
**REPORT OF THE 2nd MEETING OF THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE
MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP¹**
15-16 June 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark

*Hosted by the Danish Ministry of Environment and Food,
Environmental Protection Agency*



**Ministry of Environment
and Food of Denmark**
Environmental
Protection Agency

¹ Report finalised after a process of consultation by correspondence with the AEWA EGM IWG2 participants.

EGM IWG2 DECISIONS AND ACTIONS

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
Agenda item 2.	Adoption of agenda	The agenda (document AEWA/EGM IWG 2.2 Rev.1) was adopted with no comments.	
Agenda item 3.	Admission of permanent observers and individual expert observers	The individual experts were admitted to the EGM IWG2 and the organisations present were all approved by the Meeting as permanent observer organisations to the EGM IWG.	
Agenda item 5.	Guidance on the composition, role and responsibilities of national delegations	Document EGM IWG 2.3 - <i>EGM IWG Guidance on the Composition, Role and Responsibilities of National Delegates</i> was adopted by the Meeting with the inclusion of the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom and Sweden (see Appendix 1).	
Agenda item 6.	EGM IWG Task Forces	Both the generic and Agriculture Task Force Terms of Reference were adopted with the incorporation of changes (see Appendices 2 and 3 respectively).	The Secretariat would take the lead and invite the designation of representatives for the Pink-footed and Taiga Bean Goose Task Forces. The Secretariat will identify a coordinator for the Agriculture TF and its work will be launched.
Agenda item 7.	Project concepts – legal regulations and communication		
	<u>1. Review of harvest-related legal regulations in the EGMP Range States</u>		<p>The Secretariat should commission the production of relevant model legislation which would be an ideal case scenario for running an Adaptive Management System and disseminate this amongst the range states. Funds will be sought in the operational budget of the EGMP coordination.</p> <p>Each range state could then undertake either a review of its own relevant legislation or decide to outsource the review with regard to 1) the opening/closure of goose hunting seasons and quota-setting and 2) the collection of harvest</p>

EGM IWG2 DECISIONS AND ACTIONS

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			data. The outcome of those reviews, including an estimation of the time frame necessary to amend legislation (if amendment is needed) should then be communicated to the Secretariat. An overview of the feedback of each country will be presented to the EGM IWG3 in June 2018.
	<u>2. EGMP Communication Strategy</u>		The Meeting agreed that the Secretariat should take the issue forward and start fundraising in order to be able to commission the work to the identified contractor as soon as possible.
Agenda item 8.	EGMP logo	The Meeting approved the EGMP logo presented.	
Agenda item 9.	EGMP budget 2017-2018	1) The Meeting approved handling the saving accumulated so far (ca. 179,000 EUR by the Coordination Unit and 59,900 by the Data Centre) as well as any surplus money from one year to another as a reserve.	1) The Secretariat would establish a reserve and report back to the countries annually as to what it had been used for. 2) The Secretariat will prepare the calculations for two options for 1) equally splitting up the costs between the range states and 2) paying according to the UN scale of assessments for circulation very early in 2018 and subsequent consideration by the EGM IWG at its annual meeting in 2018.
Agenda item 11.	PfG Adaptive Harvest Management update	The preferred management option was confirmed as being optimizing harvest to stabilize the population at 60,000, which will be examined again the following year, and the harvest quota for 2017/18 was set at 36,000, although it is acknowledged that it	

EGM IWG2 DECISIONS AND ACTIONS

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
		it is unlikely that this level of harvest would be attained.	
Agenda item 13.	Feedback session on the implementation of TBG ISSAP actions <i>(see Appendix 4 for feedback provided by the range states)</i>		The UK delegation provided the following activity to be added by the Secretariat to the work plan and the reporting format: “ <i>Review factors possibly contributing to rapid declines in eastern England and implement appropriate management responses, as appropriate</i> ”.
Agenda item 15.	TBG Sustainable Harvest Assessment	Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Norway agreed on a harvest rate of 3% for the Central Management Unit of the Taiga Bean Goose for 2017/18 <i>(see Appendix 5 for the actual numbers)</i>	
Agenda item 17.	IWG Reporting Process		The Secretariat would circulate a draft national reporting format to the EGMP range states for review. The format will be finalised following the feedback received and translated into an online template by the end of 2017. The reporting process will be launched by January 2018.
Agenda item 18.	Next AEWA EGM IWG Meeting	The meeting agreed on the dates for the 2018 annual meeting.	The Secretariat would send out a reminder to the EGM IWG range states requesting back-up offers to host the EGM IWG3 on 14-15 June 2018, in case this cannot be held back-to-back with the Barnacle Goose Workshop in the Netherlands.

Agenda item 1. Opening

1. Representing Norway, the Chair of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), Mr Øystein Størkersen opened the meeting, giving a short introduction to the main objectives of this second Meeting of the AEWA EGM IWG (EGM IWG2), which would deal with operational issues as well as management options for the coming harvest period.

2. On behalf of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, the Head of the Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit, Mr Sergey Dereliev welcomed the delegates to the meeting. He thanked the Danish Ministry of Environment and Food, Environmental Protection Agency for hosting the meeting and providing exceptionally good facilities.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of agenda

Decision: The agenda (document AEWA/EGM IWG 2.2 Rev.1) was adopted with no comments.

