AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT PLATFORM

5th MEETING OF THE
AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP

15-18 June 2020, Online conference format

REPORT OF THE 5th MEETING OF

THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT

INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP[1]

[1] Report finalised after written consultation with the meeting participants.

The 5th Meeting of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group took place remotely in an online conference format.

List of abbreviations

AFMP	Adaptive Flyway Management Programme
AHM	Adaptive Harvest Management
BG E. Greenland population	East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland Population of the Barnacle Goose
BG Russia population	Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose
FRP	Favourable Reference Population
FRVs	Favourable Reference Values
GG	Greylag Goose
IPM	Integrated Population Model
ISSMP	International Single Species Management Plan
MCDA	Multi-Criteria Decision Analyis
MU	Management Unit
PfG	Pink-footed Goose
TBG	Taiga Bean Goose
TF	Task Force

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
Adoption of agenda	The meeting agenda (*doc. AEWA/EGM IWG/5.2/Rev.1*) was adopted with no amendments.	
Admission of permanent observers and expert observers to EGM IWG5	The Range States accepted the participation of Ireland and Spain in the meeting as Range State observers.	
Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2019-2020)	The EGM IWG took note of the report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2019-2020).	
EGMP Finance report for 2019-2020	The EGM IWG took note of the EGMP Finance report for 2019-2020.	In the run-up to the EGM IWG6, the Secretariat will circulate a request for information on in-kind contributions from the Range States which will subsequently be included into the next finance report. The Range States will continue to seek funding for the contributions to the EGMP core budget.
Revision of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG	The proposal of Norway for amending Rule 16 was not accepted as it did not meet approval of the majority of the Range States.	
Summary of EGMP National Reports 2020	The EGM IWG took note of the summary of the EGMP national reports for 2020.	Recommendations and conclusions presented by the Secretariat will be taken into account in the decision-making process.

Report and recommendations from the PfG Task Force	The EGM IWG took note of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force report, adopted the workplan for 2020-2021 and accepted the use of spring population estimates as population target reference.	
PfG population status report 2019-2020	The EGM IWG took note of the Pink-footed Goose population status report for 2019-2020.	
PfG AHM for 2020	The EGM IWG adopted the preferred management option for the period 2020-2021; the agreed offtake quota of 22,000 individuals will be distributed according to the agreed 30/70 ratio between Norway (6,600) and Denmark (15,400).	
Report and recommendations from the TBG Task Force	The Range States took note of the report and recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force. The non-AHM workplan for 2020-2022 was adopted (presented in Annex 1 of this report).	The Range States agreed to proceed with the October and March counts in the Central Management Unit beyond 2021. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will continue the search for a suitable candidate to fulfil the capacity of a second coordinator in the Eastern 1&2 Management Unit. The Range States will designate dedicated experts to further boost the activities of the Task Force. The Integrated Population Model will be used to estimate the population and guide the management decisions with the anniversary date in March.
TBG population status report 2019-2020	The EGM IWG took note of the Taiga Bean Goose Population Status Report for 2019-2020.	

TBG harvest assessment for 2020-2021	The Range States agreed on the preferred management option for 2020-2021, suggesting an interim harvest quota of 9% (6,500) in the Central Management Unit, of which 3,770 is allocated to Finland, 1,950 to Sweden, and 780 to Denmark, which will maintain the population at 70,000.	
Report and recommendations from the Agriculture TF	The EGM IWG took note of the report and recommendations from the Agriculture Task Force and adopted the workplan for 2020-2021.	
BG E. Greenland population AFMP process	The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.19/Rev.1*, agreeing on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources that are required for the entire process.	
BG E. Greenland population AFMP framework	The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.20/Rev.1*, accepting the indicative timeline and the process for development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources required for its implementation.	
BG Svalbard population AFMP process and FRVs	The Range States agreed on the proposed FRVs and next steps for the planning and development of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.	

BG Russia population AFMP process	The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.16*, agreeing on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources that are required for the entire process.	
BG Russia population Status Report and population IPM	The EGM IWG took note of the population status report and the Integrated Population Model for the Barnacle Goose Russia/Germany & Netherlands population.	
BG Russia population AFMP framework	The Range States agreed on the indicative timeline and the process for development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and took note of the resources required for its implementation.	
BG AFMP: FRVs for the Barnacle Goose Russia population	The Range States agreed on the principles of setting Favourable Reference Values as described in the documents *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18* and *AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.11*.	The Range States will do their utmost to provide the revised values on populations and/or ranges by the end of 2020. The Secretariat will revise the document with the values provided by the Range States; the revised draft will be issued in 2021.
BG Russia population AFMP: Cumulative impact of derogation and legal hunting	The Range States agreed on the principle underlining the proposal of 200 % threshold above the Favourable Reference Population as a trigger for additional measures, under the provision that an additional inclusive discussion would be arranged once coordination of derogation and hunting will need to be launched.	

BG Russia population AFMP: Indicators	The Range States agreed on the indicators presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.	
BG Russia population AFMP: Iterative phase	The Range States agreed on the iterative phase presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.	The Secretariat will amend the timelines with respect to the provision of derogation data in order to more clearly align it with the process under the EC.
BG Russia population AFMP: Annual workplans	The Range States agreed on the approach and timeline for the development of annual workplans presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.	
Final adoption of BG Russian population AFMP	The Range States adopted the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme process document (*AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18)*, pending the missing sections.	
Establishment of Barnacle Goose Task Forces	The Range States agreed on the establishment and Terms of Reference of two Task Forces – for Russia/ Germany & Netherlands population and for E. Greenland, Svalbard and Scotland population of the Barnacle Goose.	
Summary and adoption of the BG Russian population AFMP process	The Range States agreed on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and the steps that are involved and took note of the resources that are required for implementing the process.	

GG AFMP process	The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.12*, agreeing on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources that are required for the entire process.	
GG population status report	The EGM IWG took note of the Greylag Goose population status report.	The Secretariat will revise the document to include the amendments requested by Spain and Belgium. The Range States will do their utmost to ensure timely provision of monitoring data to the Data Centre.
GG AFMP framework: Introduction		The Secretariat will amend the document by including Belgium in the list of Range States in Management Unit 1.
GG AFMP: Definition of FRVs	The Range States agreed on the outlined Favourable Reference Values under the condition that the values would be revised following submission of data from the Range States by the end of 2020.	
GG AFMP: Population targets above FRVs (MCDA results)	The Range States agreed on the population target of 70,000 breeding pairs for Management Unit 1, option B (80,000 breeding pairs) was adopted as a population target for Management Unit 2. The decision will be reviewed if any changes occur in the Favourable Range Population after submission of data from the Range States with a deadline end of December 2020.	The Secretariat will revise the document incorporating amendments requested by the Netherlands.

GG AFMP: Info-Gap Analysis	The Range States agreed on the management criterion of 15% reduction in population over 10 years, according to which up to 40% increase in the nominal level of offtake was possible.	
GG AFMP: Indicators	The Range States agreed on the overall outline of the indicators with the notion that the Task Force will work on their further refinement.	
GG AFMP: Iterative Phase	The Range States agreed on the proposed modalities for the iterative phase under the provision that a more detailed plan for its implementation would be discussed and decided in the GG Task Force.	
GG AFMP: Workplans	The Range States agreed on the approach and timeline for the development of annual workplans presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.	
Final adoption of AFMP	The Range States adopted the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose.	
Summary and adoption of the GG AFMP process	The Range States agreed on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and the steps that are involved and took note of the resources that are required for implementing the process.	

GG Task Force ToR	The Range States agreed on the establishment of a Task Force for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose and adopted its proposed ToR.	
EGMP costed Programme of Work and budget for 2021	The EGM IWG reviewed and approved the EGMP budget estimate for 2021 (presented in Annex 2 of this report), took note of the indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2021 (presented in document AEWA/EGMIWG/5.26) and reviewed and approved the proposed cPoW for 2021 (presented in document AEWA/EGMIWG/5.26).	The Barnacle Goose Russian Population documents will be revised using the new wording to be submitted by the Netherlands for this purpose.
Election of the next EGM IWG Chair	The Range States elected the UK as the Chair to the EGM IWG for the period from 2020-2022.	
Date and venue of the next EGM IWG meeting	The Secretariat accepted the renewed invitation of Finland to host the 6th Meeting of the EGM IWG in Helsinki in 2021. The meeting dates will be determined and announced after consultation with Finland.	

Day 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, greeting the participants and outlining the main objectives of this fifth Annual Meeting of the AEWA EGM IWG (EGM IWG5).

2. Dr Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary of AEWA, thanked the Chair and welcomed the participants to the EGM IWG5.

3. Mr Sergey Dereliev, Head of the Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit, noted that this was a big year for the EGMP with a lot of work for the Data Centre and the Range States. The Secretariat was excited to be hosting the meeting in an online format for the first time.

4. Ms Eva Meyers, Coordinator of the EGMP, introduced the guidelines for the online meeting as presented in document *AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf. 5.1*.

Adoption of Agenda

5. In the absence of comments from the meeting participants, it was agreed to adopt the proposed meeting agenda.

Decision:

The meeting agenda (*doc. AEWA/EGM IWG/5.2/Rev.1*) was adopted with no amendments.

Admission of Permanent Observers and Expert Observers to EGM IWG5

6. No new permanent observers attended the meeting. However, Ireland and Spain joined as non-participating Range States taking part in the meeting as observers. The Chair welcomed Ireland and Spain expressing hope that they would join the EGMP as participating Range States soon, noting that it would be crucial for processes under the EGMP.

Decision:

The Range States accepted the participation of Ireland and Spain in the meeting as Range State observers.

Report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2019-2020)

7. Ms Eva Meyers and Prof Jesper Madsen, Head of the EGMP Data Centre, introduced this agenda item (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.4*) explaining that the platform comprises of 14 participating Range States and the EU with no new countries having joined since the previous year. The Secretariat welcomed the involvement of Ireland in the implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme (AFMP) for E. Greenland/Scotland & Ireland and Svalbard/South-West Scotland populations of Barnacle Goose for the first time. Spain has also recently joined the process on implementation of the Greylag Goose International Single Species Management Plan (ISSMP). However, the official status of these countries as participating Range States in the EGMP is still pending confirmation.

8. There have been some changes in the Secretariat – due to financial constraints the position of the Programme Management Assistant has been vacant since August 2019. Ms Shenay Huseynova joined the team earlier in 2020 as a consultant to assist with the preparation for EGM IWG5.

9. Prof Madsen went on to provide a brief overview of the main activities of and outputs by the Data Centre.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the report of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre (2019-2020).

EGMP Finance Report for 2019-2020

10. Mr Sergey Dereliev presented a short overview of document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.25*. The status of payments to the EGMP core budget for 2020 stood at € 84,836 with additional pledges amounting to € 230,688. However, even with all the pledges fulfilled, there would be an expected funding gap of €150,476.

