currently the process is not adaptive due to lack of data and of an optimal monitoring framework. A good example of the necessity is the reliance of the current harvest strategy only on the January count, which was severely biased low in 2018 and 2019, most probably due to cold temperatures in January pushing the birds into more southern regions which are less accessible or where they are simply not recorded. The IPM circumvents this problem by using counts at different times of the year together with any other demographic information available to estimate the size of the population.

65. Secondly the focus lies on developing explicit and quantifiable objectives to be used to set quotas and management performance. The main management objectives are to maintain the population between 60,000 and 80,000 birds, whilst providing opportunities for sustainable hunting and avoiding closed hunting seasons as much as possible. To fulfil both management objectives some trade-offs are necessary. The decision on where exactly to set the population target and the hunting quota is a policy decision to be taken by the decision-makers.

66. The constant harvest rate strategy quota is based on the January count (41,927 in 2019). Therefore, based on this agreement and the models used, the recommended harvest quota for 2019 is set at 1,740 birds, slightly higher than last year. The quota per country is spread out with 261 birds in Russia, 852 in Finland, 452 in Sweden, and 174 in Denmark. No exact numbers are available on the actual harvest, since some countries only provide cumulative figures for Bean Geese. The recommendation for 2019 is to maintain the adult harvest rate of 3%, whilst continuing the development of the IPM to be ready for the 2020 season. The model will then be used to explore some of the trade-offs between management objectives to enable an informed judgement, in order to be able to propose an adaptive management strategy in 2020 that incorporates explicit and quantifiable management objectives, relies on a robust monitoring programme and explicitly recognises the uncertainty whilst offering a mechanism for learning and adaptation. Clarifying on a question from the EC Dr Johnson explained that in the case of the Taiga Bean Goose additional monitoring needs are still very high, for which some additional resources will need to be invested. In contrast to this, for the Pink-footed Goose several monitoring streams are available and the IPM offers cost saving possibilities by identifying the optimal streams necessary for modelling.

67. Sweden stated that the 3% harvest rate was agreed in Copenhagen at EGM IWG2 to be applied until the recovery of the Taiga Bean Goose, which seems to have been reached with around 60,000 birds counted in autumn 2018 and spring 2019. Since most birds winter in Sweden, causing significant damage on fields, a higher harvest rate is needed to prevent agricultural damage, which is costly to the country. Following the suggestion of the Chair, it was agreed to nevertheless use the 3% harvest rate this year, as no other recommendation can be made ad hoc with the available data and models. On the basis of the IPM more informed discussions will be held at EGM IWG5 next year to set an appropriate harvest quota. The Range States were urged to focus on improved monitoring for input to the IPM, enabling this informed decision.

Decision and Actions:

The Meeting agreed to continue using the constant harvest quota of 3% until next year, with the proviso that Sweden might not be able to adhere to the quota.

The harvest quota for 2019 has been set at 1,740 individuals, with the aim to have the IPM ready to be implemented next year for setting the new quota.

Finland, Sweden and Denmark shall take the necessary steps to implement harvest regulations to adjust the harvest for the coming 2019/2020 hunting season and will focus on improved monitoring for input of data to the IPM, enabling more informed decision-making for 2020.

Sweden specifically will endeavour to work on enhancing means to monitor harvest specific to the Taiga Bean Goose sub-species to enable better modelling with the IPM next year.

8.3 Report and Recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force

68. Mr Mikko Alhainen, Coordinator for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force of the EGMP presented on the work progress and recommendations to the EGM IWG, referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.11](#).

69. The thematic monitoring sub-group mandated at EGM IWG3 had been established. The group's work focused on the implementation and further development of the Taiga Bean Goose monitoring framework to enhance quality of data on population size, harvest and sub-species delineation.

70. A number of meetings were held by the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force, including two MU-specific meetings for the Central MU (held in Sweden) and for the Western MU (online).

71. The issue of harvest data collection in Denmark and Sweden was discussed by the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force, identifying further need to develop the harvest monitoring to meet the minimum requirements of harvest data and its timely delivery.

72. Furthermore, work on the brochure for separation of Tundra and Taiga Bean Goose has been progressing. The guidelines are foreseen to be available before the mid-winter counts in 2020. The collection of data sets on sub-species to increase understanding on delineation between Tundra and Taiga Bean Geese has started with head samples collected which are being DNA-analysed. The information will also flow into the guidelines to be prepared.

73. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force recommended the development of a monitoring framework for the for the *Western MU* population including the following activities:

- Increase of the number of GPS-tagged Taiga Bean Geese to assess unknown staging and wintering sites, focus the monitoring activities on the right areas and provide information on possible risks associated with Swedish hunting and spring derogation/conditional shooting. Put special focus on the GPS-tagging of the Norfolk group, which has experienced the most severe decline and whose current migratory patterns and threats they are exposed to are currently unknown;
- Continue age structure/juvenile proportion assessment in Slamannan and organise such in Jutland;
- Compile all existing data to combine with the new telemetry data for the assessment of key sites and combine with spatial data on the extent and distribution of spring derogation/conditional hunting;
- Improve international coordination of the mid-winter counts. Immediate sharing of monitoring data and bird movements between monitoring experts to increase the chances of finding the birds during mid-winter counts.

74. Further, the Task Force recommended the development of a cost-effective and reliable long-term monitoring framework for the *Central MU* of the TBG in order to deliver an estimate of the true population size to be used as a basis for harvest strategy modelling:

- For the period of 3 years, the Central MU TBG population size shall be monitored in three seasonal counts: (1) Autumn, (2) Mid-winter and (3) Spring counts. Together with previous datasets they will provide the basis for further analysis of the optimal monitoring framework:
 - i. Continue autumn and January counts as part of the Swedish Monitoring programs;
 - ii. Supported with funding spring counts based on voluntary efforts to cover essential coordination and travel costs and ensure successful monitoring;
 - iii. Consider further expanding the spring monitoring to spring staging sites in Finland and Denmark. A proposal to organise spring counts in Finland will be prepared, if considered necessary.
- An IPM shall be used to 1) estimate the true population size and 2) analyse which of the available censuses provides greatest value for effort and how to further strengthen the monitoring within the available resources, thus providing feedback to required monitoring efforts;
- To strengthen the harvest bag recording in Sweden and Denmark and explore new ways of collecting harvest data on species and/or sub-species subject to international quotas. Harvest bag recording shall cover regular hunting, conditional hunting and derogation shooting with the possibility to differentiate between forms of harvest. A harvest data estimation process shall be developed to meet the schedule of the annual decision-making process of the EGM IWG.

75. In the *Eastern 1&2 MUs* it was recommended to develop and establish a monitoring framework. Whilst some counts already occur in the area much more is necessary to establish a functioning monitoring framework. A funding proposal for a project furthering this work has been circulated in May 2019 to the Range States. The options are open to revise and broaden the proposal, involving more countries/organisations in order to meet the funding possibilities of the countries. Moreover, the appointment of a second coordinator for the Eastern 1&2 MUs has been envisaged since inception of the Task Force and is still pending. Range States were encouraged to put forward proposals for suitable, preferably Russian-speaking, candidates with an existing network.

76. The non-AHM related workplan extended in 2018 until 2020 was proposed to be kept, with the view to be revised or extended next year. The draft workplan for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force (Annex 5) will be finalised in the next few months.

77. Denmark noted that whilst they have no objection to the recommendation on enhanced monitoring in Denmark and Sweden, there is not much funding available for such work, and the country will not be able to deliver the spring monitoring at this time.

78. The EGM IWG agreed on the recommendations and the workplan for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force with a note on the situation on the Danish funding restricting monitoring activities. The bulk of the birds are in Sweden at this time.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG agreed to keep the non-AHM workplan as previewed until 2020, adopted the workplan for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force (Annex 5) and agreed on the recommendations of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force.

The **Taiga Bean Goose Task Force** will work on increasing the monitoring framework for the Western MU, encouraging better international cooperation and timely data sharing.

Furthermore, the **Taiga Bean Goose Task Force** will support the development of the IPM for the Central MU, including the reinforcement of the monitoring framework. **Denmark** and **Sweden** will improve provision of hunting monitoring, separated by types of hunting, with the proviso that Denmark will do so within the realms of limited financial possibilities.

The **Range States** will seek funding possibilities for the project proposal on monitoring activities in Eastern 1&2 MUs and put forward recommendations for a second coordinator for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force for the region.

Agenda item 9. Greylag Goose session

9.1 Continuation of the Greylag Goose ISSMP implementation process

79. The Chair introduced the subject and the structure of the next agenda items related to Greylag Goose management, starting with a discussion on the continuation of the implementation of the Greylag Goose process.

80. Beginning of February 2019 France had issued a new spring hunting derogation, using the adopted ISSMP for the Greylag Goose as justification. Thereafter a communication on ministerial level between France and Norway ensued, with Norway stating agreement with the extension of the hunting season in France until 28 February. The lack of transparency in the process taking place bilaterally between France and Norway, outside the EGMP framework, was of high concern to the Chair, since the ISSMP states that the implementation of the ISSMP and the Adaptive Flyway Management Programmes (AFMPs) have to be agreed in a coordinated manner between the Range States. The Chair emphasised that when acting outside the EGMP framework, the credibility of the implementation process for the Greylag Goose and the EGMP are put at risk. Hence, the decision was made by the Chair to temporarily suspend the implementation process for the Greylag Goose ISSMP, pending the discussion of the subject at this meeting and likewise has been communicated to the National Government Representatives of the EGMP. To conclude, the Chair strongly reiterated that to maintain trust and support to the processes of the EGMP, it is extremely important that all Range States follow the agreed principles within the EGMP.

81. France delivered a statement on behalf of the Secretary of State, Ms Emmanuelle Wargon stating that the events that have taken place since the adoption of the ISSMP in December 2018 in Durban have caused a misunderstanding. France reaffirmed its commitment to the EGMP and the process of implementation of the ISSMP for the Greylag Goose, also by its intention to contribute financially (EUR 40,000) to the platform in 2019. Further, it was noted that the ongoing work on Greylag Goose is part of a larger commitment made by the French Government in 2018 to set-up an adaptive management approach, for species the state of conservation of which is unsatisfactory, for example the Turtle Dove, and for some of them which are experiencing a very important increase in their population, such as the Greylag Goose. France explained that within the Norway-France-Spain management unit identified in the ISSMP, some countries are facing damage caused by Greylag Geese resulting from the considerable increase in the population. The means implemented by the countries concerned have not been able to stabilise and even less to reduce the level of this damage, particularly to crops. Whilst having full commitment for the development of a shared strategy between the Range States via the EGMP, due to the urgency of the situation with a rapidly expanding population of Greylag Geese causing damage, France intended to test a derogation under the conditions in Annex 4 of the ISSMP as of February 2019. The derogation had been in place only for a short time and subsequently had been suspended by the State Council. During this time a system of declaring the hunting bag by smartphone was tested and found useful with lessons learnt to flow into the EGMP process.