Agenda item 3. Admission of permanent observers and individual expert observers

3. The Chair introduced the individual experts who had been invited to this meeting to contribute to specific agenda items, i.e. Dr Fred Johnson, U.S. Geological Survey, Ms Sonia Rozenfeld, Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution and Ms Melissa Lewis, Environmental Law Expert on the AEWA Technical Committee, all of whom were admitted by the Meeting.

4. He went on to introduce the specialised observer organisations represented at the Meeting:

- The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)
- The Committee of Professional Agricultural Organisations and General Confederation of Agricultural Cooperatives in the European Union, known as COPA COGECA
- BirdLife International
- The European Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation (FACE)
- Migratory Birds of the Western Palearctic (OMPO)
- Wetlands International
- Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT)

5. In accordance with the EGM IWG Modus Operandi, the Chair invited the admission of these organisations as permanent observers to the Working Group.

Decision: The individual experts were admitted to the EGM IWG2 and the organisations present were all approved by the Meeting as permanent observer organisations to the EGM IWG.

Agenda item 4. Reports of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and the AEWA European Goose Management Platform Data Centre

6. On behalf of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, the Head of the Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit, Mr Dereliev gave a short summary of events since the last meeting of the EGM IWG in December 2016. The report of that meeting had been finalised in December together with the work plan for the implementation of the non-Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) - related actions of the Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan (2017-2018).

7. The Task Force to develop an international framework for dealing with agricultural conflicts caused by geese (EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force) had been convened. The arrangements between the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and Aarhus

University were concluded in form of a Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC), which defines the parameters of collaboration and the Aarhus University services to the EGMP as the Data Centre.

8. The recruitment of the EGMP Coordinator and Programme Management Assistant, to be based at the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat in Bonn, had been very time-consuming and lengthy. The Coordinator should be able to enter on duty on 03 July 2017, while the interviews for the Assistant post are scheduled to take place in July 2017 so that it was hoped to have a fully-fledged unit serving the EGMP by the end of the year.

9. As a result of the delay with recruitment of the EGMP staff, the Secretariat has had to deal with the organisation and substantial matters of four EGMP-related events within six months, which constituted a heavy additional workload.

10. Regarding the development of project proposals, a costed project concept for a review looking into national hunting legislation, with the aim to provide guidance on adapting national legislations to allow administrations to regulate hunting on an annual basis, as necessary within the AHM process, had been developed with AEWA Technical Committee Environmental Law Expert, Ms Melissa Lewis.

11. The second project the Secretariat had been requested to initiate was that of the development of a coherent Communication Strategy for the EGMP, for which a call for tenders had been announced. The Secretariat had already undertaken several communication-related trips, presenting the progress of implementation of the EGMP to the Expert Group on the Birds and Habitats Directives of the EU (NADEG), and the European Parliament in Strasbourg and in Brussels.

12. Representing the newly established AEWA EGMP Goose Data Centre at Aarhus University, Professor Jesper Madsen reported that Ms Gitte Høj Jensen had been recruited to coordinate the annual data collation. The EGMP Goose Modelling Consortium, currently consisting of Aarhus University and other relevant institutions from the Netherlands, France, Sweden and the United Kingdom had met for the first time in May in the Netherlands. In preparation for the recent Barnacle Goose Management Planning Workshop, the Data Centre had prepared a prototype of models for the Barnacle Goose, as well as annual monitoring and adaptive harvest updates and modelling updates for the Taiga Bean Goose and Pink-footed Goose for the current meeting.

Agenda item 5. Guidance on the composition, role and responsibilities of national delegations

13. Referring to document EGM IWG 2.3 - *EGM IWG Guidance on the Composition, Role and Responsibilities of National Delegates*, AEWA Associate Programme Officer, Ms Nina Mikander explained the background of the guidance document and, the need to set a limit on the total number of participants while ensuring the continued involvement of national experts and stakeholders. The document also included an outline of the roles of the various delegates.

14. The United Kingdom and Sweden had some comments to the text of the guidance, which were supplied to the Secretariat in writing and subsequently incorporated.

15. It was clarified that it is for the range states participating in the EGMP to decide on the composition of their national delegations. The guidelines suggest that each delegation should comprise at least one national government representative with the mandate to make decisions with financial and legislative implications and one national expert to provide input and advice, where necessary. Within the limit of five members per country delegation, the involvement of further expert and stakeholder organisations in the process is encouraged.

16. In answer to concerns raised by Sweden with regard to decisions on national legislation, Mr Dereliev clarified that it was not for the Meeting to decide on national legislation but that the implications of decisions made at the annual EGM IWG meetings may require amendments to national legislation. The dynamic nature of decision-making and adaptive regulations were the core of the system. The legislation in each country was already being looked at with the aim of being able to make recommendations to enable any potential adjustments.

Decision: Document EGM IWG 2.3 - *EGM IWG Guidance on the Composition, Role and Responsibilities of National Delegates* was adopted by the Meeting with the inclusion of the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom and Sweden (see Appendix 1).