11. Nearly all the Range States identified as paying countries had provided contributions to the EGMP budget in 2019. For 2020, only the contributions from Norway and Germany had reached the EGMP Secretariat and the Data Centre, so far. There were a number of pledges which were, however, below the indicative scale of payments leading to the projected funding gap in the EGMP budget for 2020 if the situation would remain the same.

12. In addition to the core budget, in 2019, contributions had been received for specific projects: Norway provided funding for Greylag Goose activities, Finland funded the development of the Integrated Population Model (IPM) for the Taiga Bean Goose, while Germany contributed to the development of the AFMPs for Barnacle and Greylag Geese (compilation of Box 1).

13. Mr Dereliev concluded by emphasising that contributions in 2019 and 2020 had continued to being short of reaching the full agreed budget, whilst the Secretariat and the Data Centre had continued operating by spending less. In 2019, delays in payments and pledges had resulted in the termination of one staff position at the Secretariat – Programme Management Assistant – leading to a strain on the Secretariat's delivery. If all pledges for 2020 materialised, the expenditures would be covered, and reserves replenished with a remaining positive cash balance of €4,482. The vacant position at the Secretariat could not be filled in 2020 due to the budget prospect; the situation would be re-evaluated in 2021 with a hope for a better budget prospect allowing to restore the capacity of the Secretariat.

14. The Chair reiterated the importance of securing funds for the EGMP budget in a timely manner, which would help the Secretariat and the Data Centre in the planning of their activities.

15. Speaking on behalf of Finland, Mr Esko Hyvärinen pledged a provision of € 10,000 to the EGMP core budget.

16. Responding to the request from the Netherlands to reflect their contribution to the modelling for the Barnacle Goose in the report, the Secretariat clarified that the figures had not been included since the report covered the funds and expenditures of the Secretariat and the Data Centre, while any other funds spent by the countries in contribution to the process were considered as in-kind contributions. It was agreed that the Secretariat would circulate a table requesting information on the in-kind contributions from the Range States in advance of the EGM IWG6. The information on in-kind contributions provided by the Range States would then be reflected in the next finance report.

17. Norway appealed to the Range States encouraging prompt contributions to the EGMP budget to avoid uncertainties putting a strain on the functioning of the platform.

18. France confirmed the contribution of € 40,000 to the EGMP budget in 2020. For administrative reasons, the contribution would be made towards the end of the year.

19. Replying to the suggestion from France to revise the EGMP budget taking into account that the contributions and expenses had mostly remained the same over the past years, Mr Dereliev noted that the savings in the EGMP budget in the last annual cycle were mainly against the position of the Coordinator and termination of the Programme Management Assistant position, whereas the rest of the budget figures were matching the expenditures. He explained that the staffing costs put into the budget are the standard costs intended to cater to any situation and accounting for the biggest possible expenditures in terms of staff. The current incumbent costs less, but if a change in the incumbent was to take place, it could lead to a different situation; therefore, the Secretariat preferred to maintain the current arrangement.

20. It was noted that apart from contributions to the core budget in 2019, the UK had committed € 30,000 to hosting the EGM IWG4 in Scotland. In 2020, the UK has been contributing to the development of the Barnacle Goose (BG) E. Greenland Population AFMP where further work on impact modelling has been planned. Mr Heptinstall, the UK´s representative, confirmed that the UK remained committed to the scale of assessment and the budget as it had been stated in previous years, thanked the Secretariat for dealing with the financial challenges and welcomed the employment of a consultant to support the platform.

21. Drawing attention to the fact that only Denmark, France, the UK and Norway had contributed funds according to the indicative scale of contribution in 2019, Germany invited the Range States to consider and reassess the need for the further use of the scale.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the EGMP Finance Report for 2019-2020.

In the run-up to the EGM IWG6, the Secretariat will circulate a request for information on in-kind contributions from the Range States which will subsequently be included into the next finance report.

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

Revision of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG

22. The Secretariat introduced the agenda item (*doc.* *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.3*) reminding those present that the proposal from Norway concerning Rule 16 on decisions and provision for voting was raised in 2019 but deferred to this year's IWG meeting.

23. After the second circulation of the proposal this year, five Range States submitted comments to the proposal – France and the UK supported it, while the EU, Germany and the Netherlands opposed to the amendment.

24. Belgium objected the proposal noting it could discourage new Range States from getting involved in the process. Finland, Iceland and Denmark joined Belgium in confirming that they were against the proposed amendment.

25. France supported the amendment as a consensus suggesting replacing "EGMP core budget" with "EGMP activities" which would include both contributions to the budget and in-kind contributions. The Secretariat

suggested for France to submit a new proposal for revision at EGM IWG6 since the suggested rewording was changing the nature of the proposed amendment.

26. The European Commission noted that it was fundamentally opposed to the amendment as it would mean introducing a differentiated approach to the Range States, based on their willingness to contribute to the budget. Although there is an understanding of the financial challenges faced, the EC suggested working together to secure contributions through other means.

27. Given that 7 out of 15 Range States were against the amendment, the proposal was rejected. Norway agreed to the suspension of the proposed changes inviting the Range States to submit modifications of the proposal at the next EGM IWG meeting.

Decision:

The proposal of Norway for amending Rule 16 was not accepted as it did not meet approval of the majority of the Range States.

Summary of EGMP National Reports 2020

28. Referring to document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.5*, Ms Eva Meyers provided a brief overview of the EGMP national reports for 2019-2020. Belarus was the only country which had not submitted the report, the reason being the pending designation of its National Government Representative.

29. Some of the reports were submitted late, which was partly due to technical issues. Aiming for the timely production of the meeting documents, the Secretariat stressed the importance of avoiding such delays in the next national reporting cycle.

30. The Secretariat recommended keeping the current reporting format, while the level of detail and information could be improved. More comprehensive and up-to-date information would allow the Secretariat to provide a better overview of the relevant activities taking place in the Range States.

31. On behalf of Norway**,** Ms Ingunn Tombre noted that the country had a subsidy scheme in place instead of the compensation scheme indicated in the report, hoping that this error could be amended in the next reporting cycle.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the summary of the EGMP national reports for 2020. Recommendations and conclusions presented by the Secretariat will be taken into account in the decision-making process.

Report and Recommendations from the Pink-footed Goose Task Force

32. In his capacity as the Coordinator of the Pink-footed Goose (PfG) Task Force (TF), Prof Madsen presented document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.6*, outlining the activities of the TF in the past year.

33. The TF has been working on improving international exchange with hunters in Denmark and Norway, in particular with regard to their input to data collection.

34. Technical discussions are ongoing regarding the potential bias in the demographic variables of the IPM for PfG, which has been developed and put to use since 2019.

35. Prof Madsen went on to put forward recommendations from the TF on whether spring or autumn estimates should be used for the population target. Based on the IPM, the population has been declining in the past years nearing the population target. In this context, it is becoming increasingly important to discuss the timing for introduction of harvest restrictions in Denmark and Norway and to decide if autumn or spring estimates would be used.

The TF recommended using the population estimates for spring population size (60,000) due to the following reasons:

- The spring target was used in the ISSMP in order to address management issues mainly related to agricultural damage in spring and spring tundra degradation.
- Since the implementation of the ISSMP, the spring estimate has been accepted as the target by farmers and authorities dealing with agricultural conflict.
- Spring estimate will provide a bigger buffer from ecological perspective, in terms of the viability of the population to weather conditions and harvest.
- Choosing the spring estimate will allow for better and more constant hunting possibilities providing revenue to landowners and thus leading to alleviation of conflict with farmers in Norway and Denmark.

However, choosing the spring population estimate could lead to inconsistencies in international conservation context as international organisations such as Wetlands International and the Ramsar Convention have previously used autumn population estimates as reference.

36. Furthermore, an overview of the proposed TF workplan for 2020-2021 was presented.

37. The TF suggested preparation of a proposal, outline and a time plan for the assessment of progress against the ISSMP objectives to be conducted jointly with the Secretariat and the Data Centre. The proposal would be circulated to the IWG members for approval in autumn 2020 with the progress report on compilation of the assessment to be presented at the EGM IWG6 in 2021. The evaluation of the ISSMP implementation is set to be discussed and decided by IWG in 2022, which will mark 10 years since the introduction of the plan.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force report, adopted the workplan for 2020-2021 and accepted the use of spring population estimates as population target reference.

Pink-footed Goose Svalbard Population Status Report 2019-2020

38. On behalf of the Data Centre, Dr Henning Heldbjerg and Prof Jesper Madsen reported on the population status of the Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose (*doc.* *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.7*). According to the population counts, a total of 82,000 birds have been recorded in autumn with a majority in Jutland, Denmark, and 63,000 in spring, most of which were in Trøndelag, Norway with an increasingly large group in Finland (6,000). The population has seen a significant increase over the last decade and a stabilisation and a slight decline in the last few years. Notably, the population estimate based on the IPM is closer to the population target than it has been since 2006.

39. As elaborated by Prof Madsen, consistent development of a new migration route has been discovered in recent years which may have implications for the international PfG flyway management plan. Tagging data has revealed that the birds from Novaya Zemlya in Russia have laid a new migration path by flying

through the Arctic Ocean over Finland down to Örebro, a major staging area in Sweden, and further south-east to Denmark. It was suggested that cultural learning by individuals is an important driver of this development. As research is still ongoing on the new migration pattern, the information has not been included in the population report.

40. The Data Centre emphasised the importance of marking and X-raying as well as GPS-tracking and increasing wing surveys in Denmark and Norway as a way of improving the monitoring of the population in the future.

41. Replying to a question from FACE on the impacts of the population on tundra vegetation on Svalbard, Prof Madsen reported that there is an ongoing ecosystem evaluation in the area with the assessment results expected in the coming years.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the Pink-footed Goose population status report 2019-2020.

Adaptive Harvest Management for the Svalbard Population of Pink-footed Geese: 2020

42. Representing the Data Centre, Dr Fred Johnson provided information on this agenda item based on document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.8*. The Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) was first implemented on Pink-footed Geese in 2013 with an objective to use harvest in Norway and Denmark as a tool to maintain a population size near 60,000. An IPM was introduced in 2019, incorporating all monitoring data in a single unified analysis. The model is smoothing out the large fluctuations that are due to sampling error or other bias.

43. It was stressed that according to the recent trends, it appears that the population target is being approached. The survival rate from natural causes is showing decline due to unknown reasons.

44. Based on the estimate of May population size (68,400) and 18 days above freezing temperatures in Svalbard, the suggested harvest quota for 2020-2021 is 22,000 – 6,600 for Norway and 15,400 for Denmark. Due to the predicted above-average production rates, the harvest quotas are the same as in the previous season despite the observed population decline. However, it is important to note that the harvest quotas have never been met since the launch of AHM. Thus, counting with about 60 % of harvest quota as in previous years, the population size is expected to remain at the same level in 2021 as in 2020.