82. The statement from Norway also affirmed the support for the EGMP and its processes and the expectation to continue the work on the implementation of the ISSMP for the Greylag Goose. Whilst until the plan is operative, each country has at its discretion to act independently, any future issues should be dealt with under the umbrella of the EGMP. Norway added that they see much value in speeding up the implementation process of the ISSMP as much as possible and committed additional funds for this phase of the coming year.

83. The EC reminded that the outcomes of EGMP processes, as well as national measures taken for implementation of the plans, in the cases of EU Member States should always be in line with the Birds

Directive. The EC stated its full support to the work of the EGMP and the implementation of the two ISSMPs adopted at MOP7, including the development of the AFMPs that are based on Management Units. The EC further stated that the main objective of the ISSMPs is to improve coordination between Range States and identify problems nationally and transboundary. The international framework needs to be in place before each country takes action based on the AEWA ISSMPs, in order not to undermine the benefits derived from and the credibility of the whole process. In this context France's decision was premature and not coordinated within the EGMP. Moreover, it was not justified considering the absence of an AFMP and the lack of evidence according to the conditions of Article 9 of the Birds Directive, in particular with regards to demonstrating the absence of satisfactory solutions. Hence, the EC supported the decision taken by the Chair to suspend the Greylag Goose ISSMP implementation process until EGM IWG4. The EC requested that all EGMP Range States shall respect the principles of coordinated and step-wise action that is established in the ISSMPs and that all concerned EU Members States shall act in line with the requirements of the EU Birds Directive. If these principles are not followed, the EC will see itself forced to re-evaluate its support towards the EGMP and the implementation of the ISSMPs under its remit.

84. The Netherlands supported the suspension of the Greylag Goose process until this meeting, based on the fact that countries have made bilateral decisions on the basis of the ISSMPs, prior to any coordinated decision making and with this jeopardising international cooperation. It was reiterated that such a situation should be avoided in the future implementation of the ISSMPs.

85. Germany noted that while they will not take part in the implementation of the Greylag Goose ISSMP, the decision taken by France has wider implications in the work of the EGMP and thus, Germany shared the concerns that were raised by the Netherlands and the EC. The need to follow agreed procedures was also raised and the willingness to contribute towards the Greylag Goose process providing relevant data.

86. The UK, as a non-Greylag Goose Range State indicated their support on the statement made by the EC on the bilateral actions of Norway and France being unjustified and unacceptable. Whilst also stressing on the importance of international cooperation, the UK also sees this as a tool to work constructively in the future.

87. BirdLife expressed its worries about the process and reinforced that this issue has put at risk the credibility of the entire process as well as the concept of adaptive harvest management. FACE voiced its support towards the EGMP, seeing the process of adaptive harvest management as the future for ensuring the conservation and management for certain waterbird species at the international level, thus the need to move the process forward.

88. The Chair concluded that next to the expressed concern about the bilateral arrangements outside the process of the EGMP, Range States, the EC and Observers alike also had expressed support for the continuation of the process. The suggestion to continue the Greylag Goose process under the condition that all Range States adhere to the agreed principles under the EGMP framework, i.e. that any implementation of the Greylag Goose ISSMP will be jointly agreed by the EGM IWG, was accepted by the EGM IWG. However, in case the principles are not adhered to and decisions are taken outside of the EGM IWG, the entire process is put at risk.

Decision:

The EGM IWG agreed to continue the process of implementation of the Greylag Goose ISSMP under the condition that all Range States adhere to the agreed principles under the EGMP framework.

9.2 Adaptive Flyway Management Programme (AFMP) framework and process for the Greylag Goose

89. Presented by Ms Eva Meyers, the EGM IWG heard an overview of the proposed process for the Greylag Goose, based on document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.12/Rev.1](#) *Process for the Development of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Northwest/Southwest European Population of the Greylag Goose*.

90. The mandate for the development of the AFMP is contained in the ISSMP for the Greylag Goose. The purpose of the AFMP is to establish an agreement amongst Range States on the implementation of those activities in the Greylag Goose ISSMP that require coordination at the population and/or MU level.

91. The outcomes of a management planning meeting for the development of the AFMPs held in Kalø, Denmark, in March 2019 included a proposed outline of an AFMP for the Greylag Goose, including the definition of MUs and FRVs, population targets, monitoring indicators and programmes, as well as protocols for the iterative phase. Annexes to the AFMP are planned provide additional information on MU-specific workplans, information on Box1 of the ISSMP, population models, the documentation of the MCDA process and impact models.

92. The proposed timeline for the development of the AFMP for the Greylag Goose NW/SW European population is streamlined as much as possible to keep the process short, taking into account the desire of the Range States to start implementing the ISSMP as soon as possible and is aiming at the presentation of a draft AFMP for adoption to the EGM IWG at its 5th meeting in June 2020. The timeline foresees the provision of the pending national FRVs to the Secretariat in order not to delay the whole process.

93. The development of the AFMP will require additional resources to be provided by the Range States. Norway has already provided co-funding of EUR 23,000 for the MCDA with work scheduled to start in July 2019. Co-funding of EUR 8,400 is still needed as soon as possible. Staff time for development of population models from ONCFS has been assured by France. Furthermore, a new position for Academic Technician is envisaged to be established to undertake Box 1 (of the ISSMP) data collation and the development of impact models. The cost of this position for the duration of two years is set at EUR 192,000. The final compilation of the AFMP is to be undertaken by the Secretariat and Data Centre with the help of an external consultant. The provision of the resources in due time is a condition for delivery of the elements of the process given in the timeline.

94. The data needs on national level for the development of the AFMPs were outlined by Prof. Madsen for the Range States, the Data Centre and national research institutes.

95. France stated that a shortened timeline is prerogative for decision-makers to potentially provide more funding and suggested to start the implementation once FRVs have been provided, starting a process of trial, improvement and re-trial. The Secretariat explained that the process of setting population targets after provision of the FRVs finally leading to decision-making at EGM IWG5 and implementation of the plan is imperative to be followed through without implementation on the ground before the process is finalised.

96. Other Range States expressed agreement with the proposed elements of the outline of the AFMP and timeline for the process, however, reservations were voiced by Sweden regarding the practicality of summer counts in Sweden related to the MU selection, as well as by Denmark and the EC on the cost of the process. The suggestion by Denmark of three-yearly data provision was in principle seen to be conceptually feasible, but possibly leading to a reduced ability to meet the management objectives. It was decided to differ the decision to the beginning of the iterative phase.

97. The EC suggested to add a section on the cumulative impact of derogations and legal hunting as contained in the outline for the Barnacle Goose AFMP.

98. Germany stated not to take part in the implementation of the AFMP for the Greylag Goose.

99. The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline of the AFMP for the Greylag Goose and took note of the proposed timeline and steps, as well as data and resources needed.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline of the AFMP for the Greylag Goose and took note of the proposed timeline and steps, as well as data and resources needed.

The **EGM IWG** will decide on the length of the cycle for data provision after the establishment phase of the process for development of the AFMP has been concluded.

The **Secretariat** will add a section on cumulative impact of derogations and legal hunting to the AFMP.

9.3 Definition of Management Units for the Greylag Goose

100. Dr Léo Bacon and Prof. Jesper Madsen presented the document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.14](#) *Definition of Management Units in the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose and implications for monitoring*.

101. Neckband re-sighting results were used to generate data from birds ringed in Norway, Germany, Denmark and Sweden. Re-sightings showed the migration of the birds throughout the year including the Netherlands, France and Spain.

102. Based on these findings on the biological component, looking at the density of re-sighting for each breeding population from the country where they were neck-banded, three MUs can be distinguished:

MU1 Norwegian breeding birds migrating to wintering grounds in the Netherlands and Spain, using stopover sites in Denmark, Germany and France. Breeding birds in this MU do not show any exchange with breeding birds in MU2 during the breeding season.

MU2 Swedish and Danish breeding birds, nowadays primarily wintering in the Netherlands, and partly to France.

MU3 Dutch, Belgian and north-west German breeding birds which are primarily sedentary.

103. These MUs are in line with the preliminary MUs included in the Greylag Goose ISSMP but have been confirmed with comprehensive data analyses.

104. For Finland the data available was not enough to be included in the modelling, therefore it is not clear if these birds could be integrated into one of the three MUs or define a separate MU.

105. Managing and monitoring has cost implications linked to the number of MUs. The more MUs are decided on, the more data on population size, offtake, as well as on demographic variables (adult survival and productivity) will be needed. The benefits of separation of MUs needs to be weighed against the monitoring needs.

106. Range States already indicated that summer counts are very difficult in some countries due to the large numbers and wide spread localisation of the birds. A possibility to circumvent this, would be a random sampling programme from which one can interpolate or use it as an index for the trend for the summering population in the countries.

107. The Range States expressed their preferences on the number of MUs to apply, taking into account the biological assessment, management objectives, as well as the feasibility of monitoring needs. The option of managing the Greylag Goose in one sole MU was supported by Norway, Denmark and France for cost reasons, with all three Range States stating to be able to compromise on two. The Netherlands, Finland, Belgium and the EC expressed preference for multiple MUs, ideally three or as a second choice two MUs to distinguish residential and migrating population.

108. Relating to a question from Germany, the Secretariat assured that no matter how many MUs will be applied, the fundamental principle is of keeping the population in a Favourable Conservation Status (FCS)

across the range. Germany also agreed to make efforts to contribute data on the summer counts in the Länder as much as possible, even though they are not taking part in the implementation of the AFMP.

109. The Range States reached a compromise agreeing on setting two MUs for the Greylag Goose AFMP. MU1 and MU2 will be managed jointly as the migratory population and MU3 separately as the resident population.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG agreed on setting two Management Units for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose (migratory MU1 and MU2 as one unit and resident birds in MU3 as another unit).

The **Range States of the Greylag Goose** will endeavour to support the necessary monitoring to support the two MUs of the Greylag Goose, with the proviso that summer counts are extremely difficult in some countries.

Germany will not take part in the management of the species but will make efforts to contribute monitoring data to the process.

9.4 Defining Favourable Reference Values (FRVs) for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose

110. Dr Szabolcs Nagy presented document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.16/Rev.1](#) *Defining Favourable Reference Values for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose*.