Agenda item 6. EGM IWG Task Forces

17. Referring to document EGM IWG 2.4 – *AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group Task Forces*, Ms Mikander explained that the establishment of task forces under the EGM IWG had been adopted under Rule 29 of the EGM IWG Modus Operandi at its first meeting. The document outlined the process for establishment of task forces and the generic terms of reference (ToR). It also recommended the establishment of species-specific task forces for the Pink-footed Goose (*Anser brachyrhynchus*) and Taiga Bean Goose (*Anser f. fabalis*) to ensure coordinated cooperation amongst range states for the delivery of all the objectives and results in the respective Species Management and Action Plans already under the remit of the EGMP.

18. The task forces would deal with preparatory work before the meetings of the EGM IWG, which would remain as the decision-making forum. The task force membership would be less restrictive than that of the EGM IWG and could include national government representatives and experts from various thematic fields.

19. The workload would vary; however, it was expected that the task force participants should participate actively in the development of EGM IWG meeting documents. Task forces could meet via skype calls and potentially, in future, back-to-back to the annual EGM IWG meetings, dependent on the availability of funds, although documents would have to be produced according to the deadlines established in the EGM IWG Modus Operandi.

20. Once the Meeting had adopted the relevant ToR for a task force, the Secretariat would send invitations to countries and permanent observer organisations to designate representatives and maintain up-to-date membership lists. Members of the Agriculture Task Force had already been designated.

21. With regard to both the generic and Agriculture Task Force ToR, under *Membership*, first line, the United Kingdom suggested replacing ‘*representatives of national bodies*’ with ‘*designated governmental representatives*’ for legal clarity.

22. Responding to a question by Denmark on the ‘assistance’ of task forces with the regular monitoring, Ms Mikander explained that the role of the task forces was to make sure that the data was delivered to the AEWA EGMP Goose Data Centre, rather than to engage in monitoring.

23. Following a short discussion on the tasks under the Agriculture Task Force ToR, it was decided to amend the first bullet point as follows:

- ‘develop and support the implementation of an international interdisciplinary cooperation framework for dealing with agricultural conflicts caused by geese-interaction between geese and agriculture;’

24. Representing the EU, Mr Ludovic Le Maresquier, DG ENV, European Commission, stressed the importance of the EU’s representation in the Agriculture Task Force.

Decision: Both the generic and Agriculture Task Force Terms of Reference were adopted with the incorporation of changes (see Appendices 2 and 3 respectively).

Action: The Secretariat would take the lead and invite the designation of representatives for the Pink-footed and Taiga Bean Goose Task Forces. The Secretariat will identify a coordinator for the Agriculture TF and its work will be launched.

Agenda item 7. Project concepts – legal regulations and communication

1. Review of harvest-related legal regulations in the EGMP Range States

25. Environmental Law Expert on the AEWA Technical Committee, Ms Melissa Lewis introduced this project concept, the establishment of which had been decided at EGM IWG1 in December 2016, to review portions of national legislation and to provide countries with individual guidance as to how they could adapt their processes on an annual basis. The Secretariat had been requested to come up with a costed project proposal.

The Secretariat suggested that the objectives of the project should be as follows:

Primary objective: To review those portions of range states' legislation that are relevant for the opening/closure of goose hunting seasons and quota-setting, and provide each state with individually tailored guidance on how these can be adapted to enable administrators to transpose international decisions regarding AHM into their national decision-making processes in good time, on an annual basis.

Potential secondary objective: To review those portions of range states' legislation that are relevant for the collection of harvest data, and provide each range state with individually tailored guidance on how these can be adapted to enable administrators to monitor compliance with internationally agreed harvest quotas and submission of comprehensive annual data for population modelling.

26. The Secretariat suggested that the project should have three components to draw from existing examples to develop model legal approaches, identify and review all relevant legal provisions in each range state and to produce recommendations for each range state concerning appropriate modifications to the *status quo*. In order to keep the costs down, copies of relevant legislation received in the review phase could be translated into English using automated translation systems and the final interpretation checked by the range states for accuracy. After reviewing the legislation, draft recommendations would be developed in consultation with the range states.

27. Four EGMP range states were excluded from the project; Estonia, Ireland and Poland were not active in the EGMP yet and in the Netherlands, goose shooting was only possible under derogation.

28. Time and cost estimates for the project were presented for the creation of models and for both the high and lower priority range states.

29. With regard to the funding of the project, Mr Dereliev explained that the first step would be to create model legislation, the cost of which could be covered by several countries. All the other items could be funded by a grant from one entity or shared by several entities. Alternatively, each country could pay for the review of its own legislation.

30. The proposal presented by the Secretariat was discussed. The United Kingdom stressed the importance of consistency and that another option could be self-assessment by each country based on established criteria.

31. Germany concurred with the United Kingdom, pointing out that a review of national legislation by the project was not deemed feasible. Furthermore it was pointed out that the main obstacle was not how to adapt national legislation to allow for Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) but what can be achieved on political level.

32. Mr Dereliev stressed that it would be useful if countries could produce a timeline for the accommodation of amendments in their legislations as the implementation of management plans was dependent on the legal ability of countries to do this. Timelines needed to be compact and should be communicated; it was essential to achieve uniformity across the range states as soon as possible.