45. Moving forward, improvements will be made in the IPM through understanding of the correlation between spatial and temporal variability in the observed proportion of young and reproductive success. Moreover, it is planned to utilise the abundant monitoring data on PfG in order to estimate the amount of data sufficient for management purposes. Dr Johnson hoped that the findings of this research could be applied to other populations of species lacking monitoring data.

Decision and Action:

The EGM IWG adopted the preferred management option for the period 2020-2021; the agreed offtake quota of 22,000 individuals will be distributed according to the agreed 30/70 ratio between Norway (6,600) and Denmark (15,400).

Report and Recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force

46. Referring to document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.9/Rev.1*, Mr Mikko Alhainen, Coordinator of the Taiga Bean Goose (TBG) Task Force, outlined the key activities implemented in each Management Unit (MU).

47. Efforts are ongoing to secure funding for the project proposal compiled by the TF as well as to designate a second coordinator to the Eastern 1&2 MU. The recent listing of the Taiga Bean Goose in the Russian Red Data Book is among the key developmentsin the MU. In addition, the launch of a new goose monitoring project is planned in Germany, with a specific focus on TBG.

48. Amongst other achievements, the TF has developed and published an identification guide for the separation of Tundra and Taiga Bean Goose subspecies, including language versions in Danish, Finnish and Ukrainian which have been made available for download on the EGMP website.

49. Mr Alhainen went on to present the proposed non-AHM workplan for 2020-2022, included in Annex 1 of this report, envisaging the establishment of coordinated TBG counts in the Eastern 1 MU, especially in Poland. Further work is needed to strengthen the harvest bag recording and to increase the level of awareness and identification skills of goose hunters. The TF encouraged the Range States to establish national working groups for coordinated implementation of relevant activities.

50. The recommendations proposed by the TF included the adoption of the non-AHM workplan for 2020-2022, the continuation of October and March counts in the Central MU beyond 2021, the designation of a coordinator for Eastern 1&2 MU and experts to the TF from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Poland and Germany.

51. In terms of AHM, the TF recommended using the newly developed IPM as a base for the assessment model with an anniversary date in March, after most harvest has taken place. In addition, it was suggested to reassess the current 3% harvest rate in the Central MU in relation to the current population size and population objectives.

52. In conclusion, the TBG TF Workplan for 2020-2021 was presented.

53. The Meeting took note of the TBG TF report and approved the provided recommendations.

Decision and Actions:

The Range States took note of the recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force.

The non-AHM workplan for 2020-2022 was adopted (presented in Annex 1 of this report).

The Range States agreed to proceed with the October and March counts in the Central Management Unit beyond 2021. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will continue the search for a suitable candidate to fulfil the capacity of a second coordinator in the Eastern 1 Management Unit. The Range States will designate dedicated experts to further boost the activities of the Task Force.

The Integrated Population Model will be used to estimate the population and guide the management decisions with the anniversary date in March.

Taiga Bean Goose Population Status Report 2019-2020

54. Dr Henning Heldbjerg informed the participants that the report (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.10/Rev.1*) was aimed at providing input for the modelling of the harvest strategy in the upcoming hunting season and was therefore mainly based on the Central MU.

55. Based on the IPM estimates, an overall population increase has been recorded over the last decade. The production of young has been very high in the past year, reaching 26.9 % compared to 7% in 2017 and 8% in 2018. The harvest data available is rather limited, with a considerable time lag in delivery of information, and

further complicated by difficulties in separation of subspecies. A very small number of wing samples received does not allow for a reliable age ratio estimate.

56. While reliable annual population estimates are available for autumn and spring, additional data on harvest, annual survival and reproductive success is required from the Range States to improve modelling work in the Central MU.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the Taiga Bean Goose Population Status Report 2019-2020.

Taiga Bean Goose Harvest Assessment in the Central Management Unit for 2020

57. Dr Fred Johnson gave a summary of this item referring to document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.11*. He was confident that the IPM had been sufficiently developed to help guide decision-making on harvest quotas.

58. Using the March population size to project population size five years into the future, the Data Centre has developed three harvest quota scenarios, suggesting scenario C with the harvest rate of 9% (6,500) keeping the population at around 70,000. Dr Johnson explained that according to the IPM, March 2020 population estimate is 75,200, some harvest liberalisation is possible if the aim is to maintain the population at 70,000.

59. The Data Centre acknowledged those who had contributed to the report and particularly thanked Mr Samu Mäntyniemi, LUKE, Finland for his tremendous support in developing the IPM.

60. In relation to the information on hunting regulations in Germany provided on page 18 of the document, Mr Babak Miller brought to the attention of the IWG that as of 31 March 2020 TBG hunting had been seized in the federal state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. It was agreed that this information would be taken into consideration and included in the relevant documents for EGM IWG6.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the preferred management option for 2020-2021, suggesting an interim harvest quota of 9% (6,500) in the Central Management Unit, of which 3,770 is allocated to Finland, 1,950 to Sweden, and 780 to Denmark, which will maintain the population at 70,000.

Report and Recommendations from the Agriculture Task Force

61. In her capacity as the Coordinator of the Agriculture Task Force, Ms Ingunn Tombre reported on the activities of the TF in 2019-2020 (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.24/Corr.1*). New members representing FACE, Copa Cogeca and Wadden Sea Forum have joined the TF bringing the total number of participants to 23.

62. The TF could contribute to a number of activities for the implementation of the Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose ISSMPs, related to the assessment and management of agricultural damage.

63. Ms Tombre proposed the organisation of a workshop for the exchange of experiences and knowledge as a way forward for implementation of the planned activities. She noted that invitation of external experts, in particular from the field of social science, could be beneficial, creating a transdisciplinary framework.

64. In an effort to collate all sources in a single database, the TF has been working on an overview of projects and activities that are of relevance to the EGMP. Ms Tombre invited those present to contribute to the database by providing additional pertinent sources and information.

65. Amongst the activities planned is also compilation of a cost assessment of goose management based on the existing information (Box 1, Range State reports) initially proposed at the EGM IWG4 in Perth. Given that the IWG deems the assessment useful, a way forward can be discussed.

66. Ms Tombre went on to present the proposed TF workplan for 2020-2021.

Decision:

The EGM IWG took note of the report and recommendations from the Agriculture Task Force and adopted the workplan for 2020-2021.

67. The Chair concluded the first day of the meeting noting that the new online meeting format had been successful so far. Ms Eva Meyers thanked the TF coordinators for their excellent work throughout the year and appealed to the Range States encouraging the designation of representatives to the TFs.

Day 2 - Opening Remarks

68. Dr Jacques Trouvilliez announced that AEWA marked the 25th anniversary of the adoption of the Agreement on 16 June 2020. He noted that AEWA is a platform bringing together governments, scientific communities and NGOs, which is an important factor of its success. Norway and the UK congratulated AEWA and thanked the Secretariat for all the good work over the past years conducted in a transparent and involving manner.

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

69. Ms Eva Meyers introduced document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.19/Rev.1* outlining the next steps and the timeline for the finalisation and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme (AFMP) process. The completion and adoption of the final version of the BG E. Greenland population AFMP are planned for the forthcoming EGM IWG6 meeting in June 2021.

70. As one of the Range States for BG E. Greenland population AFMP, UK expressed their gratitude to the Secretariat and Range States for the progress made, stating that the document was very helpful and provided guiding steps for the future development of the process.

71. Iceland expressed its commitment to the process and announced that although the country cannot yet commit to the amount of € 10,000 as indicated in Table 1 of the document, € 3,300 will be allocated to the development of the population model.

Decision:

The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.19/Rev.1*, agreeing on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources that are required for the entire process.

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

72. Mr Szabolcs Nagy, Consultant for the EGMP, and Prof Jesper Madsen introduced the AFMP framework based on documents *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.20/Rev.1* and *AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.11.*

73. Mr Nagy drew the participants´ attention to the fact that the role of the AFMP for BG E. Greenland population was not to maintain the population at a certain level but to prevent the decline of the population below the Favourable Reference Population (FRP) value.

74. Mr Madsen elaborated on monitoring indicators and programmes explaining that the indicators would be compiled based on already existing information on the flyway.

75. Development of the workplans is planned to be completed by 30 September 2020. As noted by Mr Nagy, national workplans will guide the implementation of the ISSMP at the Range State level and will be shared for information purposes only, while the workplans of the Task Forces and Data Centre will be adopted by the EGM IWG by correspondence and revised at the EGM IWG6.

76. On behalf of the European Commission**,** Michael O'Briain congratulated AEWA on its 25th anniversary and on actively promoting conservation across Europe and beyond. He expressed appreciation for the AEWA Secretariat keeping close consideration of developments in the EC in the context of reporting to the Habitats Directive and commended the quality of the work conducted. Although there are some concerns regarding the

quality of the reporting of EU member states to the Article 9 of the Birds Directive, the EC will actively encourage the provision of comprehensive data to underpin the AFMP process.

77. Iceland made a reservation regarding the breeding FRP numbers for Iceland (2,000 pairs) indicated in Table 1 of the document, noting that an internal decision is needed on whether this value could be used for the FRP. It was agreed that Iceland will confirm the final figure to the Secretariat by the end of 2020.

78. The EC, Birdlife International and Germany expressed concerns regarding the concept of Favourable Reference Values (FRV) and its application in relation to other animal species. Mr Dereliev brought to their attention that the FRVs are the values against which the Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of species is measured, whilst the legal status is defined by various legal instruments such as the Birds Directive, Bern Convention and AEWA (Table 1 of the Agreement). The Commission highlighted that the issue of FRVs (for which the Commission had organised a dedicated workshop early 2020) is currently largely focused on population levels (FRP) and much less so on range (FRR) and habitat (FRH), that the debate on FRVs for birds is very much still in an initial stage. Considering the need to further develop this topic, the Commission said that it was open to considering developing joint guidelines with AEWA on this subject.

79. The UK reiterated commitment to the legal obligations under the Birds Directive clarifying that the UK does not see the AFMP as a target-setting exercise, but as a legally sound and ecologically appropriate action ensuring conservation of the Barnacle Goose while negative impacts are managed. The UK stated its support for the adoption of the document hoping that the Range States will agree to move forward with this outlined innovative and exciting management process.

Decision:

The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.20/Rev.1*, accepting the indicative timeline and the process for development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources required for its implementation.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme Process and Favourable Reference Valus (FRVs) for the Svalbard/SW Scotland Population of the Barnacle Goose

80. Ms Meyers acquainted those present with this agenda item, briefly relaying the content of documents *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.21* and *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.22* and noting that further clarifications are provided in the briefing note written by Mr David Stroud for the European Commission (*AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.12*).