111. Dr Nagy provided background on the need for defining the Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) contained in the ISSMP and in the provisions of Article II(1) of AEWA. The Range States had agreed at the 2nd AEWA International Management Planning Workshop for the Barnacle Goose and the Greylag Goose, which took place in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands, on 19 June 2018, to apply the CMS definition of FCS and to define the Favourable Reference Values (FRVs) applying the EU FCS guidelines (Bijlsma et al., 2019²). Following this introduction, Dr Nagy explained the stepwise process of setting FRVs following Bijlsma et al. 2019.

112. Range States commented on the late submission of the revised version of the document and expressed the wish to receive revisions in track changes in future.

113. The EC commented that generally the concept of FRVs was mainly developed for declining species and its application for very abundant species is not so easy. Further the EC stated that the documents produced by AEWA are of high importance for the EC and that these shall be in line with the guidance document from the EC on this topic. The EC also stated that the AEWA documents produced on setting FRVs (for Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose) presented to this meeting are not supported by the EC, as they are missing some crucial elements and are not in line with the discussions previously held with AEWA on the principles of setting FRVs for birds, based on the work done by the EC and Member State's experts in the framework of the EU Habitats Directive. The EC explained that the EU Habitats Directive requires an assessment on the FCS of species, which is a different approach from assessing the extinction risk and red listing. The FRVs for population and range are two elements among several, in assessing the status under the EU Habitats Directive. The EC considered that the current intention of the documents seems to be aiming at establishing the Minimum Viable Population instead of the FRVs. However, the EC also welcomed the approach that AEWA is taking on defining FRVs for bird populations as a constructive way forward of defining population levels that could serve as guiding elements in the debates of management of abundant goose species. The EC referred AEWA to its guidelines as part of Article 12 reporting for 2019. These guidelines reflect the efforts of joint work

² **Bijlsma, R. J., Agrillo, E., Attorre, F., Boitani, L., Brunner, A., Evans, P., Foppen, R., Gubbay, S., Janssen, J. A. M., van Kleunen, A., Langhout, W., Noordhuis, R., Pacifici, M., Ramirez, I., Rondinini, C., van Roomen, M., Siepel, H. & Winter, H.V.** 2019. Defining and applying the concept of Favourable Reference Values for species and habitats under the EU Birds and Habitats Directives; Technical report. Wageningen, Wageningen Environmental Research, Report 2928. 94 pp. (URL: <http://edepot.wur.nl/469035>).

between Member States and the EC. The EC further highlighted that the report by Bijsma et al. 2019, which is an external report by contractors clearly states that in the case of conflicting definitions and approaches, the official EC guidelines take precedence. Finally, criticism on the substance of the Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose documents on FRVs were voiced by the EC. The two documents deal with FRPs mainly, not with Favourable Reference Range or Habitat and therefore represent a minimalistic approach. Furthermore, conclusions seem to be derived from assumptions, rather than scientific conclusions and FRVs are not examined on Management Unit level sufficiently.

114. The Netherlands expressed support of the comments of the EC and requested further that the FRV document(s) should be understood on their own merits by including the clarification of FRVs, the translation of FRP and FRR to MU, national and SPA level, including data to be used as well as adding the graph on the Management Units shown in the presentation by Dr Nagy.

115. Also, an extended timeline was requested to set the FRVs nationally since the setting of FRVs could have a major impact on agricultural management in the Netherlands and thorough discussions with the Provinces are necessary to take into account all potential consequences beforehand.

116. Whilst it was pointed out by the Secretariat that agreement from the Range States was necessary only on the approach to set the FRVs, not on the document itself, the Secretariat agreed to the wish of several Range States to revise and improve the document to find agreement. Clarifications were offered by Dr Nagy in the meeting but will also be added to the revised document.

117. Following an extensive discussion, the EGM IWG agreed on the following way forward:

1. The document will be revised according to the discussion and comments made during the meeting and shall be reviewed and agreed within the next month by end of July 2019 to avoid a delay in the whole process.
2. The timeline given in the document for the definition of FRVs will be amended and circulated to the EGM IWG.
3. The Greylag Goose Range States will provide the figures of their national FRVs for the breeding population to the Secretariat by the 12 July 2019.
4. Favourable Reference Values should be possible to aggregate from national to management unit and to flyway population level.
5. The Favourable Reference Population for the non-reproductive season should be derived from the national Favourable Reference Populations defined by the Range States for the breeding season.
6. If the FRVs cannot be agreed on within the proposed timeframe, the process of the MCDA will be started in parallel to the decision-making process on the FRVs.
7. The process and principles set out in the guidance document on Reporting under Article 17 of the EU Habitats Directive should be applied.

118. It was clarified by the Chair that no implementation will begin, before the EGM IWG will agree on the AFMP at EGM IWG5 in June 2020.

Decision and Actions:

The Range States agreed to a revision of the document AEWA/EGMIWG/4.16/Rev.1 by the Secretariat, on which they will endeavour to agree. The revision will be circulated by 31 July 2019 to the Range States.

The **Secretariat** will send an amended timeline for the definition of the FRVs for the Greylag Goose.

The **Range States of the Greylag Goose** will endeavour to agree on the FRVs as soon as possible. If the FRVs cannot be agreed in time, the process for the MCDA will be started in parallel to the decision-making process on the FRVs.

The **Range States of the Greylag Goose** will send the national FRVs for the breeding population to the Secretariat by 12 July 2019.

Agenda item 10. Barnacle Goose session

10.1 Adaptive Flyway Management Programme (AFMP) framework and process for the Barnacle Goose

119. Outlining the essence of document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.13/Corr.1](#) *Process for the Development of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose*, Ms Meyers gave the EGM IWG information about the proposed structure and content of the AFMP, which differs slightly from the AFMP for the Greylag Goose.

120. The proposal brought to the EGM IWG focussed on the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose. Discussions on the AFMPs for the Svalbard/South-west Scotland population, as well as for the East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland population were still under discussion with the respective Range States and will be followed up by the Secretariat.

121. The proposed timeline for completion of the development of the AFMP, including the definition of MUs and FRVs, is similar to the Greylag Goose timeline with a first draft to be presented to the EGM IWG5 meeting in June 2020.

122. Further data and resources for the position of Academic Technician to collate information and develop the impact models and for the AFMP compilation, are required until end of the year 2019. Funding for the additional position should ideally be secured by July 2019. The development of population models has already been agreed and funded by the Netherlands.

123. Sweden stated that like for the Greylag Goose, the monitoring costs implied are problematic for the country. The EC also expressed concerns on the costs of the impact models, whereas the Netherlands stated that the impact models are crucial for the process, since they are key to defining the damage which is the basis and justification for the whole AFMP. Also, the EC suggested to look into the possibility of a longer monitoring cycle of three years to reduce costs.

124. The UK detailed that they are eager to start the process for the Greenland population and potentially for the Svalbard population. A brief discussion with the Icelandic delegation has already taken place, reaching agreement on a meeting in autumn, to which hopefully also Norway, Greenland and the Republic of Ireland will be able to agree and join.

125. The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline and content and took note of the timeline. They also considered the data needs and resources required for the AFMP for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population.

126. The Chair reiterated that the agreement is on the initial phase to get the process started. Afterwards, during the iterative phase, decisions like on the length of the cycle can be considered.

Decision and Action:

The EGM IWG agreed on the proposed outline and content of the AFMP for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & the Netherlands population and took note of the proposed timeline and steps, as well as data and resources needed.

The **EGM IWG** will decide on the length of the cycle for data provision after the set-up phase of the process for development of the AFMP has been concluded.

The **Secretariat** and **Range States of the Greenland and Svalbard population** will organise a meeting in autumn 2019 to initiate a process for these two populations.

10.2 Definition of Management Units for the Barnacle Goose

127. Referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.15](#) *Definition of Management Units in the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose and implications for monitoring*, Prof. Jesper Madsen presented the possible MUs, as suggested in the ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose:

- MU1 The Arctic Russian breeding population (migratory);
- MU2 The temperate Baltic breeding population, including the Oslo Fjord breeding population (migratory)
- MU3 The temperate North Sea breeding population, breeding in Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and South-western Denmark (considered sedentary).

128. Between the two temperate MUs (MU2 and MU3) an exchange of birds is already occurring – the predictions are that these two MUs will overlap in not too long a time. At the same time some exchange is also occurring from the temperate MUs to the Arctic MU (MU1).

129. Whilst the MUs are not discreet, the management objectives are different for the MUs. Specifically, Range States have expressed the wish to separate the Arctic breeding MU from the temperate MUs. Also, the temperate MUs bring different problems with them.

130. The monitoring needs and requirements for no MU, two or three MUs to be considered and decided by the EGM IWG, were presented in a table and are very similar to those for the Greylag Goose.

131. The Netherlands pointed out the wording in the ISSMP on page 10 stating the split into three MUs due to specific management challenges, not to be negotiable, and therefore preferring to keep three MUs, a view with which Germany agreed. The option had been tabled at this meeting nevertheless due to the monitoring needs and the connected cost implications that one, two or three MUs bring, as Prof Madsen outlined.

132. Sweden once again expressed concerns on the costs of summer counts that are currently not set up in their country and extremely difficult due to widespread birds, therefore stating preference for one MU. Denmark and Norway also advocated for one MU since no biological reason seems to be given for a split into three MUs, but if no consensus can be reached on this, they also could agree on keeping three MUs.

133. The EGM IWG noted the implications of having three MUs, as stated in the ISSMP, as a basis for the development of the AFMPs for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & the Netherlands population.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG agreed to base the AFMP on three MUs for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & the Netherlands population (MU1, MU2 and MU3) as already specified in the ISSMP.

The **Range States of the Barnacle Goose** will endeavour to support the necessary monitoring to support the three MUs of the Barnacle Goose, with the proviso that summer counts are extremely difficult in some countries.

10.3 Defining Favourable Reference Values (FRVs) for the Barnacle Goose

134. Making reference to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.17/Rev.1](#) *Defining Favourable Reference Values for the Barnacle Goose (Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population, East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland Population, Svalbard/South-west Scotland Population)*, Dr Szabolcs Nagy outlined the justification for the need to set Favourable Reference Values (FRVs), the step-wise approach of setting the FRVs, as well as conclusions and recommendations to the EGM IWG.

135. The Chair opened the floor for comments from Range States and Observers.

136. In the same way as was stated for the Greylag Goose document, the Netherlands stated the late availability of the document, giving only a short time for national discussion before making a decision at the EGM IWG meeting. For future processes the request is to give more time to discuss with technical staff nationally.

137. Following the discussion, it was decided that the Secretariat will revise the FRV document for the Barnacle Goose incorporating the additional information given in Dr Nagy's presentation and requested by the Range States, along the same lines as the redraft of the FRV document for the Greylag Goose. Within the next 6 months the document will be revised, reviewed and finalised. Exact timelines will be defined by the Secretariat after internal discussion. This would lead to a decision on the approach of setting the FRVs by the end of the year. In 2020 until June and the EGM IWG5 meeting a document will be produced in a collaborative process with the Range States, suggesting FRVs for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose. The first deadline for comments in writing from the Range States was set to 31 July 2019.