33. Responding to a remark by Denmark on the importance of clarity as to what could be expected from the range states with regard to the provision of harvest data to the Data Centre, Mr Dereliev agreed that the expected timelines and dataflow were both critical elements.

34. Representing FACE, Dr David Scallan further stressed the need for good harvest data with reference to FACE's work in promoting this and also suggested ranking the scale of political will to make changes in legislation with regard to amending legislation to incorporate AHM into national decision-making processes on an annual basis

35. Responding to a question from Norway as to the possibility to outsource the review of national legislation, Mr Dereliev responded that each country could decide if they want to carry out the review themselves or if they want to outsource it, with the help of the Secretariat.

Actions:

The **Secretariat** should commission the production of relevant model legislation which would be an ideal case scenario for running an Adaptive Management System and disseminate this amongst the range states. Funds will be sought in the operational budget of the EGMP coordination.

Each **range state** could then undertake either a review of its own relevant legislation or decide to outsource the review with regard to 1) **the opening/closure of goose hunting seasons and quota-setting** and 2) **the collection of harvest data**. The outcome of those reviews, including an estimation of the time frame necessary to amend legislation (if amendment is needed) should then be communicated to the **Secretariat**. An overview of the feedback of each country will be presented to the EGM IWG3 in June 2018.

2. EGMP Communication Strategy

36. As decided by EGM IWG1, the Secretariat had produced terms of reference for the development of a coherent communication strategy, which had been consulted with the EGM IWG and a call for tenders had been published. The Secretariat had meanwhile reviewed the submitted tenders and identified a potential contractor with very specific experience on AHM.

37. Responding to questions regarding the required funds and the implementation of the communication strategy, Mr Dereliev confirmed that additional funding would be required for this project and that all EGMP stakeholders would have a role to play. Communication is key and should be targeted at all levels. The chosen tender had represented the best value for money and once commissioned, this long-term communication strategy and three-year communication plan would be delivered within six months

Decision and Action: The Meeting agreed that the Secretariat should take the issue forward and start fundraising in order to be able to commission the work to the identified contractor as soon as possible.

Agenda item 8. EGMP logo

38. Presenting the draft logo, Mr Dereliev explained that EGM IWG1 had requested the Secretariat to produce a logo for the EGMP and the Secretariat had endeavoured to do this on the basis of the style of logos for the existing International Species Working Groups. This task was posted as an opportunity on the United Nations Volunteer Platform and a volunteer had been recruited, who the Secretariat had worked closely with in order to produce a logo, which was final apart from some minimal fine-tuning.

Decision: The Meeting approved the EGMP logo presented.

Agenda item 9. EGMP budget 2017-2018

39. Presenting this agenda item, Mr Dereliev stressed that sufficient funds were essential to the operations of the EGMP. An estimated budget had been presented to countries at the launch of the EGMP in Paris in 2016, consisting of two

components; one for a coordination unit at the Secretariat and one for a Data Centre at Aarhus University (both include staffing costs and operational costs).

40. Ireland, Poland, the Russian Federation and Spain had not yet confirmed their participation in the EGMP, although some progress had been made. The Secretariat would continue its efforts in getting these important range states on board and would be grateful for any support from the current EGM IWG members.

41. Mr Dereliev presented a table showing the estimated annual EGMP operational budget, which amounted to:

EUR 282,000 for the coordination unit at the Secretariat; and
EUR 184,000 for the costs of the Data Centre.

42. He went on to show an overview of the funding transferred or confirmed so far and this showed that for 2017, the Secretariat had a reserve of EUR 179,000 and the Data Centre a deficit of EUR 74,400. For 2018, the only pledge so far was for EUR 20,000 towards the costs of the Data Centre.

43. Finland was considering the possibility of a further contribution for 2018.

44. Belgium confirmed that the paperwork for contributions for 2017 and 2018 had been completed. It would be helpful to have a formula upon which to base the amounts contributed as Belgium was involved with several EGMP-related species.

45. The European Commission was willing to contribute but not able to commit until the issue had been discussed internally.

46. Latvia very much regretted that the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development had cut off all voluntary contributions.

47. Norway had pledged EUR 30,000 towards the Greylag Goose process and EUR 30,000 towards the operational costs of the EGMP.

48. Regarding the balance left from one year to another, Mr Dereliev enquired whether this could be kept in the form of a reserve, since there is no reliability as to when contributions will arrive in any particular year. In this way operations, would not be hampered while waiting for grants to be received and both the Coordination Unit and the Data Centre can be funded from the reserve for the first six months of the year before the annual budget has been replenished.

Decision: The Meeting approved handling the saving accumulated so far (ca. 179,000 EUR by the Coordination Unit and 59,900 by the Data Centre) as well as any surplus money from one year to another as a reserve.

Action: The Secretariat would establish a reserve fund and report back to the countries annually as to what it had been used for.