81. The Secretariat proposed to hold a virtual meeting of Range States in autumn 2020 to agree on the development process of the AFMP, namely the timeline, resources and distribution of responsibilities. The first draft is planned to be presented at EGM IWG6 in 2021 with the final document ready for adoption at EGM IWG7 in 2022.

82. Norway stated its support to the process and committed to contributing to it as much as possible in the coming years.

83. The UK seconded Norway's comment adding that they were looking forward to working with Norway on this Barnacle Goose population.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the proposed FRVs and next steps for the planning and development of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.

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

84. Ms Meyers gave an overview of the AFMP process based on document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.16*. The first draft has been prepared for adoption at EGM IWG5, pending several sections under development such as the FRVs.

85. The Secretariat presented the milestones for the next years. A final version of the AFMP is envisaged to be ready for adoption at EGM IWG6, including missing sections as well as the finalisation of the FRVs, expansion of the IPM to MUs 2 and 3 and the development of a pilot impact model for two countries. The evaluation and revision of the AFMP is projected for 2026.

86. The Netherlands expressed their agreement with the proposed timelines and the process document with a minor request to amend "Dutch Working Group" to "Dutch Research Consortium" in Table 1 of the document.

Decision:

The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.16*, agreeing on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources that are required for the entire process.

Population Status Report and the Integrated Population Model for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose

87. Representing Sovon, Mr Kees Koffijberg gave an introduction to this agenda item referring to documents *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.17* and *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18* (Annex 3 of the document) compiled through joint efforts of national coordinators. Mr Koffijberg particularly thanked Hans Baveco and Paul Goedhart for their work on the development of the IPM.

88. The current population stands at 1.3 million individuals. The long-term trends show a steep increase in the Russian population with signs of stabilisation in recent years. While initially the population mostly wintered in the Netherlands, it has now expanded its wintering grounds to Denmark and Sweden.

89. The population's productivity has considerably declined over the last decades. Survival has declined too, which can be attributed to increased levels of derogation offtake. Most of the derogation offtake takes place in Denmark and the Netherlands.

90. The IPM results will provide a base for projections of future population development and impact assessment of derogation effort. Mr Koffijberg stressed the need for more recent data and for delivery of information on summer counts, in particular from Sweden, but also from Denmark, Norway and Germany. He concluded by noting that an extension of the IPM to MU 2 and MU 3 is planned.

91. On behalf of Finland**,** Mr Esko Hyvärinen reported that unprecedented agricultural damage had taken place in the country this year with birds inflicting damage estimated between € 2,000,000-3,000,000 on 4,000 hectares of fields. The expected return of birds in the autumn is discouraging farmers from growing winter cereals. Targeted derogation is hardly possible since it is difficult to predict the whereabouts of the birds. Mr Hyvärinen thanked the Secretariat for its excellent work on the subject and welcomed all support that can be provided to Finland in reviewing the damage and managing the agricultural conflict.

92. The EC responded to the information provided by Finland reminding that there is a considerable amount of flexibility for derogation under the Birds Directive when it comes to the management of agricultural conflict. Referring to the listing of the Barnacle Goose in Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, Mr. O'Briain pointed out that there was a duty to provide special protection areas for the Barnacle Goose foreseeing key migration staging posts.

93. Replying to the comment from the EC, Finland stated that the process of arranging more feeding areas for birds had already been launched.

94. Responding to an enquiry from the EGMP Data Centre on the possible reasons for the declining productivity of the Russian Barnacle Goose population, Mr Koffijberg explained that although there was no clear explanation at the time being, this tendency had also been recorded in other goose species breeding in the Arctic.

Decision:

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

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

95. Guided by document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18*, Ms Meyers presented a summary of the AFMP framework. The AFMP follows the structure agreed at EGM IWG4 (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/4.13/Corr.1*).

96. The Netherlands expressed discontent with the timeline for review of technical documents, noting that a proper review of the documents is highly difficult under a 30-day period in advance of the EGM IWG annual meetings. It was suggested that drafts of documents are circulated earlier in the process, ensuring that the final product is a result of a broader consultation. Referring to the EC briefing note (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.12*) prepared by Mr David Stroud, the Netherlands expressed appreciation for a greater amount of detail, suggesting a similar approach for the documents produced by the Secretariat. Germany joined the intervention from the Netherlands, noting that the federative system makes it even more challenging to work under short deadlines.

97. Mr Dereliev clarified that the issue is caused by lack of capacity rather than will at the Secretariat. The Secretariat acknowledged the voiced concerns and informed that in the forthcoming implementation phase, a lot of work would be conducted at the TF level ensuring better involvement of the Range States through the designated national representatives.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the indicative timeline and the process for development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and took note of the resources required for its implementation.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose: Favourable Reference Values (FRVs)

98. Referring to documents *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18* and *AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.11*, Mr Sergey Dereliev elaborated on the suggested FRVs explaining where they have been derived from.

99. Germany thanked the Secretariat for the elaborate work, but reiterated their unease regarding the possibility of potential precedent-setting for other species, in this context, proposing to use the term "reference point" instead of "favourable reference value" as a safety net to better distinguish the process from other processes

under the Habitats Directive. In addition, it was highlighted that Germany had not submitted any numbers for FRVs, and the numbers used by the Data Centre were population numbers which were not deemed to be target values.

100. BirdLife International seconded Germany's comment once again warning that using the term "favourable reference values" would set dangerous precedents for other species. They added that considering that defining FRVs is particularly difficult for this population given its dynamics and range, it would be preferable to approach derogation on the basis of damage or situations where no other alternatives exist.

101. Responding to the concerns regarding potential precedent-setting, Mr Dereliev clarified that the current process is set in terms of certain species and populations and is not to be extended with respect to other species, not even under AEWA itself. As for the rewording of the term, the Secretariat noted that it was a matter of semantics which could be explored further, but what really mattered was the approach itself and its results.

102. The Netherlands reported that work was ongoing on a national level to define FRVs both for Barnacle and Greylag Goose. Once ready, the analysis could be translated and made available to all Range States providing a guiding example. It was also noted that for calculation of the Favourable Reference Range (FRR), a mix of distribution and range data has been used which should be specified to avoid a misunderstanding. In response to the point on FRR, Mr Dereliev pointed out that the current figures are tentative, and it had been suggested in the document that the Range States revise the figures providing values based on the range method. The Secretariat hoped that the numbers would be provided allowing for the revision of the document by the end of December 2020.

103. On behalf of Finland, Mr Esko Hyvärinen expressed disagreement with the value of 7,000 pairs for the breeding population indicated in Table 1 of the document and requested it to be removed to avoid confusion. He reported that Finland has not launched an FRV exercise at national level but will try to provide a number by the end of 2020.

104. Following a discussion with a number of Range States debating the values used to derive the FRVs, as a temporary solution, the Secretariat suggested that the countries agree on the principles for the time being under the provision that the values would be updated through the numbers provided by Range States by the end of 2020.

105. The Secretariat noted that the only information pending from Germany is the data on the wintering range. Germany reported that the data available needed assessment on the federal state level noting that it could take between two and six years to generate values, given limited resources and difficulties in coordination. It was noted that given the noted limitations, Germany will be given the opportunity to provide the data later in the process.

106. The Netherlands agreed on the outlines of the FRVs but made a reservation regarding the FRV process until the document was to be revised to include the values provided by the Range States.

Decision and Actions:

The Range States agreed on the principles of setting Favourable Reference Values as described in the documents *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18* and *AEWA/EGMIWG/Inf.5.11*.

The Range States will do their utmost to provide the revised values on populations and/or ranges by the end of 2020.

The Secretariat will revise the document with the values provided by the Range States; the revised draft to be issued in 2021.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose: Cumulative Impact of Derogation and Legal Hunting

107. Mr Dereliev introduced the agenda item *(doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18*) specifying that the purpose of the exercise was to ensure that the derogation measures were applied in a manner allowing for the maintenance of the population above the FRP.

108. The Secretariat put forward a two-tier approach with a 200% threshold above the FRP acting as a trigger for additional measures. If the population is above 200%, routine activities are envisaged on monitoring of the population size, offtake under derogation and hunting and population modelling which will be used to predict the impact of these measures. However, if the population drops below 200%, it is suggested to have a coordination of offtake under derogation and hunting and application of coordinated conservation measures as necessary to avoid that the population declines below the FRP.

109. Mr Dereliev went on to report that while at present the population as a whole is well above 200% of the FRP, but both MU2 and MU3 are well below this threshold, drawing attention to the need for coordination of offtake in MU2. Given that the majority of the population in MU3 breeds in the Netherlands, the country can undertake necessary measures on its own.

110. With a number of Range States requesting clarifications on the mechanism and timeline for coordination of joint measures, the Secretariat explained that a fully-fledged proposal on the coordination was not yet developed. While the general direction for the course of actions will be decided based on the population status, derogation and hunting data from the previous year, the Range States will agree to coordinate on the further details throughout the year. The further details of the mechanism will be refined in use. Mr Dereliev reassured the Range States that a mechanism that is useful and comfortable for all Range States can be established as a result of careful thinking and cooperation.

111. The EC proposed for the approach to be merged with the existing derogation systems in the EU, warning against having two systems in place. The Secretariat responded clarifying that the process would build on the existing ones as much as possible with close involvement of the Range States and we should be ideally all using one and the same dataset. The Commission informed that it was working closely with Member States to improve the quality and completeness of derogation reporting. It recalled that the deadline for Member States to submit national derogation reports to the Commission was September of the following calendar year.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the principle underlining the proposal of 200 % threshold above the Favourable Reference Population as a trigger for additional measures, under the provision that an additional inclusive discussion would be arranged once coordination of derogation and hunting will need to be launched.

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

112. Prof Madsen presented the item *(doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18)* clarifying that the same programme will be set up as for the BG E. Greenland population.

113. Elaborating on the assessment of the risk of zoonotic influenza transmission to the general public, the Data Centre noted that it was planned to use the quarterly reports issued by the relevant EU agencies in order to assess if there is an increased risk of disease transmission by the EGMP species.

114. Responding to an enquiry from Germany on whether the indicator minimising risk to other flora and fauna is predominantly focused on the impact on tundra degradation, Prof Madsen stated that the focus is on the Arctic breeding grounds, whereas risk to temperate breeding meadow birds does not appear to be critical.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the indicators presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose: Iterative phase

115. Prof Madsen informed the Meeting on this element of the AFMP *(doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18)* listing the data required from the Range States. He stressed that data is needed to establish the summer population sizes in MUs 2 and 3. It was hoped that the countries would do their utmost to support the Data Centre with that data. It was particularly emphasised that the information was to be submitted to the Data Centre each year no later than 30 April. The reports should be based on the latest information available, preferably with a gap of no longer than 1 year.

116. With regard to the derogation reporting, the EC drew attention to the fact that the April deadline meant the establishment of a different cycle compared to the one in the EU, alerting that separate processes should be avoided. The Data Centre stated that the reporting cycle could be aligned and reviewed accordingly.