Decisions and Actions:

The Range States agreed to a revision of the document by the Secretariat, on which they will endeavour to agree.

The **Range States of the Barnacle Goose** will send comments for the revision of the document to the Secretariat by 31 July 2019.

The **Secretariat** will amend the document on FRVs for the Barnacle Goose taking into account the comments received and will aim at having a final version consulted and approved by the Range States by the end of the year.

The **Secretariat** will endeavour to make documents of complex content available as soon as possible to give time for intra-national consultations before decision-making at the EGM IWG meeting.

10.4 Modelling Consortium overview of current projects

138. Prof. Jesper Madsen presented on the work of the International Modelling Consortium. Many activities of the very active group have already been mentioned under other agenda items.

139. Representatives of the International Modelling Consortium were present in the national delegations participating in this meeting (Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, UK).

140. The International Modelling Consortium is coordinated by the EGMP Data Centre, organising annual meetings, exchanging data and undertaking various analyses. Currently each Range State supports their own experts. The aim in the future is to attract EU funding (e.g. Horizon 2020 program) for the activities and become more formalised and expand the work. The work of the International Modelling Consortium is ground-breaking by modelling waterbird species across borders in Eurasia.

Agenda item 11. Report and Recommendations from the Agriculture Task Force

141. Dr Ingunn Tombre, Coordinator of the Agriculture Task Force of the EGMP reported on the activities of the Task Force and recommendations to the EGM IWG, referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.18](#).

142. The Agriculture Task Force held its second face-to-face meeting on 17 June 2019, closing the annual cycle of activities. A key output of the Agriculture Task Force in the past year has been the production of a report on management measures for geese ("An overview of the management measures for geese in Range States of the EGMP"). The report compiles the currently available information on the different measures used for reducing crop damage and agricultural conflicts.

143. The report reveals the need for common practices in countries managing the same population along the flyway.

144. The effectiveness of the measures has not yet been analysed within the scope of the report. However, the need to quantify and develop benchmarks has become apparent, leading to an analysis of the correlation

between goose numbers and crop damage. Indicators need to be developed to measure the actual crop damage, considering management objectives (fundamental, means and process objectives).

145. Further key work of the Agriculture Task Force is to provide data to the EGMP's work processes. Currently the data needs for the development of the AFMPs concentrate on agricultural impact assessment and models. Some information is already available and will be compiled by a sub-group of the Agriculture Task Force. A couple of reports have been received at the face-to-face Task Force meeting by Mr Johan Månsson (Sweden) on evaluation and improvement of methods for crop damage reduction and by Karen Post (Copa-Cogeca/EU Farmers) on the amount and kind of funding used for goose management subsidies and compensation. A third presentation was given by Mr Frank Huysentruyt on the identification of measures in relation to objectives, outlining the need for a guidance document for "practical use" based on the ISSMPs, specified by species, Range State and region to enable a value-based process to guide decision-makers.

146. The workplan for the Agriculture Task Force (Annex 6) was discussed during the face-to-face Task Force meeting and some small changes applied to be circulated to the EGM IWG. Close cooperation with the International Modelling Consortium has increasingly become important for the work of the Agriculture Task Force.

147. Activity in the field and interactions with farmers were also pointed out as crucial to the process. Two examples of such interaction changing attitudes and rallying support for the work of the international work on goose management.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2019/2020 of the Agriculture Task Force as presented in Annex 6.

Agenda item 12. EGMP Finance Report for 2018/2019

148. Referring to the document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.19/Rev.1 EGMP Finance Report 2018/2019](#), Mr Sergey Dereliev presented the financial situation of the EGMP in the last year, during which the funding for the Platform has been provided by the Range States on the basis of an indicative voluntary scale of contributions agreed on at EGM IWG3 in June 2018.

149. The financial report encompasses the full year 2018, as well as actual expense figures for Quarter 1 (Q1) of 2019 and projections until 31 December 2019.

150. In 2018 the voluntary contributions of the Range States of EUR 364,138 left a funding gap of EUR 101,862 to the full budget of EUR 466,000 agreed at EGM IWG3 with one reservation from Germany. The gap could be filled to an extent with a larger carry over from the previous year and some reduction in expenditure due to post incumbents in the Secretariat and other savings. Expenditure in 2018 reached a level of EUR 338,825.

151. In 2019 pledges by the Range States to date of the EGM IWG4 reached EUR 266,168 with only EUR 11,000 (Netherlands) payments actually received so far. Therefore, the funding gap versus the agreed budget (EUR 466,000) is EUR 199,832.

152. The funds contributed by the Netherlands to the Barnacle Goose activities (EUR 10,000) were integrated into the EGMP budget in 2019 due to the species being brought under the umbrella of the platform, whereas the funds Norway allocated towards the Greylag Goose process (EUR 23,708 leftover) were earmarked for the work on the MCDA for the Greylag Goose. In 2018 some funds (EUR 4,800) were contributed by Norway for communications material and a recent contribution of EUR 18,480 has been pledged by Finland for the development of the IPM for the Taiga Bean Goose.

153. The cash balance at the beginning of 2019 showed a full reserve for the Secretariat and the Data Centre (EUR 252,000 in total) and a carry-over of EUR 36,501 to the 2019 EGMP budget.

154. Due to the low level of pledges and much lower level of payments received until June 2019, the cash balance estimated at the end of 2019, taking into account the projected expenditure (EUR 382,285) enabling the EGMP to operate, leaves a gap of EUR -79,616

155. In 2019 the reserve has been crucial for the EGMP to survive, therefore maintaining a full reserve in 2020 is of utmost importance. The Range States were requested to communicate their pledges and payments for 2020 in a timely manner (Q1), as well as making every effort to meet the indicative scale of voluntary contributions towards the core budget.

156. Once comprehensive figures from all Range States on in-kind contributions have been received, these will also be reflected in the finance report.

157. Following a suggestion from Norway it was agreed that some countries will receive invoices of the amount stated in the scale of contributions at the end of each year for the following year, whilst others will communicate their pledges and receive the invoices accordingly afterwards. Procedures will be clarified individually for each Range State with the Secretariat.

158. The Scottish Government confirmed a pledge of £25,000 to the EGMP on behalf of the UK at this meeting, with the aim to possibly fund the remainder of the indicative scale for the UK until the end of the year. Due to the Brexit negotiations the UK is in an exceptional financial situation at the moment. The hosting of the EGM IWG4 meeting also has a value of EUR 10,000 in-kind contribution from the UK.

159. Belgium stated that whilst they have little agricultural damage and resulting compensation payments in their country, the contribution is seen as an investment in the future to prevent further damage. Belgium urged other countries to use the same approach to justify payments and make contributions.

160. The Chair reiterated the seriousness of the financial constraints the EGMP is facing and asked the Range States to make all efforts to find extra funding for the platform.

161. The EGM IWG took note of the EGMP finance report for 2018-2019.

Decision and Actions:

The **Range States** took note of the finance report for 2018/2019 and will make all efforts to secure funding to fill the gap in the 2019 EGMP budget and ensure continued operations of the platform.

The **Secretariat** will enquire with each Range State and agree on an individual way of invoicing for voluntary contributions towards the annual core budget.

If full information is available from the Range States, the **Secretariat** will include in-kind contributions made by Range States outside the EGMP core budget for activities that provide a direct input into EGMP processes.

Agenda item 13. EGMP budget and costed Programme of Work for 2020

162. Mr Dereliev presented the *EGMP budget for 2020 and costed Programme of Work*, referring to document [AEWA/EGMIWG/4.20](#).

163. The 2020 EGMP budget estimate and the costed Programme of Work (cPOW) for 2020 was presented with a total of 466,000 EUR, split into 282,000 EUR for the Secretariat and 184,000 EUR for the Data Centre, thereby remaining at the same level as in previous years.

164. As requested by France at the previous meeting (EGM IWG3, in Leeuwarden in June 2018), one new scenario for a scale of contributions for 2020 was presented next to the option of continuing with the voluntary, indicative scale of contributions 50% by population/50% by UN scale with 15% cap (scenario 5 with 9 Range States) as adopted for 2019. The new scale is built on the same principles, however encompasses all 15 Range States, attributing a minimum payment of EUR 2,000. For the already paying countries the level of contributions is not much different in the new scale, however, the risk of the countries allocated a minimum contribution not being able to contribute is quite high, which could lead to a deficit in the budget critical for

the EGMP. This view was generally agreed on by the Range States and the new scale presented found unrealistic for EGMP operations.

165. The cPOW for 2019 was revised as requested by the Range States at EGM IWG3 in Leeuwarden in June 2018, following the adoption of the ISSMPs for the Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose at MOP7. Except for Germany, who rejected the 2019 cPOW, all other Range States agreed with the revised document by correspondence. Using the 2019 cPOW as a basis and considering the proposed budget estimate for 2020, the cPOW for 2020 was presented to the meeting.

166. During the ensuing discussion the Range States stated the need for understanding the high staffing costs of the two posts in the Secretariat. The Secretariat referred the actual expenditures of the posts being significantly lower than the budgeted amounts due to the current post incumbents but took note of the need for more information and breakdown of the costs, which will be provided to the Range States. Norway in addition asked to add “P” and “G” to the positions for “professional” and “general” type of staff respectively.

167. Commenting on expenditures for 2020 Norway stated that with the new work on the Greylag Goose and Barnacle Goose AFMPs, the expenditures are likely to be higher and approaching EUR 466,000. The Secretariat confirmed that a new projected expenditure estimate will be provided next year, which is likely to be higher than this years’ expenditure.

168. Germany reinforced their reservation on the budget for 2020 and the indicative scale of contributions. Even though indicative, for Germany the commitment is legally too close to mandatory contributions, which cannot be made.

169. Range States expressed concern about the low level of contribution of some countries, putting an unfair burden onto the Range States contributing more. However, looking at feasibility, the scale was generally accepted as the best scenario and endeavoured to be aimed at by all Range States.

170. Norway and the UK also commented on the respectful, reliable and transparent handling of funds by the Secretariat and the Data Centre.

171. The Chair invited the Range States to agree and adopt the budget, as well as the cPOW for 2020 and take note of the proposed scale of contributions presented.

172. The EGM IWG approved the budget for the EGMP for 2020 as presented (Annex 1) and the cPOW for 2020 (Annex 2) and agreed to maintain the same indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2020, as for 2019 (Annex 3) with one reservation from Germany on the budget and indicative scale of voluntary contributions.