49. Mr Dereliev went on to request proposals from the EGM IWG members on ways of sharing the budget from 2019 onwards. He further explained that there were basically three options, if a decision should be taken by the EGM IWG members that contributions from 2019 onwards shall be mandatory for each Range State:

1. To **equally split** the costs up between the participating countries and the EU, which would come to roughly 30,000 EUR per year; or

2. To pay according **to the amount of populations** per participating country and the EU, whereby the EU would be paying the biggest share; or

3. To pay according to the **UN scale of assessments**, whereby France, Germany and the United Kingdom would pay the biggest share because they had the biggest factor in the UN scale of assessments.

50. In the ensuing discussion, Mr Dereliev assured those present that all possible efforts were being made to get the missing EGMP range states on board, i.e. the Russian Federation, Poland, Spain and Ireland. With regard to the costs as they are calculated now and how these would be affected when the number of populations increased, Mr Dereliev explained that it was expected the costs of the Secretariat to be more stagnant, whereas those of the Data Centre would increase.

Action: The Secretariat will prepare the calculations for two options for 1) **equally splitting up the costs** between the range states and 2) paying according to the **UN scale of assessments** for circulation very early in 2018 and subsequent consideration by the EGM IWG at its annual meeting in 2018.

Pink-footed Goose Session

Agenda item 10. Population status update

51. Referring to document EGM IWG 2.5 – *Pink-footed Goose Population Status Update 2016-2017*, Professor Madsen reported on the status of the Svalbard Pink-footed Goose population, which had been subject to management for the last three years under an AEWI International Species Working Group, which was already working in the form of a task force. In recent years, the Pink-footed Goose had been extending its migration range into Sweden and Finland and also wintering in Germany. Sweden and Finland would remain as observers to the process as long as the migrating numbers remained low.

52. The goal and objectives for the Svalbard Pink-footed Goose had been agreed upon by the International Working Group. A stable population was considered to consist of ca. 60,000 individuals. Numbers in Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium had reached a record high due to the good breeding season; in late April 2017, 88,000 individuals had been recorded with Finland as a site increasing in importance, where birds had moved to Oulu, thereby establishing a new migration route.

53. Estimates had become challenging due to the changes in the population's migration route. An alternative way of population estimation based on Capture-Mark-Recapture had been established and had supported recent population estimates based on ground-based surveys. Increasingly, observers in the field were inputting the data electronically so it was being sent to the Data Centre immediately.

54. Reliable harvest bag estimates around May showed a significant increase in harvest since the mid-2000s, with most birds being shot in Denmark (75%). Population growth had continued following a good breeding season and harvest had increased but not relative to population growth.

55. Based on X-rays of birds captured by canon-netting in spring, in the 1990s, for each bird shot, one was crippled. Currently one out of every eight birds shot was crippled. Thus, there was a definite improvement, due to targeted campaigns in Denmark and Norway in recent years.

Agenda item 11. Adaptive Harvest Management update

56. Referring to document EGM IWG 2.6 – *Pink-footed Goose Adaptive Harvest Management Update 2017*, Dr Fred Johnson introduced the Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) programme, which aimed at an optimal harvest strategy. Prediction models were developed and the harvest observed.

57. The models were successful in predicting population size from one year to another until the population got over 60,000 birds, when in most cases, models were predicting lower numbers than the actual numbers observed.

58. The management objective was to maintain a population of 60,000 to avoid human-goose conflicts, by providing sustainable hunting opportunities in Norway and Denmark. Due to an increase in the population size to 88,000, the 2017 harvest quota increased to 36,000 compared to 25,000 last year.

59. Dr Johnson summarised that updated model weights showed little or no evidence of density dependence so that the population could continue to grow exponentially for some time at least. The timing of spring appeared to have more effect on reproduction than on survival.

60. After five years of implementation, it may be time to re-visit at least some of the elements of the AHM programme, potentially including other actions to reduce survival and/or reproductive rates.

61. On behalf of Copa Cogeca, Ms Karen Post expressed the concern that the high population was likely to cause more conflict with farmers so that she very much hoped that the EGM IWG would find a solution to that.

Decision: The preferred management option was confirmed as being optimizing harvest to stabilize the population at 60,000, which will be examined again the following year, and the harvest quota for 2017/18 was set at 36,000, although it is acknowledged that it is unlikely that this level of harvest would be attained.

Agenda item 12. Pink-footed Goose Range State Updates

62. Updates on the implementation of the Pink-footed Goose ISMP were provided by all four Range States (Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark and Norway)

Taiga Bean Goose Session

Agenda item 13. Feedback session on the implementation of TBG ISSAP actions

63. Mr Dereliev introduced this agenda item and proceeded to facilitate the reporting session on actions undertaken following the EGM IWG1 with the emphasis on habitat conservation and other non-AHM related activities by June 2017 in the Eastern 1 and Central and Western Management Units, on the basis of the workplan agreed upon in conjunction with the consultation procedure of the EGM IWG1 Meeting Report.

64. In future, range states would report in advance and findings would be summarised in a document for presentation to the meetings of the EGM IWG.