117. Referring to the summer counts, Sweden reported that given that the population tends to be spread all over the country, making it very costly to conduct the counts, no promises could be made on the delivery of this information. It was noted that in Finland the counts are done before the migration when all birds are on agricultural fields, providing an example which Sweden could follow.

118. Germany could not confirm if the April deadline could be met as prior consultation was necessary with the federal states.

Decision and Action:

The Range States agreed on the iterative phase presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.

The Secretariat will amend the timelines with respect to the provision of derogation data in order to more clearly align it with the process under the EC.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose: Annual Workplans

119. Ms Meyers reported on the agenda item (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18)* pointing out that one workplan had been suggested for MU1&2 due to overlapping actions. The development of workplans is scheduled to be completed by 30 September 2020. Workplans of the Task Forces and Data Centre are to be adopted by the EGM IWG by correspondence.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the approach and timeline for the development of annual workplans presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.

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

120. The Chair appealed to the Range States, inviting them to make a final decision on the entire AFMP with all the different elements discussed. With no comments from the floor, it was concluded that the Barnacle Goose Russia Population AFMP was adopted by the Meeting.

121. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr Dereliev provided an outline of the discussions and the agreed points.

122. Germany confirmed agreement on the general principle of setting the FRVs but reiterated the reservation on the process itself. Another reservation was made by Germany with regard to indicators as internal consultation with the federal states was needed to assess the feasibility of providing the data.

Decision:

The Range States adopted the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme process document (*AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18)*, pending the missing sections.

Establishment of Barnacle Goose Task Forces

123. Ms Meyers introduced the draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the two Task Forces (TFs) (*doc*. *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.23*) – one dedicated to the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population and another one to the E. Greenland, Svalbard and Scotland population. Ms Meyers explained the roles put forward for the TFs, noting that they will function similar to the other TFs within the EGMP.

124. The UK welcomed the establishment of TFs, considering them a useful forum to continue the development and implementation of the management plans. The intervention was supported by Norway.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the establishment and Terms of Reference of two Task Forces – for Russia/ Germany & Netherlands population and for E. Greenland, Svalbard and Scotland population of the Barnacle Goose.

Summary and Adoption of the Process for Further Development and Implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the Russia/Germany & Netherlands Population of the Barnacle Goose

The Secretariat indicated that in addition to the timeline shown in the AFMP document (*doc*. *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.18*), there would be a few other steps according to the agreements reached on FRVs and other elements discussed; however, the document would not be revised.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and the steps that are involved and took note of the resources that are required for implementing the process.

125. The Chair gave an overview of the discussions and decisions made in the course of the day. She thanked everyone for their engagement and input, announcing the closure of the second meeting day.

Day 3 – Opening Remarks

126. The Chair opened the session on the Greylag Goose (GG), informing the participants that the elements of the AFMP would be presented one-by-one and the Range States would be invited to reach an agreement on the process, timeline and overall AFMP at the end of the session.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme Process for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose[2]

127. Ms Meyers gave a summary of the proposed AFMP process based on document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.12*. The first draft of the AFMP has been prepared by the Secretariat and the Data Centre, pending several sections under development.

128. France was impressed by the work conducted by the Secretariat for this proposal and glad to see that the info-gap analysis allows to launch the process and begin active management at flyway level despite the lack of accurate data. Having taken note of the high importance of the bag data collection, France committed to doing its utmost to provide reliable information in due time.

129. Norway supported France's intervention noting that they were looking forward to launching the process and urging the Range States not to delay it further.

130. Replying to a question from Norway on the planned timeline for AHM, Mr Dereliev explained that the available data did not allow for the application of a population model and proposal of management measures. The earliest possible date for the launch of AHM would be in 3 years once the Range States provided data.

131. The European Commission alerted that the issues of legal protection of the species set out in the Birds Directive needed to be fully factored into the debate. They stressed that application of derogation in the EU with regard to the GG had to be in full conformity with the Birds Directive.

Decision and Action:

The Range States adopted the document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.12*, agreeing on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and taking note of the resources that are required for the entire process.

Population Status Report for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose

132. Dr Henning Heldbjerg reported on the GG population status referring to document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.13*. Two Management Units have been defined – MU1, which is migratory and MU2, which is sedentary. According to the mid-winter counts, long-term growth of the population has been taking place. The current population has reached 750,000 with a slight decline in recent years.

133. The Data Centre stressed on the importance of having population counts during the breeding season. Recent data of mid-winter counts is lacking from Spain and Germany, while essential derogation data is missing from Germany and the Netherlands. Stressing the importance of the monitoring information from the

[2] All the further references to the Greylag Goose in this report are to the NW/SW European population.

Range States. Dr Heldbjerg reiterated that modelling of optimal harvest strategy was not possible due to data deficiencies.

134. Spain requested for Andalusia to be mentioned instead of Donana with regard to the hunting bag, pointing out that hunting was prohibited in Donana.

135. France recommended using IWC as a source to fill in the missing information of mid-winter estimates of the GG in Table 1 of the document.

136. The Netherlands stated that negotiations were underway with the EU in relation to the lack of derogation offtake data and measures are to be taken on the matter. However, the improvement of monitoring information will take some time since it involves coordination between 12 provinces.

137. Germany is not planning to implement the AFMP, but the delivery of monitoring data could be possible. Following the discussion with the federal states, further information on the availability of monitoring data will be confirmed to the Secretariat. Establishment of a goose monitoring scheme including GG is ongoing in Germany; however, some of the population is not allotted to any MU which should be noted in the context of data compilation in the future.

138. Belgium requested an amendment to Table 4 of the document clarifying that the reference on no or few breeding birds applies to the southern part of Belgium. The figures from the northern part of the country where several thousands of breeding birds are present will be delivered to the Secretariat in due course.

139. Norway and Sweden reported complications in monitoring due to the wide spread of the population across the countries in summer.

140. Finland noted that some of the data collected from the Birds Directive reporting applies to the whole population in Finland while only part of it belongs to the Northwest/Southwest European population. GPS neck collar banding is being conducted in the country to gather information on the delineation of populations. The outcomes of the study will be delivered to the Data Centre in writing as soon as data becomes available.

141. The Range States commended the Data Centre for doing a tremendous job on the compilation of the report.

Decision and Action:

The EGM IWG took note of the Greylag Goose population status report.

The Secretariat will revise the document to include the amendments requested by Spain and Belgium.

The Range States will do their utmost to ensure timely provision of monitoring data to the Data Centre.

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

142. Ms Meyers acquainted those present with the framework of the GG AFMP (*doc.* *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.14*). The outline of the AFMP follows the outline agreed on at EGM IWG4.

143. Belgium brought to the Secretariat's attention that they were not included in MU1 in the document requesting the amendment of this information.

Action:

The Secretariat will amend the document by including Belgium in the list of Range States in Management Unit 1.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose: Favourable Reference Values (FRVs)

144. The EC supported the intervention from BirdLife International, stressing the importance of information on the range as a key parameter. It was also noted that in terms of Favourable Reference Habitat (FRH) for this species, the agenda on the restoration of habitat in Europe should be taken into consideration.

145. The Netherlands reiterated that they had the same concerns regarding the FRV methodology as for the BG AFMP, but that they would like to agree with the outlines of the principles in order to move forward.

146. Similar to the process with the Russia/Germany & Netherlands population of the Barnacle Goose, Germany reiterated that no FRVs had been submitted for the Greylag Goose process, and the numbers used by the Data Centre were population numbers.

147. In response to the questions from Germany and the Netherlands regarding the calculation of the FRR, Mr Dereliev agreed that application of the method was still not uniform with respect to the definition of range. He reminded that a period of six months was offered to the countries to apply the range method as defined by the EC in order to define the FRR more precisely. As for the German population, the data presented in Article 12 of the Birds Directive was used to calculate the FRR. The Secretariat hoped that the Range States would be able to provide up-to-date monitoring data within the discussed six-month period.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the outlined Favourable Reference Values under the condition that the values would be revised following submission of data from the Range States by the end of 2020.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose: Population Targets above Favourable Reference Values (MCDA Results)

148. Dr Johnson introduced the agenda item (*doc.* *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.14/Corr.1*) directing the attention of those present to Annex 4 of the AFMP. There was not sufficient data to model the relationship between the Greylag Goose abundance and the management objectives expressed in the ISSMP. Multi-criteria Decision Anlaysis (MCDA) was used for the first time to set the population target for migratory birds. It clearly separates the science, namely expert solicitation, from the value-based part, which is the swing-weighting exercise deciding on the weights of different management objectives.

149. Based on the analysis, it became clear that lowering the abundance of GG would best meet a wide range of management objectives. The most preferred targets were 70,000 breeding pairs for MU1 and 100,000 breeding pairs for MU2, whereas the second most preferred target remained the same for the MU1 and amounted to 80,000 breeding pairs for MU2. It should be noted that the analysis showed only a minor difference between the two preferred options in how well they will meet the management objectives.

150. Spain explained that the target could not be set in its case since the fraction of the population which would be migrating to Spain each year could not be predicted.

151. Sweden was supportive of the MU1 target but had concerns regarding the monitoring of breeding pairs. Mr Dereliev suggested that the matter could be methodologically solved with the Data Centre and within the GG TF once it was established.

152. The Netherlands stressed that all management in the country was subject to the EU derogations of the Birds Directive; the target-setting was therefore hypothetical since these obligations had to be applied first. The intervention was supported by the EC.

153. The Netherlands went on to request the amendment of the "adaptive harvest management" to "adaptive flyway management" on page 10 of the document and change "harvest recommendation" to "management recommendation" on page 16.

154. Following a discussion, all of the Range States belonging to MU1 supported the suggested population target of 70,000 breeding pairs, while the MU2 Range States unanimously agreed on option B (80,000 breeding pairs).

155. Giving a summary of decisions made, the Secretariat concluded that while all the MU1 Range States had supported the suggested population target of 70,000 breeding pairs, a consensus decision had been made on adoption of option B as a population target in MU2. The decision will be reviewed in the context of any possible changes in the FRP following the exercise until December 2020.

Decision and Action:

The Range States agreed on the population target of 70,000 breeding pairs for Management Unit 1, option B (80,000 breeding pairs) was adopted as a population target for Management Unit 2. The decision will be reviewed if any changes occur in the Favourable Range Population after submission of data from the Range States with a deadline end of December 2020.

The Secretariat will revise the document incorporating amendments requested by the Netherlands.

Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose: Info-Gap Analysis

156. Dr Johnson presented this element of the GG AFMP referring to Annex 4 of the GG AFMP (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.14/Corr.1*).

157. Dr Johnson reported that flyway estimates of abundance appeared to be severely biased. As traditional population modelling techniques or decision-analytical tools could not be used, the Data Centre turned to the information-gap analysis. The method which is intended for situations of deep uncertainty is frequently used in private industry and more recently in a number of conservation issues.