Decisions and Action:

The presented budget estimate for 2020 (Annex 1) and indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2020 (remaining the same as for 2019) (Annex 3) was approved with one reservation from Germany.

The Range States also approved on the cPOW for 2020 as presented (Annex 2).

The **Secretariat** will provide additional information on the UN staffing costs to the Range States, as requested.

Agenda item 14. Extension of the taxonomic scope of the EGMP to other waterbird taxa

173. Mr Dereliev introduced the subject; a preliminary discussion and exchange on the potential expansion of the scope of the EGMP. No document was presented for this agenda item and no decision-making was expected at this meeting.

174. The Long-tailed Duck, Velvet Scoter and Eurasian Curlew were presented as potential species to join the EGMP. Each has an ISSAP and the species are occurring in the Range States present at this meeting. The first two are globally threatened species, the third Near-Threatened. Despite the red-listing status, the Birds Directive still allows hunting for these species and reservations have been made to their listing under AEWA.

Whilst countries will still be able to hunt the species, they also have an obligation for sustainable use, therefore harvest management has been introduced through the ISSAPs for recovery of the species.

175. A priority list for future management planning is also currently being established by the AEWA Technical Committee, on which for example the Common Eider is likely to be high up.

176. For the Eurasian Curlew the work is most advanced, with the only regular hunting practice in France. Bilateral discussions between Secretariat and the French Government are ongoing about the development of an AHM Plan. Such AHM plans would need coordination. However, to set up stand-alone coordination mechanisms would mean that the same Range States of the EGMP would convene in a separate meeting. The Secretariat suggested that the most efficient possibility for management of these populations would be to bring them to the EGMP by extending its taxonomic scope. Each species would still be dealt with separately. A decision to extend the scope of the EGMP to further species would of course also need to be underpinned by the adequate financial resources.

177. The Netherlands made a statement on behalf of the EC expressing worry about the expansion of the geographical scope of the EGMP. The UK expressed the opinion also not to be in favour of extending the scope of the EGMP for not losing the focus on geese and the targeted discussions. Nevertheless, great appreciation was voiced for AEWA's management of sustainable use and management processes overall. The view was supported by the Netherlands and France also mentioning the additional resources that would be needed, not seeming realistic in the current situation of the platform.

178. The Netherlands stated that they also conduct damage control for other species of geese, requesting information if considerations are made, to include such species under the EGMP. The Secretariat responded that under the prioritisation exercise of the AEWA Technical Committee also issues like damage control are taken into account. Once the species has a management plan it could be discussed to include it under the EGMP. However, the focus of the EGMP should be on a pan-European platform for sustainable use and management, including declining huntable species, not only abundant species, where the focus lies on damage control.

179. Benefits and synergies to bring other species to the EGMP were clearly seen by Finland and Iceland. Support for the development of AHM plans for the mentioned species was expressed by Wetlands International, supporting the inclusion of such species under the EGMP. Also, at MOP7 the European Union representative requested the EGMP to focus more on declining rather than increasing species. A further argument brought forward was the possibility offered by AEWA to manage the European Curlew, whose population is extending to the UK, who possibly will lie outside the EU in the future. In such context the expertise of AEWA to manage AHM processes would be helpful.

180. Germany shared the concerns expressed by the EC, UK and the Netherlands. Thoughts on addressing other issues fostering the decline of species next to harvest, such as climate change, renewable energy, expansion, marine pollution, which in many countries might be more significant, were brought forward by Germany. The Secretariat reminded these issues being reflected in the management plans. Some AEWA working groups exist (for example for North European Seaducks), addressing broader conservation issues as mentioned.

181. The Chair closed the agenda point, thanking the Range States for sharing their thoughts on the subject.

Agenda item 15. Date and venue of the next EGM IWG meeting

182. Representing Finland, Mr Janne Pitkänen stated that his Government, specifically the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, would like to host the meetings of the EGMP Task

Forces and the 5th annual meeting of the EGM IWG in June 2020, which will be held back-to-back, in Helsinki, Finland.

183. The meetings were tentatively scheduled to take place within the week of 15-19 June 2020, with the EGMP Task Force meetings taking place on 15 June, preceding the EGM IWG5 meeting. The Range States were asked to communicate any clashes with major conferences or meetings they are planning to attend as soon as possible, to ensure a maximum attendance at the meetings. The Range States will be consulted before a final decision on the dates is taken.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG members accepted the offer of Finland to host the 5th annual meeting of the EGM IWG (EGM IWG5) in Helsinki. The delegates agreed on the tentative dates for EGM IWG5, to be held back-to-back with EGMP Task Force meetings within the week of 15-19 June 2020.

The **Range States** will communicate potential clashes of the envisaged dates with important meetings and conferences they are planning to attend to facilitate a final decision on the dates.

The **Secretariat** will consult with the Range States before a final decision on the dates is taken.

Agenda item 16. Summary of the meeting, next steps and closure of the meeting

184. The Chair expressed gratitude towards the Scottish hosts of the meeting, facilitating a good week in beautiful surroundings. Ms Uldal reminded the Range States to keep their eyes on the end goal, where the activities of the EGMP lead. Two great examples are already visible with the Pink-footed Goose population stabilising and the Taiga Bean Goose population increasing in the Central MU. The small steps currently taken towards the implementation of the Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose ISSMPs are nevertheless steps in the right direction.

185. Important discussions on budget and contributions have been held. In this context the Chair urged the Range States once more to leverage additional contributions once returning to their home countries after the meeting, to ensure the continuing operations of the EGMP.

186. Dr Trouvilliez on behalf of the Secretariat reiterated the need to increase equality between the Range States by all contributing to the EGMP at the level of the indicative scale of voluntary contributions towards the core budget, thereby ensuring the burden to be spread fairly. He urged the Range States to return home trying to find more funds to support the platform, as decisions have to be made in the next few weeks on continuing staff contracts in the Secretariat.

187. Dr Trouvilliez also thanked all the Range States for the passionate, engaged discussions, the AEWA and Data Centre staff, as well as Scottish Natural Heritage, wishing a safe return for all participants.

188. With that the Chair declared the Meeting closed.

Annex 1³

EGMP Secretariat Budget for 2020 (in EUR)

Object of expenditures	
Staff Costs	
EGMP Coordinator (100% ; P2)	142.000
Programme Management Assistant (100%; G5)	80.000
Subtotal	222.000
Operating costs	
Communication	5.000
Travel (staff and experts)	15.000
Miscellaneous (contracts, projects, workshops)	15.000
Subtotal	35.000
Meetings	
EGM IWG annual meeting (logistics, venue, etc.)	5.000
EGM IWG annual meeting travel (delegates, experts, staff)	20.000
Subtotal	25.000
Total Budget	282.000

EGMP Data Centre Budget for 2020 (in EUR)

Object of expenditures	
Staff Costs	
Goose Monitoring Coordinator (100%)	96.000
Population Modelling Expert (50%)	48.000
Lead Compiler (22.5 %)	30.000
Subtotal	174.000
Operating costs	
Travel, meetings, miscellaneous	10.000
Subtotal	10.000
Total Budget	184.000

³ As agreed by the EGM IWG at its 4th meeting 18-20 June 2019, with one reservation from Germany

Annex 2

EGMP Costed Programme of Work for 2020

Activity No.	Activities	Priority ranking*	Timeframe	Total Budget (€) Secretariat & Data Centre	AEWA Secretariat Budget (€)	Data Centre Budget (€)	Additional funding needs for projects (€)
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 work with the EGMP Data Centre	core	rolling		-	-	-
4	Undertake fundraising activities (project proposals, identify and approach potential donors)	core	rolling		-	-	-
5	Maintain the rolling costed Programme of Work for 2020	core	rolling		-	-	-
6	Develop and revise a draft costed Programme of Work for 2021	core	spring/autumn		-	-	-
7	Represent the EGMP at relevant meetings	core	rolling		-	-	-
8	Staff travel on official business	core	rolling	20.000	15.000	5.000	-
9	Consultancies and SSFAs	core	rolling	13.000	13.000	-	-
10	Other operational costs e.g. procurement, office supplies, office equipment, telephone, etc.	core	rolling	1.500	1.500	-	-
Staff costs							
	Head of Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit (2%) - AEWA			in kind	in kind	-	-
	EGMP Coordinator P2 (35%) - AEWA			49.700	49.700	-	-
	Programme Management Assistant G5 (30%) - AEWA			24.000	24.000	-	-
	Head EGMP Data Centre / EGMP Lead Compiler (2.2%) - Aarhus University			2.933	-	2.933	-
	EGMP Goose Monitoring Coordinator (5%) - Aarhus University			4.800	-	4.800	-
	Sub-total			115.933	103.200	12.733	-
B EGMP Meetings and Workshops							
1	Organise and support the EGMP International Goose Modelling Consortium Meeting	core	Jan - Mar	5.000	-	5.000	-
2	Organise and support the face-to-face meeting of the EGMP Task Forces (back to back with EGM IWG5)	high	Jan - June	-	-	-	-
3	** Organise the Fifth Meeting of the European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG5) (venue, catering, etc)	core	Jan - June	5.000	5.000	-	-
4	Travel for staff and funded delegates to EGM IWG5 (travel, visa, DSA, etc.)	core	Jan - June	20.000	20.000	-	-
5	Prepare meeting documents for EGM IWG5	core	Jan - June	-	-	-	-
6	*** Organise other meetings and workshops as necessary	medium	as required	-	-	-	tbd
Staff costs							
	Head of Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit (4%) - AEWA			in kind	in kind	-	-
	EGMP Coordinator P2 (20%) - AEWA			28.400	28.400	-	-
	Programme Management Assistant G5 (30%) - AEWA			24.000	24.000	-	-
	Head EGMP Data Centre / EGMP Lead Compiler (2.2%) - Aarhus University			2.933	-	2.933	-
	EGMP Goose Monitoring Coordinator (10%) - Aarhus University			9.600	-	9.600	-
	EGMP Population Modelling Expert (5%) - Aarhus University			4.800	-	4.800	-
	Sub-total			99.733	77.400	22.333	-
C National Reporting							
1	Develop a revised National Reporting format according to the decisions made at the EGM IWG meetings	core	Jan/Feb	-	-	-	-
2	Adapt and maintain National Reporting System	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
3	Undertake the analysis and summary of National Reports	core	May	-	-	-	-
Staff costs							
	EGMP Coordinator P2 (5%) - AEWA			7.100	7.100	-	-
	Programme Management Assistant G5 (5%) - AEWA			4.000	4.000	-	-
	Sub-total			11.100	11.100	-	-
D International Single Species Action and Management Plans under the EGMP							
Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP							
1	Coordinate and support the work of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
Pink-footed Goose ISSMP							
2	Coordinate and support the work of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
Barnacle Goose ISSMP							
3	Coordinate the development of Adaptive Flyway Management Programme(s) for the Barnacle Goose	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
Greylag Goose ISSMP							
4	Coordinate the development of Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Greylag Goose	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
Crosscutting							
5	*** Develop a guidance on conflict resolution and consistency with EU legal framework (ISSMP Action B2)	high	tbd	-	-	-	tbd
6	*** Create a toolbox for decisions in relation to determining significant damage (ISSMP Action B3)	high	tbd	-	-	-	tbd
7	Coordinate and support the work of the Agriculture Goose Task Force	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
Staff costs							
	Head of Science Implementation and Compliance Unit (4%) - AEWA			in kind	in kind	-	-
	EGMP Coordinator P2 (28%) - AEWA			39.760	39.760	-	-
	Programme Management Assistant G5 (11%) - AEWA			8.800	8.800	-	-
	Head EGMP Data Centre / EGMP Lead Compiler (5.7%) - Aarhus University			7.600	-	7.600	-
	EGMP Goose Monitoring Coordinator (20%) - Aarhus University			19.200	-	19.200	-