65. The TBG range states, Germany, Russia and the United Kingdom were not present at EGM IWG1 and reported individually.

66. See Appendix 4 for the feedback provided by the range states.

Agenda item 14. Population status update

67. On behalf of the AEWG EGMP Goose Data Centre, Professor Tony Fox referred to document EGM IWG 2.7 *Taiga Bean Goose Population Status Report 2015/16 and 2016/17*, explaining that although this process was very much in the early stages, progress has been made. In Appendix 1 of the International Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Taiga Bean Goose (TBG), provisional flyway Management Units (MU) had been defined. In 2014, the Western Management Unit (MU) was considered to consist of ca. 1,500 individuals, stable or declining, the Central MU 35,000, stable or declining and the Eastern 1 MU down to 15,000 and declining. The Eastern 2 MU was down to ca 2,000-5,000 individuals, which was a major cause for concern.

68. Supported by the Danish Environmental Protection Agency, feather stable isotope analysis showed that TGB wintering in Eastern Germany and Poland must have originated from Western Siberia confirming the discrete nature of the Eastern 1 population, which will probably be confirmed by transmitters recently fitted to birds in the Russian Federation.

69. He went on to outline the status, distribution and monitoring status of the individual MUs, whereby data was being obtained from a huge network of goose counters and hunters and coordinated at the AEWA EGMP Goose Data Centre by Gitte Høj Jensen. The Western MU had showed little change since 2014, while the Central MU was estimated at ca 51,500. He stressed the improvements necessary for obtaining more reliable data from all MUs and particularly the alarming lack of data for the Eastern 1 and 2 Management Units.

70. Mr Nagy concurred that the apparent total collapse of monitoring in Germany was very worrying

Agenda item 15. Sustainable Harvest Assessment

71. Referring to document EGM IWG 2.8 *An Interim Harvest Strategy for Taiga Bean Geese*, Dr Johnson recalled the decision of EGM IWG1 in December 2016, i.e. the continuation of the closed hunting season for the Western and closure of hunting for the Eastern 1 & 2 Management Units until such time as further management alternatives could be possibly outlined for consideration on the basis of strengthened datasets. For the Central Management Unit, EGM IWG1 decided to defer the decision until the present Meeting, subject to the availability of a better information basis following the mid-January counts.

72. Since December 2016, model revisions had been carried out, to account for the lack of a terminal age and allow for the possibility that natural mortality and density dependence may vary among classes. Over 100,000 different parameterizations of the model were carried out to account for parameter uncertainty and to ascertain which harvest rate best maintains the population between 60,000 and 80,000 in winter over the time frame 2018 - 2025.

73. Dr Johnson went on to present the figures for potential harvest targets for the Central MU of 2% and 4%, which were discussed by the range states.

74. In the ensuing discussion, Finland thanked all those concerned for the good work and strongly encouraged this process to go forward with coordination between the countries. The priority was a quick recovery of the population. The relevant Finnish legislation was about to be adopted in parliament.

75. After further discussion on how to best achieve recovery of this population within a reasonable timeframe, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Norway agreed on a 3% harvest rate. For the actual numbers, both total and per country, please see Appendix 5.

Decision: Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Norway agreed on a harvest rate of 3% for the Central Management Unit of the Taiga Bean Goose for 2017/18 (see Appendix 5).

76. Mr Nagy remarked that this was a historic moment, as for the first time consensus had been reached amongst countries in Europe on how to reduce hunting to enable an existing quarry species to recover.

Agenda item 16. Data provision

77. Professor Madsen presented document EGM IWG 2.9 *AEWA EGMP Data Centre Work Plan: January 2017-June 2018*. The Data Centre was based at Aarhus University, Denmark and was coordinated by himself, Ms Gitte Høj Jensen and Professor Tony Fox. The work plan presented had been amended in the light of the decisions of the preceding Barnacle Goose Management Planning Workshop, which had taken place on 12-14 June 2017 and clearly indicated that it would be a very busy year for the Data Centre.

78. Germany thanked the Data Centre Coordination Team for incorporating the outcomes of the Barnacle Goose Workshop in the work plan and confirmed that the issue would continue to be discussed on national level.

79. An international EGMP Goose Modelling Consortium was in the process of being set up to collaborate on the development of integrated population models for populations currently included under the EGMP. In July 2017 the Consortium would discuss and agree on a model structure for Barnacle Goose populations and socio-economic interactions. A data request on barnacle goose management schemes would be sent to range states in September 2017 with a deadline of 2,5 months for submission.

80. Work was ongoing in preparation for the Management Planning Workshop for the Greylag Goose, scheduled to take place on 4-6 October 2017 in Paris, France. Mr Thibaut Powolny from OMPO would be taking the lead in compiling the AEWA International Species Management Plan for the Greylag Goose (NW/SW European Population). A draft biological assessment would be submitted to the relevant range states by 4 September 2017.

81. In 2017 monitoring networks will be established within the EGMP range states, as well as with the International Waterbird Census of Wetlands International and other stakeholders, with the aim of sharing the work and getting the most efficient data.

82. In December 2017 agreements would be made with the EGMP range states and their responsible institutions on harvest data collection systems and harvest data provision.

83. He briefly outlined the current data collection activities in the Pink-footed Goose range states and the need to streamline the process and strengthen alternative estimation of population size based on marking and satellite tracking.