158. While the info-gap analysis suggests that an increase in offtake is necessary to stabilise or decrease population size, it is important to consider that there is no recent data on the level of offtake and the recent midwinter counts suggest that the population is no longer growing.

159. The Data Centre suggested growth rate leading to 15% population decline in 10 years, which suggested a possible 40% increase in the level of harvest. However, it was pointed out that the info-gap analysis did not provide a sound basis for adaptive, dynamic decision-making in the long term which can only be done based on up-to-date regular monitoring data on abundance and offtake.

160. Replying to a question from FACE on the reason for high hunting estimates, the Data Centre stated that some problems had arisen in the Netherlands related to derogation reporting where double reporting might have occurred.

161. The EC called for extreme caution, given the high uncertainty in the process and keeping in mind that the situation could change once information became available.

162. France believed that the criterion was quite conservative and would not pose a risk on the conservation of the population.

163. Mr Dereliev informed those present that as a result of lengthy and careful considerations, a highly risk-averse approach had been developed, which is the best possible option in the circumstances of data unavailability. He reminded that decision-making on the basis of the info-gap analysis was suggested for no longer than three years by which time data should be made available to proceed with structured decision-making for the population. Mr Dereliev went on to stress that the suggested change in offtake would be revisited on an annual basis based on the data flowing from the Range States.

164. BirdLife International asked for clarification on the implications of the decision in terms of countries setting their own quota, alerting that it could be used to trigger derogations for spring shooting and other practices that are not allowed under the Birds Directive. The Secretariat explained that applying 40% offtake was at the discretion of the Range States, noting that it was a common understanding that the requirements of Article 9 of the Birds Directive need to be met when applying derogations in the EU. Mr Dereliev called for extreme caution in the application of the 40% increase in offtake by the Range States, emphasising that results from any change in harvest rate need to be closely monitored.

165. In conclusion, the Secretariat underlined that the 40% increase in the nominal level of offtake was not a coordinated action and it was to be applied at national level at the discretion of the individual Range States. The Data Centre suggested that the Range States refer to the population data that they had provided in the ISSMP when trying to apply the percentage of the increase possible.

166. The Chair appealed to the countries to agree on the criteria keeping in mind that data should be provided in the course of the next three years, allowing implementation of proper adaptive management.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the management criterion of 15% reduction in population over 10 years, according to which up to 40% increase in the nominal level of offtake was possible.

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

167. Prof Madsen presented the agenda item explaining that the indicators were used to follow progress against the fundamental objectives of the GG ISSMP and on the progress of the GG AFMP. He elaborated on the proposed indicators noting that the goal was to avoid high costs and build on data already available.

168. Replying to a question from Norway on whether relevant quantifiable information not directly identified as an indicator can be used, the Data Centre suggested that proposals on new indicators could be discussed at the Task Force level.

169. Spain reported that no accurate estimate could be provided for the indicator on the number of hunters hunting geese since hunters were not divided by species in the country. Finland endorsed the use of this indicator noting that it would provide interesting information on the social importance of the activity and informing those present that annual statistics were gathered on the hunters who have succeeded in hunting at least one Greylag Goose in a year.

170. Referring to the fundamental objective six on minimising costs of goose management, the Netherlands enquired about what was implied under the costs and how one could ensure that it was interpreted in the same way by the Range States. The Data Centre reported that the indicator needed to be discussed with the Range States before a decision was taken on this issue, suggesting that the resources spent on the administration of goose management as well as cumulative use of compensation and accommodation schemes fell under the costs implied.

Decision and Action:

The Range States agreed on the overall outline of the indicators with the notion that the Task Force will work on their further refinement.

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

171. Prof Madsen reported on this element of the AFMP proposing a 12-year cycle for the revision of the ISSMP and outlining short- and long-term annual monitoring goals.

172. It was stressed that more systematic info on monitoring was needed from each of the Range States. The Data Centre invited the countries to agree on summer counts carried out in 2021 or 2022 so that in 3 years time one survey per country can be established as a baseline. There would be at least a one-year time lag between submission and analysis of data.

173. In addition, the Data Centre will use the information on derogations from the EU. In the long-term, the document will be revised in order to do population management at MU level for which a regular flow of monitoring data is required. Implementation of the AHM at MU level is envisaged earliest for 2023, however, it heavily depends on the flow of monitoring information.

174. Warning that data on crippling rate is highly difficult to obtain, France enquired whether using mean crippling rate was possible for all countries and all years.

175. Responding to the question, Prof Madsen proposed to set up the programme for MUs 1 and 2 specifically conducting fieldwork in the summer time which is best suited for crippling rate assessment. The result obtained would not be representative for the whole flyway, but it can be done in a cost-effective way based on the experience with the PfG. Once the numbers are converted per country, harvest information per country can be corrected for the assessment of the crippling ratio, which takes into account the harvest rate.

176. Norway drew attention to the fact that setting the baseline for 2021 caused some challenges. They recommended to the TF and the IWG to develop a more detailed plan distributing work between the countries. Monitoring can be done in different parts of the country and on the distribution of young birds, however, monitoring of breeding pairs widely spread throughout the country is hardly possible. Norway hoped that the TF would be established shortly so that the process can be further refined.

177. As pointed out by the Netherlands, the application of data from the Article 12 report was also problematic since the information dates six years back and has a large range with a high standard error in annual growth rate. The data collected that way is not very useful for the purpose.

178. The EC informed those present that the EU Birds Directive Article 9 reporting on derogations is annual with a one-year time lag and deadline in September, urging the Range States to make use of it in order to avoid creating parallel processes.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the proposed modalities for the iterative phase under the provision that a more detailed plan for its implementation would be discussed and decided in the GG Task Force.

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

179. Referring to Annex 1 of document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.14/Corr.1*, Ms Meyers presented this agenda item explaining that one workplan is suggested for both MUs, however, MU-specific actions can be identified. The deadline for the workplans has been set for 30 September 2020. The EGM IWG will adopt the workplans of the TFs and the Data Centre by correspondence.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the approach and timeline for the development of annual workplans presented in the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme.

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

180. Mr Dereliev provided a short summary of the EGM IWG's positions and decisions on the different agenda items covered so far, expressing hope for final approval of the overall AFMP.

Decision:

The Range States adopted the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme for the NW/SW European population of the Greylag Goose.

Establishment of a Task Force for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose

181. Ms Meyers acquainted those present with the proposed GG TF ToR (*doc. AEWA/EGMIWG/5.15*). The generic ToR for species-specific TFs approved at EGM IWG2 in Copenhagen has been used as the basis for the development of this ToR. Further activities and assignments can be designated or mandated to the TF. The overall role of the TF is to assist the IWG in catalising and coordinating the implementation of the AFMP workplans and monitoring activities.

182. Germany confirmed that their written objection regarding the legal basis of the draft ToR had been withdrawn following the written clarification from the UK on the adoption of the generic terms of reference by IWG in June 2017.

183. The Netherlands and Norway highlighted that many of the issues to be considered by the newly established BG and GG TFs were overlapping enquiring on how the work of the TF can be organised to avoid

duplicating efforts. Replying to the question, Ms Meyers noted that joint discussions are planned between BG and GG TFs, which can further be discussed with the coordinators of the TFs. The vision is for TFs to work under one umbrella, but be divided by a clear mandate.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the establishment of a Task Force for the NW/SW European Population of the Greylag Goose and adopted its proposed ToR.

Summary and adoption of the process for further development and implementation of the Greylag Goose Adaptive Flyway Management Programme

Thanking everyone for a productive day, the Chair summarised the day concluding that the AFMP and the process for further development and implementation of the Greylag Goose AFMP, including all the steps involved, had been agreed on while the TF would decide on more detailed monitoring protocols.

Decision:

The Range States agreed on the indicative timeline and process for the further development and implementation of the Adaptive Flyway Management Programme and the steps that are involved and took note of the resources that are required for implementing the process.

Day 4 - EGMP costed Programme of Work and budget for 2021

184. Mr Dereliev introduced the content of document AEWA/EGMIWG/5.26. € 20,000 have been reallocated from staffing costs (Coordinator's post) at the Secretariat budget to Small Scale Funding Agreements (SSFAs) in order to hire additional support for further development of the AFMPs. The reallocation has been made on a one-off basis, based on the understanding that there will be no change in the incumbent next year so that the Secretariat's expenditures can stay within the budget.

185. With respect to the Data Centre, the allocation to budget lines has remained the same as last year. As for the indicative scale of voluntary contributions, scenario five has been chosen by the Range States in 2019. The scenarios can be recalculated and confirmed to the Range States if new countries join the platform. The Secretariat suggested keeping the indicative scale of voluntary contributions for the guidance of the Range States. The EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre budget for 2021 are included in Annex 2 of this report.

186. New elements have been added to the costed Programme of Work (cPOW); particularly with the new GG and BG activities, for the next year, the Secretariat has planned out the continuation of work to finalise the AFMPs.

187. France pointed out that the Secretariat had delivered well in the past year despite the vacant Programme Management Assistant position, questioning if it was necessary to maintain the position full-time. In response to the suggestion, Mr Dereliev informed those present that the Secretariat had been able to maintain its delivery through a big amount of strain put on its remaining staff, including staff members paid through the AEWA core budget, which is not a sustainable long-term strategy. He also drew attention to the fact that, considering time investment into the training of new personnel, maintaining a consultancy did not provide for continuity as the incumbent must change after a certain period of time according to the administrative rules. It was stressed that, given the expanding scope of activities, the Secretariat could not guarantee full delivery if its capacity was not replenished.

188. Norway and the UK supported the filling of the vacant Programme Management Assistant position at the Secretariat, underlining the growing amount of workload due to further development of activities.

189. Replying to a request of a budget overview of the Secretariat and Data Centre's core work with an indication of contributing Range States, the Secretariat proposed to change the title of the budget proposal document to better match its content and to reflect all other in-kind contributions in the budget report every year. It was also agreed that the Netherlands would submit a preferred wording with a clear indication of the funds allocated by the country for the revised version of the BG Russia Population documents.

190. Germany reiterated its reservation about the budget and scale of contributions, explaining that they would continue deciding on case-by-case basis for the country's contributions.

Decisions and Actions:

The EGM IWG reviewed and approved the EGMP budget estimate for 2021 (presented in Annex 2 of this report), took note of the indicative scale of voluntary contributions for 2021 (presented in document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.26*) and reviewed and approved the proposed cPoW for 2021 (presented in document *AEWA/EGMIWG/5.26*).

The Barnacle Goose Russian Population documents will be revised using the new wording to be submitted by the Netherlands for this purpose.

Election of the Next EGM IWG Chair

191. Thanking Ms Camilla Uldal on behalf of the Secretariat and the Data Centre for the skillful chairmanship, the Secretariat reminded that according to the Modus Operandi the Chair was elected for the period of two years.