	EGMP Population Modelling Expert (10%)- Aarhus University			9.600	-	9.600	-
	Sub-total			84.960	48.560	36.400	-
E	EGMP Data Centre						
1	Coordinate work with the EGMP Secretariat	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
2	Coordinate the work of the International Modelling Consortium	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
3	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
4	Present EGMP at various international conferences and relevant workshops	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
	Pink-footed Goose						
5	Update monitoring protocol for Pink-footed Goose	core	autumn	-	-	-	-
6	Develop data management plans for Pink-footed Goose	core	spring	-	-	-	-
7	Finalise development of IPM for Pink-footed Goose	core	March	-	-	-	-
8	Produce annual monitoring and adaptive harvest update reports for Pink-footed Goose	core	Jan-June	-	-	-	-
	Taiga Bean Goose						
9	Update monitoring protocol for Taiga Bean Goose	core	autumn	-	-	-	-
10	Develop data management plans for Taiga Bean Goose	core	spring	-	-	-	-
11	Produce annual monitoring and adaptive harvest update reports for Taiga Bean Goose	core	Jan-May	-	-	-	-
12	*** Develop an Integrated Population Model (IPM) for Taiga Bean Goose	high	spring	-	-	-	18.480
13	*** Taiga Bean Goose information brochure, including analyses of harvest distribution in Denmark (TBG Task Force activity)	high	spring	-	-	-	12.000
14	*** Improve Monitoring of Taiga Bean Goose in the Eastern 1 & 2. Management Units (TBG Task Force activity)	high	rolling	-	-	-	32.500
	Barnacle Goose						
15	Prepare a work plan for modelling activities required for the implementation of the ISSMP for the Barnacle Goose and AFMP(s)	core	January	-	-	-	-
16	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Barnacle Goose	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
17	Develop a monitoring protocol for Barnacle Goose	core	autumn	-	-	-	-
18	Develop data management plans for Barnacle Goose	core	autumn	-	-	-	-
	Greylag Goose						
19	Prepare a work plan for modelling activities required for the implementation of the ISSMP for the Greylag Goose and AFMP	core	January	-	-	-	-
20	Coordinate monitoring networks, databases and workflow with data holders and NGR for Greylag Goose	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
21	Develop a monitoring protocol for Greylag Goose	core	autumn	-	-	-	-
22	Develop data management plans for Greylag Goose	core	autumn	-	-	-	-
23	*** Develop Multicriteria Decision Analysis for Greylag Goose	high	spring	-	-	-	31.400
	Staff costs						
	Head EGMP Data Centre / EGMP Lead Compiler (12.4%) - Aarhus University			16.533	-	16.533	-
	EGMP Goose Monitoring Coordinator (65%) - Aarhus University			62.400	-	62.400	-
	EGMP Population Modelling Expert (35%) - Aarhus University			33.600	-	33.600	-
	Sub-total			112.533	-	112.533	94.380
F	Communications and information management						
1	Produce and Maintain website and social media content	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
2	Maintain EGMP workspaces	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
3	Maintain EGMP Contact Database	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
4	*** Development of a long-term Communication Strategy	high	Jan-Jun	-	-	-	75.000
5	Develop and produce publications and information materials (design, printing)	medium	rolling	5.000	5.000	-	-
	Staff costs						
	EGMP Coordinator P2 (7%) - AEWA			9.940	9.940	-	-
	Programme Management Assistant G5 (18%) - AEWA			14.400	14.400	-	-
	AEWA Information Management and Communications Team			in kind	-	-	-
	Sub-total			29.340	29.340	-	75.000
G	Further management and administrative processes according to UN rules						
1	Provide staff management, including regular team meetings with the AEWA Secretariat	core	rolling	-	-	-	-
2	Trainings, staff meetings, stand-in and other tasks within the AEWA Secretariat	core	rolling	500	500	-	-
	Staff costs						
	Head of Science Implementation and Compliance Unit (1%) - AEWA			in kind	in kind	-	-
	EGMP Coordinator P2 (5%) - AEWA			7.100	7.100	-	-
	Programme Management Assistant G5 (6%) - AEWA			4.800	4.800	-	-
	Sub-total			12.400	12.400	-	-
	Grand Total (rounded to 1,000)			466.000	282.000	184.000	169.000
				including programme support costs (13%) and overheads	including programme support costs (13%)	including overheads	including programme support costs (13%) and 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 for the EGMP core budget 2020⁴

Scenario 5			
50% by population / 50% by UN scale 15% cap, 9 states			
Range State	Secretariat	Data Centre	full budget
(Belarus)**			
Belgium	34,556	22,547	57,104
Denmark	33,760	22,028	55,787
(Estonia)**			
(EU)**			
Finland	31,115	20,302	51,417
France	26,573	17,338	43,912
(Germany)***			
Iceland	5,898	3,849	9,747
(Ireland)*			
(Latvia)**			
(Lithuania)*			
Netherlands	37,419	24,415	61,835
Norway	39,236	25,601	64,836
(Poland)*			
(Russia)*			
(Spain)*			
Sweden	41,447	27,043	68,490
UK	31,996	20,877	52,873
(Ukraine)**			
Total	282,000	184,000	466,000

* 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 costed programme of work

⁴ As agreed by the EGM IWG at its 4th meeting 18-20 June 2019, with one reservation from Germany.

Annex 4

Pink-footed Goose Task Force workplan 2019/2020

ISSAP / ISSMP Objective/Action/Result	Activity	Lead	Time-frame	Comments
Review of annual monitoring and assessment reports for the Pink-footed Goose	Comment on draft reports	Data Centre	First half of June 2020	TF members conduct the review
Analysis of potential biases in demographic variables used in monitoring and the new Integrated Population Model	Discussions about selected variables; input to analysis	Data Centre	April 2020	Activity to be decided autumn 2019
International workshop on hunting organisation in Norway and Denmark	Fundraising and organisation	OMG and IHS	November 2019	Timing to be decided in autumn 2019
Ecosystem services assessment	Proposal for monitoring and assessment; report	IT and JM	November 2019	Tbd, depending on funding opportunities
Report on new migration route by PfG	Report with recommendations to EGM IWG	Data Centre	April 2020	
Plan for review of ISSMP 2022	Note on process, criteria and procedure	Data Centre	April 2020	TF to provide input
Ecosystem impacts	Fundraising for production of assessment	JM	November 2019	Activity in collaboration with external partners (COAT)
Clarification of 60,000 population target (spring or autumn numbers?)	Preparation of note	Data Centre	March 2020	The issue has been brought up recently questioning if the target is based on spring or autumn numbers. The understanding of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force is that the target is linked to spring numbers, who incur the damage in agriculture and tundra degradation. However, the clarification has not been formalised yet. The note will be presented to the EGM IWG at its 5 th meeting in June 2020

FAJ Fred A. Johnson
 OMG Ove Martin Gundersen
 IT Ingunn Tombre
 JM Jesper Madsen
 FV Floris Verhaege
 EK Eckhart Kuijken
 CV Christine Verscheure

Annex 5

Workplan of the TBG TF 2019/2020

The draft workplan of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force is based on mandates and tasks emerging from the EGM IWG4 meeting in June 2019, in Perth, Scotland as well as discussions and ideas raised during previous meetings of the TF prior to EGM IWG4.

July - September 2019

- Finalise the TF workplan and prepare its activities following the decisions and outcomes from EGM IWG4

September 2019

- **9th TBG TF online meeting:**
Discuss and agree on the implementation of the activities included in the TBG TF Workplan.

October-November 2019

- Develop guidelines on TBG sub-species
 - Working group: Mikko, Eva, Iben, Jesper
 - Iben takes the lead to draft the outline
 - 1st draft circulated to the TF for review by the end of October
- Revise the draft and identify funding opportunities for the project in the Eastern 1&2 MU's
 - Bilateral discussion with Germany to re-structure the proposal
 - Skype meeting
 - Discuss proposal with Norway
- Support the development of harvest estimates in Sweden
- Discuss potential candidate for the 2nd TF coordinator (Eastern MUs) -options

December 2019

- **10th TBG TF online meeting:**
 - Adopt the guidelines on TBG sub-species
 - Eastern MU project proposal adoption (at the latest)
 - Status update on the progress of other activities
 - Possibly, welcome the 2nd coordinator of the TBG TF

January-February 2020

- Support the development of the TBG IPM
 - Preliminary report for review of TF in January
 - Need to discuss in detail by March what to recommend to the EGM IWG, depending on the population size and ability to regulate harvest in the Range States
- Finalise the TBG IPM;
- Support the activities in Eastern 1&2 MUs.

March 2020

- **11th TBG TF online meeting:**
 - Provide an update on the status of activities
 - Discuss draft recommendations and proposed timeline for the delivery of meeting documents for EGM IWG5.