84. Professor Fox raised attention to the fact that in the case of the Taiga Bean Goose, data collection in the Western MU was satisfactory, however in the case of the Central MU, there were still issues with the definition of races, i.e. the percentages of Taiga and Tundra Bean Geese.

85. Within the Eastern 1 MU large numbers of TBG were going to Germany, where more needed to be done, particularly by involving the relevant Federal States. For the Central MU, Sweden, Finland and Denmark also needed to increase efforts. Within the Bean Goose network, the data needed to be more reliable and also delivered on time. Hunting bag data was urgently needed at subspecies level through better engagement with hunters. Also important were robust estimates of annual survival with the help of collar-marking and productivity, by motivating the network to undertake age counts. Illegal take continued to be a problem and should be assessed regularly. X-rays should preferably be carried out to check for shotgun pellets in geese when they were caught for collar marking.

86. Finland reported that a survey of moulting families to show reproductive success on the Finnish population was being carried out via a helicopter-based approach, whereby good estimates could be produced over time.

87. The Meeting strongly urged the governments of the relevant EGMP range states (marked in red), which have not yet started to do so, to proactively work with the Data Centre to make progress towards filling the gaps in the following table as soon as possible during the course of next year.

Where/Who	TBG, Western MU	TBG, Central MU	TBG, Eastern 1 MU	TBG, Eastern 2 MU
Population size and distribution (counts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max winter count in UK (Scotland and Norfolk) • January count in Denmark 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-winter count in Sweden*, Denmark and Netherlands* • N/A²: Germany 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: Mid-winter count from Germany and Poland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: Mid-winter counts from NW China, E Kyrgyzstan, SE Kazakhstan
Productivity: Age ratio/Brood size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually sampled in Scotland • N/A: Annual sample in Denmark 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: Annual sample in Denmark • N/A: Sweden? • N/A: Finland? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: Annual sample in Germany and Poland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

² N/A = data or information Not Available

Survival	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neck-banding and telemetry in Scotland • NA: Winter neck-banding in Jutland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter neck-banding in Jutland • Neck-banding and telemetry in Sweden • Finland: Planned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: Neck-banding and telemetry in Germany, Poland and Russia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Harvest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunting bag from Sweden, Denmark and Finland • N/A: Germany • N/A: Russia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A: Hunting bag from Germany Poland and Russia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

* All birds in Sweden and the Netherlands are considered as belonging to the Central flyway MU in the absence of better information.

88. Professor Fox agreed that there was a need for a cohesive set of proposals which is why the establishment of the TBG Task Force was a priority. In answer to a question from the United Kingdom on setting targets for collar marking in the individual MUs and distributing this amongst the range states, he noted that this would be the part of the work of the TBG Task Force.

89. Representing BirdLife International, Mr Ariel Brunner pointed out that the EU should also be concerned since Germany and Poland were both member states under legal obligation to take conservation measures for the species and the EU should be vigilant as to how member states were meeting those obligations.

90. Representing Wetlands International, Mr Nagy concurred, adding that as part of the preparations for the work programme of the next two years, Wetlands International European Association was willing to help and hoped to have some resources to be able to work with the Data Centre with respect to Germany and Poland to improve the network. With the support of Norway, Wetlands International was working with the Secretariat to get data from some Central Asian countries.

91. Responding to a remark by Germany that only the full species Bean Goose *Anser fabalis* was listed under the Birds Directive rather than the Taiga subspecies *Anser fabalis fabalis*, Mr Ludovic Le Maresquier, representing the EU, suggested that the EU worked with the EGM IWG to see to what extent the Birds Directive could be helpful.

92. In summary the Chair stressed that the range states needed to step up efforts to provide the required data. The Secretariat and the Data Centre would be involved in the initiation of the TBG Task Force, which would have its own mandate and would report back to the Meetings of the EGM IWG.

Agenda item 17. IWG Reporting Process

93. Referring to document EGM IWG 2.10 *Establishment of National Reporting under the AEWA EGM IWG*, Mr Dereliev pointed out Rule 32 of the EGM IWG Modus Operandi, which states that EGMP range states shall prepare reports on the implementation of the AEWA International Species Management and Action Plans within the remit of the EGM IWG, to a format agreed by the EGM IWG.

94. National reporting under the AEWA Pink-footed Goose International Working Group had previously been carried out in the form of oral reports by each range state at working group meetings. However oral reporting was not practical under the EGMP and EGM IWG, due to the extended scope of range states, as well as species. Thus it was suggested to set up online reporting under the EGM IWG using the CMS family online reporting system. Since its establishment, the system had been much improved. Each country had one master user who had the right to delegate parts of the report to others.

95. The Secretariat would draft and circulate a reporting template by autumn 2017 for reporting on the implementation of the action and management plans relevant for the range states. The template would be light, requiring more box

ticking than descriptive text. The first report would entail most work; subsequent reports could be done on the basis of the pre-filled template by adjusting and up-dating where necessary. He pointed out that data provision templates would be run in a separate process by the Data Centre.

Decision and Action: The Secretariat would circulate a draft national reporting format to the EGMP range states for review. The format will be finalised following the feedback received and translated into an online template by the end of 2017. The reporting process will be launched by January 2018.