192. The UK has put forward its candidacy for the chairmanship in the EGM IWG. With no further countries expressing a wish to chair and no objections made, the UK was elected unanimously as the Chair to the EGM IWG for the next two-year period.

Decision:

The Range States elected the UK as the Chair to the EGM IWG for the period from 2020-2022.

Date and Venue of the next EGM IWG Meeting

193. Finland renewed its offer to host the meeting in Helsinki in 2021. The Chair and the Secretariat thanked Finland for the kind offer hoping to see everyone in Helsinki for next year's meeting.

194. The Secretariat suggested two different dates for the EGM IWG6: 14-18 June or 21-24 June. Latvia expressed its preference for the first option. The dates will be officially announced after consultation with Finland as a host.

195. Wishing everyone a successful meeting in 2021, Mr François Lamarque announced that due to retirement, the EGM IWG5 was his last EGMP meeting. The Chair thanked Mr Lamarque for his contributions to the work of the platform.

Decision:

The Secretariat accepted the renewed invitation of Finland to host the 6th Meeting of the EGM IWG in Helsinki in 2021. The meeting dates will be determined and announced after consultation with Finland.

Summary, Next Steps and Closure of the Meeting

196. Ms Camilla Uldal thanked everyone for their contributions and expressed her gratitude to the Secretariat, the Data Centre and the Task Forces for their great work noting that she was pleased to hand over the chairmanship to the UK.

197. Mr Dereliev stated that the Secretariat was delighted to have had such a productive meeting and hoped that most of the expectations had been met. The Secretariat has done its utmost to serve the IWG and deliver the best possible outcomes and will continue doing that. Mr Dereliev went on to thank the Range States for the financial and moral support to the work of EGMP highlighting the progress made since 2010 when the first pilot on adaptive management was initiated.

198. Ms Meyers thanked the Data Centre, the Task Force coordinators and the Modelling Consortium for the good work and announced that the presentations made at the meeting would be made available on the EGMP website.

199. The Data Centre expressed their thanks and acknowledgement to the AEWA Secretariat for keeping such a tight and constructive process going.

200. Dr Jacques Trouvilliez thanked Ms Camilla Uldal for her dedication and skillful chairmanship during the past two years and congratulated the UK as the new Chair of the EGM IWG. He went on to thank the EGMP team for the great job done and thanking Finland for renewing the invitation to host the annual meeting concluding that the decisions made would help the process continue in an efficient way. The Chair declared the meeting closed.

Annex 1

Biannual non-AHM Workplan for 2020-2022 for the implementation of the Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP

.

Western, Central, Eastern 1 & Eastern 2 Management Units			
	Action/Activity	**Range State / Management Unit / Stakeholder**	**ISSAP mandate**
1	**Establish coordinated Taiga Bean Goose counts in Eastern 1 Management Unit, especially in Poland.** **Target:** Functioning annual mid-winter (January) census of Eastern 1 Management Unit of Taiga Bean Geese on known key wintering areas (Germany and Poland) to generate population size estimate of the Eastern 1 Population. Development of spring and autumn counts on staging areas to better understand their exposure to hunting at other times of year, further strengthen the population size estimate and to establish a sampling protocol for generating annual age ratios from autumn staging areas. **Concrete action points:** a) In close coordination with on-going Taiga Bean Goose monitoring project in Germany, a Taiga Bean Goose monitoring in January is established in Poland utilising the existing GPS-data to cover previously unknown wintering sites in the area. b) The Range States of Eastern 1 MU are encouraged to raise funding for a project to cover the costs of monitoring framework establishment in Poland and adjacent areas of neighbouring relevant range states hosting Taiga Bean Goose during the times of the monitoring activities.	Eastern 1 Management Unit Range States (Primarily Poland and Germany) National authorities Bird and hunting organisations.	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.
2	**Strengthen the harvest bag recording** **Target:** Reliable Bean Goose harvest data with estimated Taiga Bean Goose proportion will be provided within the schedule of the annual decision-making process of the EGM IWG.	National hunting and conservation authorities and hunting NGO's of those range states that lack the capacity to provide data annually.	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

	Harvest bag recording shall cover regular hunting, conditional hunting and derogation shooting with the possibility to differentiate between forms of harvest. **Concrete action point:** Further develop or establish (electronic, citizen science-based) harvest bag recording system for waterbirds (focus on geese) with possibility to collect samples (pictures, heads) for sub-species and age ratio determination by end of 2021.		waterbirds adopted by MOP6. Obtain accurate estimates of (sub) population size, and robust demographic and harvest data.
3	**Increase number of GPS tagged and neck collared Taiga Bean Goose** **Target:** Minimum of 40 GPS deployed annually both in Western & Central and Eastern 1&2, totalling at least 80 GPS tagged Taiga Bean Goose annually and 160 by the end 2022. Deploy neck collars to all captured Taiga Bean Geese for which GPS is not available. Objective is to provide information on: - migration routes & timing and estimation of monitoring coverage to enable improvement of monitoring framework to estimate the population size in each of the Management Units. Focus on Western and Eastern 1 MU; - breeding distribution of the population between the Range States and breeding success estimation. Focus on Central MU and - survival rates to assess the viability of the population. All MU's. It shall be noted that for scientifically robust estimation of above-mentioned points requires a sample of several hundred GPS-tagged birds which are captured as a random sample optimally in the wintering areas. This can be seen as a 5-year goal to provide information for the forthcoming update of the Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP in 2025. With annual tagging of at least 80 Taiga Bean Geese would lead to total of at least 400 tagged birds during 5-year period. **Concrete action points:** a) Explore research funding for 1) the opportunities to strengthen international co-operation on TBG at respective MU;	All Range States of TBG. National authorities Bird and hunting organisations	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.

	2) the purchase on average at least 6 GPS tags annually at each range state to be provided for scientists who are capable of catching TBG. The Range states are encouraged to establish multi-stakeholder funding framework for the purchase of the GPS tags involving nature, bird and hunting NGO's and their funding instruments as well as corporations and individuals willing to sponsor GPS tagging for example in the form of an 'adopt a Taiga Bean Goose' campaign.		
4	**Organise a campaign to raise skills and awareness of the goose hunters.** **Target:** Active goose hunters have been reached by end of 2021 with popularized communicational materials delivering key messages about the importance of: • Flyway Management; • Species identification (ID brochure produced by TBG TF); • Status of TBG; • Role of harvest bag recording; • Good hunting practises and reduction of crippling. **Concrete action point:** In co-operation with national hunting NGO's a press release and other information activities will be carried out at national/regional level as relevant to TBG	All Range States Hunting NGO's & hunting administrations	1.1.3. Raise awareness amongst hunters on the need and ways to reduce crippling 1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters
5	**Establish a national working group, if relevant, and develop national prioritised 5-year work plan for coordinated implementation of actions relevant for the Range States** **Target:** Each Range State has thematic group of decision makers, researchers and stakeholders to support national level implementation of TBG ISSAP National working group has identified essential national activities and prepared a 5-year concrete action plan to implement TBG ISSAP. **Concrete action points:**	All Range States	1.2.1. Strengthen enforcement on persecution through intentional poisoning, harvest of moulting birds and shooting outside of season 1.3.1. Maintain and strengthen predator control measures in breeding and moulting areas 1.4.1. Maintain and strengthen alien predator control and eradication measures in breeding and moulting areas 1.5.1. Comply with AEWA provisions on the phasing out of lead ammunition for hunting in wetlands 1.6.1. Minimise oil pollution by strengthening enforcement of rehabilitation of oil stations

	a) National Working Group is active by end of 2020. If an EGMP National Working group already exists in the Range State, activities should be coordinated, and the Taiga Bean Goose discussion optimally takes place in shared EGMP Working Group alongside other populations subject to international coordination. b) Develop National 5-year action plan by IWG6 in 2021 for implementation of relevant ISSAP actions, where concrete progress is possible in respective range state. c) Provide compact annual reports on the implementation of the National plan until 2025 when TBG ISSAP is foreseen to be updated. d) EU-countries: Active involvement of national CAP planning process to include ISSAP Actions 2.2.1, 3.2.1 and 3.4.1.		2.1.1. Introduce seasonal reserve protection at key staging and breeding areas 2.1.2. Involve local stakeholders in the voluntary reduction of human access to key breeding areas in critical periods 2.2.1. Maintain the unharvested-fields-for-birds programme within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union 3.1.1. Continue the adaptation of forestry operations to take into account wildlife, in particular Taiga Bean Goose 3.1.2. Continue restoring mires used by Taiga Bean Geese that have been affected by past drainage 3.2.1. Maintain grassland restoration as part of CAP, in agricultural policies and actions to restore suitable grasslands as feeding habitat in key staging areas. 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

Annex 2

EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre Budget for 2021

EGMP Secretariat Budget for 2021 (in EUR)	
Object of expenditures	
Staff Costs	
EGMP Coordinator (100% ; P2)	122,000
Programme Management Assistant (100%; G5)	80,000
Consultants	0
Subtotal	**202,000**
Operating Costs	
Communication	5,000
Miscellaneous (e.g. office supplies and equipment, training)	5,000
Subtotal	**10,000**
Implementing Partner Direct Costs	
SSFAs	35,000
Subtotal	**35,000**
Travel	
Travel (staff, experts and funded delegates)	30,000
Subtotal	**30,000**
Contractual Services (Meetings)	
EGM IWG meeting (catering, venue if hosted in Bonn)	5,000
Subtotal	**5,000**
Total Budget	**282,000**

EGMP Data Centre Budget for 2021 (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**

Annex 3

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS[1]

Participating Range States		
Representative	**Position/Organisation/Institution**	**Contact Information**
Belgium		
Mr Floris Verhaeghe (NGR)	Species Policy Expert Agency for Nature and Forest Flemish Government Koning Albert I - laan 1/2 bus 74 8200 Brugge Belgium	Tel.: +32 (0) 479 89 01 09 Email: floris.verhaeghe@vlaanderen.be
Dr Frank Huysentruyt (NE)	Researcher Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO) Wildlife Management and Invasive Species Havenlaan 88 1000 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 499 865 340 Email: frank.huysentruyt@inbo.be
Denmark		
Ms Camilla Uldal (NGR) (*EGM IWG Chair*)	Head of Section Species and Nature Protection Danish Environmental Protection Agency Tolderlundsvej 5 5000 Odense Denmark	Tel.: +45 935 879 47 Email: cakis@mst.dk