April 2020

- Finalise documents for EGM IWG5
- Prepare and agree on the TBG TF report and recommendations to EGM IWG5

May 2020

- **12th TBG TF online meeting:**
 - Adopt the meeting documents for EGM IWG5
 - Draft and agree on an agenda for the 3rd face-to-face meeting of the TBG TF

Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions of the AEWA Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP (2019-2020)

Eastern 1 & 2 Management Units

Range States: Belarus, Estonia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, Ukraine

ISSAP actions ⁵	Detailed activities ⁶	Lead ⁷	Time-frame ⁸	Budget ⁹	Priority ¹⁰
Result 1.1. Legal harvest does not jeopardise an increase of adult survival rates					
1.1.1. Develop and implement international adaptive harvest management framework. Obey the principles of sustainable harvest management and decision-making framework for harvest management as described in the revised AEWA Guidelines for sustainable harvest of migratory waterbirds adopted by MOP6. Obtain accurate estimates of (sub) population size, and robust demographic and harvest data.	1.1.1.1 Prepare and adopt legislative proposals for the closure of hunting of Taiga Bean Geese (including the use of flexible hunting seasons in Belarus and Russia to allow for Taiga Bean Geese to pass before goose hunting is opened)	Responsible government authorities	2018-2020		Essential
	Range States: ALL				
	1.1.1.2 Improve knowledge on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese in all Eastern Management Unit Range States	a) Ensure national monitoring of Taiga Bean Geese at all known key sites (including providing identification training & equipment to people carrying out the monitoring where possible)	Responsible government authorities (Ministries of the Environment etc.)	2018-2020	
		Range States: ALL			
	b) Carry out satellite/GPS-tagging of Taiga Bean Geese in the wintering/staging areas to further identify and map potential key sites as well as migratory patterns (potentially tag birds in Eastern	TBG Task Force	2018-2020		High

⁵ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted blue

⁶ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted blue

⁷ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Leads on activities are still to be revised and defined

⁸ To be defined

⁹ To be defined

¹⁰ Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted in blue; the priority of the remaining activities will be revised and defined

ISSAP actions ⁵	Detailed activities ⁶	Lead ⁷	Time-frame ⁸	Budget ⁹	Priority ¹⁰
	Germany, Lithuania, Belarus or in Ukraine) Range States: best location for implementation to be decided				
	c) Increase efforts to engage Poland and Russia (especially Kaliningrad)	Lithuania Finland Norway	2018-2020		High
Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels					
1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	1.2.2.1 Prepare and implement an awareness-raising campaign for hunters to complement suggested legislation changes, including guidance on the identification of grey geese. Range States: Belarus, Ukraine	National NGOs and research institutes in cooperation with the TBG Task Force			
	1.2.2.2 Produce and disseminate special publication on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese Range States: Ukraine	National NGOs and research institutes			

Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions of the AEWA Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP (2019-2020)

Western and Central Management Units

Range States: Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, UK

ISSAP actions ¹¹	Detailed activities ¹²	Lead ¹³	Time-frame ¹⁴	Budget ¹⁵	Priority ¹⁶
<i>Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels</i>					
Action 1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	1.2.2.1 Investigate TBG shooting NE Jutland & Zealand Range States: Denmark		On-going since 2017		High
<i>Result 1.3. Impact of huntable native predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced</i>					
Action 1.3.1. Maintain and strengthen predator control measures in breeding and moulting areas	1.3.1.1 Undertake annual campaign amongst hunters in the breeding areas to strengthen fox management Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency + hunting association			
	1.3.1.2 Communicate to the Forestry & Parks Service the importance of continuing and strengthening fox management in the northernmost Finland Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency			

¹¹ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted orange

¹² From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted orange

¹³ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Leads on the activities are still to be revised and defined

¹⁴ To be defined

¹⁵ To be defined

¹⁶ Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted in blue; the priority of the remaining activities will be revised and defined

ISSAP actions ¹¹	Detailed activities ¹²	Lead ¹³	Time-frame ¹⁴	Budget ¹⁵	Priority ¹⁶
Result 1.4. Impact of alien predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced					
Action 1.4.1. Maintain and strengthen alien predator control and eradication measures in breeding and moulting areas	1.4.1.1 Carry on the eradication of raccoon dog in Lapland & Sweden Range States: Finland, Sweden	Finnish Wildlife Agency / Swedish Hunters' Association		FI: Secured (150,000 EUR) SE: secured (800,000 EUR)	
Result 2.2. Interspecific competition in spring staging areas is reduced					
Action 2.2.1. Maintain the unharvested-fields-for-birds programme (within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union, if applicable)	2.2.1.1 Continue implementing the fields for geese programme Range States: Sweden	County Administrative Boards		secured	
	2.2.1.2 Ministry of Agriculture to maintain this programme in the national CAP starting form 2020 Range States: Finland	Ministry of Agriculture			
	2.2.1.3 Demonstrate the benefits of the programme to the Agriculture Department of the Ministry of Agriculture Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency			
Result 3.1. Impact of forestry works is reduced					
Action 3.1.1. Continue the adaptation of forestry operations to take into account wildlife, in particular Taiga Bean Goose	3.1.1.1 Working models for Wildlife Friendly Forests management and forestry related habitat restorations are developed in co-operation with forestry sector and promoted at large to forest owners and corporations to reach implementation in practice. Actions implement the national management plans for the grouse species and the Bean Goose. Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency			

ISSAP actions ¹¹	Detailed activities ¹²	Lead ¹³	Time-frame ¹⁴	Budget ¹⁵	Priority ¹⁶
Action 3.1.2. Continue restoring mires used by Taiga Bean Geese that have been affected by past drainage	3.1.2.1 Implement annual goals for mire restoration by Parks & Wildlife Finland set by the Ministry of Environment Range States: Finland	Parks & Wildlife Finland			
	3.1.2.2 Develop and submit LIFE application to the EC Range States: Finland	Parks & Wildlife Finland			
<i>Result 3.3. Breeding, staging and wintering habitats are not further lost due to oil and gas or renewable energy developments</i>					
Action 3.3.1. Take account of Taiga Bean Goose breeding, staging and wintering habitats in the planning of new oil and gas and renewable energy developments	3.3.1.1 Assessment of new windfarm developments collision risk posed to Taiga Bean close to the Special Protection Areas identified as their important wintering sites Range States: Denmark and other Range States as applicable	National governments, National research institutes and windfarming companies	Ongoing	Secured	High (applied conditional to new wind farm developments)
<i>Result 3.4. Impact of agriculture on natural Taiga Bean Goose habitats is minimised</i>					
Action 3.4.1. Restore wet grassland habitats in staging and wintering areas	3.4.1.1 Increase the area of managed coastal grassland under CAP Range States: Finland	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment		secured	
Action 3.4.2. Review of & responses to rapid declines in England	3.4.2.1. Review factors possibly contributing to rapid declines in eastern England and implement appropriate management responses, as appropriate	(for UK to determine)	(for UK to determine)	(for UK to determine)	(for UK to determine)

Annex 6

Agriculture Task Force workplan

Workplan for Agriculture Task Force 2019/2020

1. Workplan 2019/2020

The following actions are planned for 2019/2020. The planned activities are based on the outcomes of the face-to-face meeting and EGM IWG4 in June in Perth, Scotland.

1. Action 1 – Collaboration with the Modelling Consortium

Activity

The Agriculture Task Force will collaborate with the Modelling Consortium and identify where the Task Force may contribute in terms of available data and compiled information. A common workshop may be an option, but the financial issues combined with this must be sorted out before this can be arranged.

Lead

I. Tombre in collaboration with Agriculture Task Force members.

Time-frame

September 2019 - March 2020

2. Action 2 – Create an overview of ongoing relevant projects

Activity

In order to evaluate the available data relevant for the modelling activities in EGMP, an overview of ongoing projects in the Range States will be created and published on the EGMP Website. An overview will contain the following information per project:

- i. Range State
- ii. Location
- iii. Project name
- iv. Goose Species involved
- v. Crop type involved
- vi. What is measured (may be several parameters)
- vii. Data availability (ongoing project, published in report, reviewed paper, etc)
- viii. Other relevant information

Details will be refined and adjusted as the work progress.

Lead

I. Tombre, with input from Task Force members.

Time-frame

September 2019 – January 2020

3. Action 3 – Evaluate available cost assessment in goose management in Range States and create an overview for the EGMP

Activity

As pointed out at the face-to-face meeting in Perth 17 June 2019, an assessment of costs spent on goose damages will be an extra source of information indicating the challenges for agriculture.

Such an overview may:

- indicate the size of the problem, i.e. one way of valuating the problem,
- show the need for actions and also justify actions (e.g. derogations),
- help to understand the Range States' goose management and priorities, and
- be a source of inspiration among countries for solving problems with geese.

Some of the above information already exists for several Range States, and the Task Force will identify the available information and presumably also collect new information with the aim to create an overview for the EGMP.

Lead

Initiated by I. Tombre, but a small group of Task Force Members (to be appointed during September 2019) will lead the work.

Time-frame

September 2019 – March 2020

Annex 7

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹⁷

PARTICIPATING RANGE STATES

BELGIUM

Mr Floris Verhaeghe (NGR)
Species Policy Expert
Agency of Nature and Forest
Koning Albert I - laan 1/2 box 74
8200 Brugge
Belgium

Tel.: +32 479 89 01 09
Email: floris.verhaeghe@vlaanderen.be

Dr Frank Huysentruyt (NE)
Researcher
Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)
Wildlife Management and Invasive Species
Van Goethemstraat, 80
9820 Merelbeke
Belgium

Tel.: +32 499 865 340
Email: frank.huysentruyt@inbo.be

DENMARK

Ms Camilla Uldal (NGR)
(*EGM IWG Chair*)
Head of Section
Species and Nature protection
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel.: +45 935 879 47
Email: cakis@mst.dk

Mr Jens Skovager Oestergaard (NGR)
Head of Division
Species and Nature protection
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

Email: jeno@ mst.dk

Professor Jesper Madsen (NE)
Head of the AEW A EGMP Data Centre
Department of Bioscience
Aarhus University
Grenåvej 12
8410 Rønde
Denmark

Tel.: +45 294 402 04
Email: jm@bios.au.dk

Ms Iben Hove Sørensen
(*Also representing CIC*)
Danish Hunters' Association
Molsvej 34
8471 Rønde
Denmark

Tel.: +45 817 716 64
Email: ihs@jaegerne.dk

ESTONIA

Mr Tõnu Talvi (NGR)
Chief Specialist of Nature Conservation
Environmental Board of Estonia
Nature Conservation Department
Viidumäe
93343 Saaremaa
Estonia

Tel.: +372 50 16 869
Email: tonu.talvi@keskkonnaamet.ee

Ms Leelo Kukk
Deputy General Director
Keskkonnaamet
Narva mnt 7A
15172 Tallinn
Estonia

Tel.: +372 55 59 77 05
Email: leelo.kukk@keskkonnaamet.ee

¹⁷ NGR – National Government Representative / NE – National Expert

EUROPEAN UNION

Mr Joseph van der Stegen
Policy Officer
European Commission
DG Environment, Nature Protection Unit
5, avenue de Beaulieu
Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +32 478 97 90 84
Email: joseph.van-der-stegen@ec.europa.eu

FINLAND

Mr Janne Pitkänen (NGR)
Senior Specialist
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Natural Resources Department
Unit for Hunting and Fishing
P.O. Box 30
00023 Government
Helsinki
Finland