[1] NGR – National Government Representative / NE – National Expert

Mr Søren Egelund (NGR)	Biologist Species and Nature Protection Danish Environmental Protection Agency Tolderlundsvej 5 5000 Odense Denmark	Tel.: +45 93 58 79 60 Email: soera@mst.dk
Prof Jesper Madsen (NE)	Head of the AEWA EGMP Data Centre Department of Bioscience Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 294 402 04 Email: jm@bios.au.dk
Ms Iben Hove Sørensen (NE) (*Also representing CIC*)	Danish Hunters'Association Molsvej 34 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 817 716 64 Email: ihs@jaegerne.dk
Estonia		
Mr Tõnu Talvi (NGR)	Senior Conservation Officer Environmental Board of Estonia Nature Conservation Department Männimäe t 93343 Lääne-Saare vald Estonia	Tel.: +3725016869 Email: tonu.talvi@keskkonnaamet.ee
European Union		
Dr Micheal O'Briain	Deputy Head of Unit European Commission DG Environment, Nature Unit Avenue de Beaulieu 5 1160 Brussels Belgium	Tel. : +32 296 87 22 Email : micheal.o'briain@ec.europa.eu

Finland		
Mr Esko Hyvärinen (NGR)	Senior Ministerial Adviser Ministry of the Environment P.O.Box 35 FI-00023 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358400143876 Email: esko.o.hyvarinen@ym.fi
Mr Olli Ojala (NGR)	Senior Specialist Ministry of the Environment P.O.Box 35 FI-00023 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358504700907 Email: olli.ojala@ym.fi
Mr Janne Pitkänen (NGR)	Senior Specialist Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Natural Resources Department Unit for Game and Recreational Fishing P.O. Box 30 FI-00023 Government Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +35 829 516 2338 Email: janne.pitkanen@mmm.fi
Mr Mikko Alhainen (NE)	Senior Planning Officer Finnish Wildlife Agency Sompiontie 1 00730 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358 (0) 509 11 12 88 Email: mikko.alhainen@riista.fi
Mr Jorma Pessa (NE)	Senior Adviser Center for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment Nature and Land Use Unit Veteraanikatu 1 90101 Oulu Finland	Tel.: +358400250040 Email: jorma.pessa@ely-keskus.fi

France		
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)	French Agency for Biodiversity (OFB) La Tour du Valat, Le Sambuc 13200 Arles France	Tel.: +33 (0) 689 18 26 63 Email: leo.bacon@ofb.gouv.fr
Dr Thibaut Powolny	Tour Séquoia, Place Carpeaux 92055 La Défense Cedex France	Tel. : +33 09 84 00 12 04 Email: thibaut.powolny@yahoo.fr
Germany		
Mr Babak Miller (NGR)	Advisor Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety Division N 5 – International Species Conservation Robert-Schumann-Platz 3 53175 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 22899 305 2655 Email: babak.miller@bmu.bund.de
Dr Heinz Düttmann (NGR)	Ministry of Environment of Lower Saxony Archivstr. 2 30169 Hannover Germany	Tel.: +49 511 120 3538 Email: heinz.duettmann@mu.niedersachsen.de
Dr Timm Reinhardt (NE)	Scientific Advisor Federal Agency for Nature Conservation Zoological Conservation Unit Konstantinstrasse 110 53179 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 8491 1433 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 IS-101 Reykjavik Iceland	Tel.: +35 484 02419 Email: sigurdur.thrainsson@uar.is
Dr Gudmundur A. Gudmundsson (NE)	Ecologist Icelandic Institute of Natural History Ecology Department Urridaholtsstraeti 6-8 IS-210 Gardabaer Iceland	Tel.: +354 5900 500 Email: mummi@ni.is
Mr Bjarni Jónasson (NE)	Advisor The Environnent Agency of Iceland Hjallalundur 3 600 Akureyri Iceland	Tel.: +354 8610058 Email: bjarnij@ust.is
Latvia		
Dr Oskars Keišs (NE)	Expert University of Latvia Institute of Biology Miera Iela 3 LV-2169 Salaspils Latvia	Tel.: +37 129 236 300 Email: oskars.keiss@lu.lv
Netherlands		
Ms Willemina Remmelts (NGR)	Senior Policy Advisor Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality Directorate of Nature and Biodiversity P.O. Box 20401 2500 EK Den Haag Netherlands	Tel.: +31 638 825 338 Email: w.j.remmelts@minlnv.nl

Mr Gerben Mensink (NGR)	Policymaker Ecology Province of Friesland P.O. Box 20120 8900 HM Leeuwarden Netherlands	Tel.: +31 582 928 955 Email: g.mensink@fryslan.frl
Mr Kornelis Koffijberg (NE)	Researcher Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland Department of Monitoring P.O. Box 6521 6503 GA Nijmegen Netherlands	Tel.: +31 247 410 463 Email: kees.koffijberg@sovon.nl
Mr Bart Nolet (NE)	Senior Researcher Netherlands Institute of Ecology Animal Ecology Department P.O. Box 50 6700 AB Wageningen Netherlands	Tel.: +31317473400 Email: b.nolet@nioo.knaw.nl
Norway		
Mr Øystein Størkersen (NGR)	Principal Adviser Norwegian Environment Agency P.O. Box 5672 Torgarden 7485 Trondheim Norway	Tel.: +47 7358 0500 Email: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no
Mr Arild Espelien (NGR)	Norwegian Environment Agency Bratsbergvegen 1008 7039 Trondheim Norway	Tel.: +47 41512396 Email: ares@dirnat.no
Dr Ingunn Tombre (NE)	Senior Researcher Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA) Department of Arctic Ecology P.O. Box 6606 Langnes 9296 Tromsø Norway	Tel.: +47 934 667 23 Email: ingunn.tombre@nina.no

Mr Ove Martin Gundersen (NE)	Project Manager Norwegian Farmers Union Skolegata 22 7713 Steinkjer Norway	Tel.: +47 922 90 491 Email: ove.martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no
Mr Paul Shimmings	Consultant, Conservation Science Department, Norwegian Ornithological Society / BirdLife Norway, Sandgata 30 B, NO – 7012 Trondheim Norway	Tel.: +47 73841647 Email: paul@birdlife.no
Sweden		
Mr Per Risberg (NGR)	Desk Officer Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Virkesvägen 2 10648 Stockholm Sweden	Tel.: +46 106 981 000 Email: per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se
Mr Urban Johansson (NGR)	Desk Officer Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Wildlife Analysis Unit Forskarens väg 5 10648 Stockholm Sweden	Tel.: +46 106 98 11 33 Email: urban.johansson@naturvardsverket.se
Dr Johan Månsson (NE)	Researcher Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences Grimsö Wildlife Research Station S-730 91 Riddarhyttan Sweden	Tel.: +46 581 69 73 25 Email: johan.mansson@slu.se
Ms Christine Aminoff	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Virkesvägen 2 10648 Stockholm Sweden	Tel. : +46 73 55 36 037 Email : christine.aminoff@naturvardsverket.se

Ukraine		
Dr Olesya Petrovych (NGR)	Chief Specialist Ministry of Ecology and Environmental Protection of Ukraine Department of Protected Areas Vasilya Lipkivskogo Street 35 03035 Kyiv Ukraine	Tel.: +38 067 784 1153 Email: petrovych.o@gmail.com
United Kingdom		
Mr Daniel Heptinstall (NGR)	Senior International Biodiversity Adviser Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) Monkstone House, City Road PE1 1JY Peterborough United Kingdom	Tel: +44 (0) 7384 836553 Email: daniel.heptinstall@jncc.gov.uk
Ms Claudia Rowse (NGR)	Head of Natural Resource Management Scottish Natural Heritage Leachkin Road IV3 8NW Inverness United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 (0) 1463 725319 Email: claudia.rowse@nature.scot
Ms Rae McKenzie (NGR)	Policy & Operations Manager Scottish Natural Heritage Wildlife Management Unit Main Street, Bowmore PA437JJ Bowmore, Isle of Islay United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 1313144155 Email: rae.mckenzie@snh.gov.uk
Ms Morag Milne (NE)	Wildlife Policy Officer Scottish Natural Heritage Battleby, Redgorten PH1 3EW Perth United Kingdom	Tel.: + 44 (0) 1738 458625 Email: morag.milne@nature.scot

Dr Jessica Shaw (NE)	Ornithologist Scottish Natural Heritage Stilligarry HS8 5RS Western Isles United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 131 314 4187 Email: jessica.shaw@nature

Observer Range States		
Representative	**Institution/Organization/Position**	**Contact Email**
Ireland		
Dr Sean Kelly (NGR) *(only participating in the process for the Barnacle Goose E. Greenland Population)*	Waterbird Ecologist National Parks and Wildlife Service Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht 90 King Street North, Smithfield D07 N7CV Dublin Ireland	Tel.: +353 85 872 8714 Email: sean.kelly@chg.gov.ie
Spain		
Mr Guillermo Ceballos Watling *(observer to the Greylag Goose process)*	Director Andalusian Hunting and Inland Fishing Institute Hunting and Fishing Department Manuel Siurot nº 50 41071 Valencina de la C Spain	Tel.: +34 671 592912 Email: guillermo.ceballos@juntadeandalucia.es

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

OMPO		
Mr Alexandre Czajkowski	Director OMPO 59 rue Ampère 75017 Paris France	Tel.: +33 (0) 6 80 20 97 92 Email: vanneau@ompo.org
Wadden Sea Forum		
Mr Manfred Vollmer	Managing Director Wadden Sea Forum Virchowstr. 1 26382 Wilhelmshaven Germany	Tel.: +49 4421 910818 Email: vollmer@waddensea-forum.org
Wetlands International		
Dr Szabolcs Nagy	Senior Advisor Wetlands International Roghorst 117 6708 KE Wageningen Netherlands	Tel.: +31 628554823 Email: szabolcs.nagy@wetlands.org

AEWA EGMP Data Centre		
Representative	**Position**	**Contact Email**
Prof Jesper Madsen *(also member of the Danish delegation)*	Head of EGMP Data Centre Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel. : +45 29440204 Email : jm@bios.au.dk
Dr Fred Johnson	Senior Researcher Aarhus University 711 SW Truluck Terrace 32038 Ft. White United States	Tel.: +1 352 494 4611 Email: fred.johnson@bios.au.dk
Dr Gitte Høj Jensen	Post-Doctoral Researcher EGMP Data Centre Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 22461504 Email: ghj@bios.au.dk
Dr Henning Heldbjerg	Coordinator AEWA EGMP Data Centre Aarhus University Grenåvej 12 8410 Rønde Denmark	Tel.: +45 242 732 50 Email: hh@bios.au.dk

UNEP/AEWA Secretariat		
Representative	**Position**	**Contact Email**
Dr Jacques Trouvilliez	Executive Secretary UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 815 2414 Email: jacques.trouvilliez@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 EGMP 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 Shenay Huseynova	Consultant UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +49 228 815 2464 Email: shenay.huseynova@unep-aewa.org
Ms Jeannine Dicken	Programme Management Assistant UNEP/AEWA Secretariat UN Campus Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 53113 Bonn Germany	Tel.: +492288152455 Email: jeannine.dicken@unep-aewa.org