Tel.: +35 829 516 2338
Email: janne.pitkanen@mmm.fi

Mr Mikko Alhainen (NE)
Senior Planning Officer
Finnish Wildlife Agency
Sompiontie 1
00730 Helsinki
Finland

Tel.: +358 (0) 29 431 2401
Email: mikko.alhainen@riista.fi

FRANCE

Dr François Lamarque (NGR)
European and International Actions Officer
Ministry of ecological and inclusive transition
(MTES)
Water and Biodiversity Directorate
Tour Séquoia
92055 La Défense CEDEX
France

Tel.: +33 1408 131 90
Email: francois.lamarque@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

Dr Léo Bacon (NE)
ONCFS
La Tour du valat, Le Sambuc
13200 Arles
France

Email: leo.bacon@oncfs.gouv.fr

Dr Mathieu Boos
Scientific Expert
Research Agency in Applied Ecology
Naturaconst@
14 rue principale
67270 Wilshausen
France

Email: m.boos@naturaconsta.com

GERMANY

Dr Carolin Kieß (NGR)
Legal Officer
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3 (Species Protection)
Robert-Schumann-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 22899 305-2668
Email: carolin.kiess@bmu.bund.de

Dr Heinz Düttmann (NGR)
Niedersächsisches Ministerium für Umwelt,
Energie, Bauen und Klimaschutz
Abteilung Wasserwirtschaft, Naturschutz,
Bodenschutz
Archivstr. 2
30169 Hannover
Germany

Tel.: +49 511 120 3538
Email: heinz.duettmann@mu.niedersachsen.de

Dr Timm Reinhardt
Senior Scientific Advisor
Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
Animal Conservation
Konstantinstrasse 110
53179 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 849 114 33
Email: timm.reinhardt@bfn.de

ICELAND

Mr Sigurdur Thrainsson (NGR)
Head of Division
Ministry for the Environment and Natural
Resources
Department of Land and Natural Heritage
Hjardarhagi 27
107 Reykjavik
Iceland

Tel. : +35 484 02419
Email : sigurdur.thrainsson@uar.is

Dr Gudmundur A. Gudmundsson (NE)
Ecologist
Icelandic Institute of Natural History
Ecology Department
PO Box 125
Urridaholtsstraeti 6-8
IS-210 Gardabaer
Iceland

Tel.: +35 459 005 00
Email: mummi@ni.is

Ms Bjarni Jónasson
Advisor
The Environment Agency of Iceland
Department for Chemicals, Inspection and Wildlife
Management
Borgir v/Norðurslóð
600 Akureyri
Iceland

Tel.: +354 591 2112
Email: bjarnij@ust.is

LATVIA

Mr Vilnis Bernards (NGR)
Senior Desk Officer
Ministry of Environmental Protection and
Regional Development
Nature Protection Department
Peldu iela 25
LV-1494 Rīga
Latvia

Tel.: +371 670 265 24
Email: vilnis.bernards@varam.gov.lv

Dr Oskars Keiņš (NE)
Senior researcher
Laboratory of Ornithology
Latvian University Institute of Biology
Miera Street 3
2169 Salaspils
Latvia

Tel.: +37 129 236 300
Email: oskars.keiss@lu.lv

NETHERLANDS

Ms Willemina Remmelts (NGR)
Senior Policy Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
NVLG - Nature
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 638 825 338
Email: w.j.remmelts@minez.nl

Mr Gerben Mensink (NGR)
Policy-maker Ecology
Province of Friesland
P.O. Box 20120
8900 Leeuwarden
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 582 928 955
Email: g.mensink@fryslan.nl

Mr Kornelis Koffijberg (NE)
Researcher
Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland
Department of Monitoring
P.O. Box 6521
6503 GA Nijmegen
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 247 410 463
Email: kees.koffijberg@sovon.nl

Dr William van Dijk
Policy Advisor
Province of Noord-Holland
Houtplein 33
2012 DE
Haarlem
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 6 3168 8132
Email: dijkwf@noord-holland.nl

NORWAY

Mr Øystein Størkersen (NGR)
Principal Adviser
Norwegian Environment Agency
Threatened Biodiversity Section
P.O. Box 5672 Torgarden
7485 Trondheim
Norway

Tel.: +47 7358 0500
Email: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

Mr Arild Espelien (NGR)
Senior Advisor
Norwegian Environment Agency
P.O. Box 5672 Torgarden
7485 Trondheim
Norway

Tel.: +47 415 123 96
Email: ares@dirnat.no

Dr Ingunn Tombre (NE)
Senior Researcher
Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA)
Department of Arctic Ecology
The Fram Centre
P.O. Box 6606 Langnes
9296 Tromsø
Norway

Tel.: +47 934 667 23
Email: ingunn.tombre@nina.no

Mr Ove Martin Gundersen
Project Manager
Norwegian Farmers Union
Hamnegata 33
7714 Steinkjer
Norway

Tel.: +47 922 90 491
Email: ove.martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no

SWEDEN

Ms Louise Bednarz (NGR)
Senior Advisor
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Naturvardsverket, Species Unit
Valhallavägen 195
106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 366
Email: louise.bednarz@swedishepa.se

Mr Per Risberg (NGR)
Desk Officer
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Naturvardsverket
Valhallavägen 195
106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 000
Email: per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se

Mr Urban Johansson (NGR)
Officer Research and Wildlife Management
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency –
Naturvardsverket, Wildlife Analysis Unit
Forskarens väg 5
Box 690, 831 27
Östersund
Sweden

Email: urban.johansson@naturvardsverket.se
Dr Johan Månsson (NE)
Researcher
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Grimsö Wildlife Research Station
730 91 Riddarhyttan
Sweden

Tel.: +46 706 63 88 83
Email: johan.mansson@slu.se

UKRAINE

Dr Olesya Petrovych (NGR)
Chief Specialist
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of
Ukraine
Unit of Coordination of Researches, Education
and Recreation activities of the Department of
Econet and Protected Areas
35, Vasilya Lipkivskogo Street
03035 Kyiv
Ukraine

Tel.: +38 067 784 1153
Email: petrovych.o@gmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Daniel Heptinstall (NGR)
Senior International Biodiversity Adviser
Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)
Monkstone House, City Road
PE1 1JY
Peterborough
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 1733 866 949
Email: daniel.heptinstall@jncc.gov.uk

Ms Rae McKenzie (NGR)
Goose Policy Manager
Scottish Natural Heritage
Wildlife Management Unit
Main Street, Bowmore
PA437JX Isle of Islay
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 1469 8107 11
Email: rae.mckenzie@snh.gov.uk

Ms Morag Milne
Wildlife Policy Officer
Scottish Natural Heritage
Battleby, Redgortan
PH1 3EW Perth
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 173 845 86 25
Email: morag.milne@nature.scot

Ms Claudia Rowse
Head of Natural Resource Management
Scottish Natural Heritage
Leachkin Road
IV3 8NW
Inverness
United Kingdom

Email: claudia.rowse@nature.scot

Dr Jessica Shaw
Ornithology Advisor
Scottish Natural Heritage
Battleby
PH1 3EW
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 7504 620 518
Email: shawmjessica@gmail.com

Dr Andrew Douse
Policy & Advice Manager
Scottish Natural Heritage
Biodiversity & Geodiversity Unit
Great Glen House, Leachkin Road
IV3 8NW
Inverness
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 1463 725241
Email: andy.douse@nature.scot

Mr Calum Watt
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House, City Rd
PE1 1JY
Peterborough
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 173 3866 948
Email: calum.watt@jncc.gov.uk

OBSERVERS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR GAME AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION (CIC)

Represented by member of the Danish delegation,
Ms Iben Hove Sørensen

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr Ariel Brunner
Senior Head of Policy
BirdLife Europe and Central Asia
Avenue de la Toison d'Or 67
1060 Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +32 491 904 653
Email: ariel.brunner@birdlife.org

COPA-COGECA

Ms Karen Post
Senior Policy Advisor
Copa-Cogeca / Danish Agricultural and Food
Council /Water and Nature Policy Department
Axeltorv 3
1609 Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel.: +45 33 39 46 52
Email: kpo@lf.dk

THE EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF ASSOCIATIONS FOR HUNTING AND CONSERVATION (FACE)

Mr Roderick Enzerink
Wildlife Policy Officer
FACE
Rue Belliard 205
1040 Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +31 636 323 619
Email: roderick.enzerink@face.eu

MIGRATORY BIRDS OF THE WESTERN PALEARCTIC (OMPO)

Dr Thibaut Powolny
OMPO
59, rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

Tel.: +33 144 010 510
Email: thibaut.powolny@yahoo.fr

NORDIC HUNTERS' ALLIANCE¹⁸

Mr Johan Svalby
Senior Advisor for International Affairs
Nordic Hunters' Alliance
Rue du Luxembourg 47-52, bte 2
1050 Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +32 478 817 468
Email: johan.svalby@jagareforbundet.se

WADDEN SEA FORUM

Mr Manfred Vollmer
Managing Director
Wadden Sea Forum
Virchowstr.1
26382 Wilhelmshaven
Germany

Tel.: +49 151 12158443
Email: vollmer@waddensea-forum.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

Dr Szabolcs Nagy
Senior Advisor
Wetlands International
P.O. Box 471
6700AL Wageningen
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 628 554 823
Email: szabolcs.nagy@wetlands.org

¹⁸ Subject to admission as permanent observer

WILDFOWL AND WETLANDS TRUST

Dr Baz Hughes
Head of Conservation Action
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
WWT Slimbridge
GL2 7BT
Gloucester
United Kingdom

Email: baz.hughes@wwt.org.uk

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

UNEP/AEWA SECRETARIAT

Dr Jacques Trouvilliez
Executive Secretary
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2414

Email: jacques.trouvilliez@unep-aewa.org

Mr Sergey Dereliev
Head of Science, Implementation and Compliance
Unit
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2415

Email: sergey.dereliev@unep-aewa.org

Ms Eva Meyers
Coordinator
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2457

Email: eva.meyers@unep-aewa.org

Ms Christina Irven
Programme Management Assistant
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2464

Email: christina.irven@unep-aewa.org

AEWA EGMP DATA CENTRE

Dr Fred Johnson
Research Biologist
U.S. Geological Survey
7920 NW 71 Street
32653 Gainesville
United States

Email: fjohnson@usgs.gov

Dr Henning Heldbjerg
Goose Monitoring Coordinator
AEWA EGMP Data Centre
Aarhus University
Grenåvej 12
8410 Rønne
Denmark

Tel.: +45 242 732 50

Email: hh@bios.au.dk

OTHER

Ms Karen Gauson
Event Organiser
Scottish Natural Heritage
Battleby Conference Centre
Redgorton
PH1 3EW
Perth
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 1738 45 85 11
Email: karen.gauson@nature.scot