Agenda item 18. Next AEWA EGM IWG Meeting

96. Mr Dereliev informed the delegates that the next annual meeting of the EGM IWG was tentatively scheduled to take place on 14-15 June 2018. He went on to report that the Netherlands were keen to host the 2nd Barnacle Goose Workshop and the EGM IWG meeting, which could theoretically be held back-to-back. This depended entirely on how much the Data Centre could deliver by June and could only be decided at the beginning of 2018.

97. Thus, the Barnacle Goose Workshop might have to be postponed to a later date, in which case an alternative host for the EGM IWG in mid-June 2018 would need to be sought. Mr Dereliev invited offers for hosting the 2-day meeting.

98. The host country obligations included covering the cost of the venue for a maximum of 80 participants and possibly also hospitality. The costs of the Secretariat and funded delegates were covered by the EGMP operational budget. A meeting room at the AEWA premises in Bonn would also be reserved for 14-15 June 2018 as a back-up option.

99. Representing the Netherlands, Ms Wilmar Remmelts reiterated that her Government was happy to organise both the workshop and the meeting in the Province of Friesland, which hosted approximately 1 million geese. She looked forward to welcoming all the participants to Friesland and to a fruitful meeting.

Decision and Action: The meeting agreed on the dates for the 2018 annual meeting. The Secretariat would send out a reminder to the EGM IWG range states requesting back-up offers to host the EGM IWG3 on 14-15 June 2018, in case this cannot be held back-to-back with the Barnacle Goose Workshop in the Netherlands.

Agenda item 19. Next Steps and Closure

100. The Chair acknowledged that all the objectives of the Meeting had been achieved and thanked those present for their active and productive contributions, both in the meeting and in its margins. Special thanks were due to the Secretariat and the Data Centre for the excellent substantial and logistical preparation and to Denmark for the exceptionally efficient organisation and for providing such outstanding facilities, which contributed substantially to the success of the meeting.

101. Adaptive Harvest Management was a procedure of learning-by-doing and this meeting had very much reflected the need for adapting to new objectives. The countries had been able to settle on harvesting quotas and other management objectives, which was a great success in itself.

102. Mr Dereliev joined in thanking all those present for their commitment to the EGMP, which was obviously an initiative they were very much committed to delivering on. He ensured those present that the Secretariat also did all it could to meet expectations. He went on to thank the host for making this week in Copenhagen one to remember and also the venue staff, who had been extremely helpful.

103. With that the Chair declared the Meeting closed.

APPENDIX 1

AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP GUIDANCE ON THE COMPOSITION, ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF NATIONAL DELEGATIONS³

1. Introduction

Complementary to the Modus Operandi for the AEWa European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), which were adopted at the 1st Meeting of the EGM IWG in December 2016, the UNEP/AEWa Secretariat was requested to produce additional guidance regarding the composition, role and responsibilities of the national delegations attending future meetings of the Working Group.

This brief guidance aims to assist the designated national government representatives to the Working Group when deciding on the composition of their national delegations for each meeting and briefly describes the basic roles and responsibilities of the designated Working Group members.

2. Composition of National Delegations

2.1. Designated national representatives to the EGM IWG

As outlined in the Modus Operandi, each range state participating in the European Goose Management Platform (EGMP) is requested by the UNEP/AEWa Secretariat to designate up to four national representatives to the EGM IWG, which may include:

- a) a maximum of two representatives from national state authorities relevant to the implementation of AEWa and;
- b) a maximum of two representatives from national scientific or expert institutions and organizations.

These designated representatives form the core of the national delegations to the EGM IWG.

2.2. National delegations attending EGM IWG meetings

It is for the Range State to **decide on the composition of its national delegation** to each meeting of the Working Group. As outlined in the Working Group Modus Operandi, the national delegations are limited to a **maximum of five representatives** from each range state. As an exception, the range state hosting a meeting of the Working Group may invite additional national participants to join that particular meeting as part of their national delegation.

The EGM IWG is the **coordinating and decision-making body** of the European Goose Management Platform, subject to decisions made by the AEWa MOP. As such, Range States are **requested to consider the following guideline points when composing their national delegations** for each meeting to ensure the smooth functioning of the Working Group, the timely delivery on the implementation of the AEWa Species Action and Management Plans under its remit, as well as the involvement of relevant experts and national stakeholders.

³ As adopted by the AEWa European Goose Management International Working Group at its 2nd Meeting on 15-16 June 2017 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

- *A minimum of **one designated government representative**:*

The EGM IWG is routinely expected to take decisions on various conservation and management measures for the species/populations it covers. Some of these decisions will require negotiations amongst the relevant range states at the Working Group meetings as well as timely follow-up and national implementation. Some management alternatives may even require, for example, amendments to national hunting regulations. It is therefore recommended, that national delegations include at least one government representative well prepared for possible negotiations with the intention to take decisions on behalf of his/her country on measures for the species/populations for which the country has been identified as a range state (including for example hunting quotas), taking into account that there may be issues under national legislation which need to be consulted before a decision can be taken.

It is for the Range State to designate the person authorised to represent it at the meetings of the EGM IWG.

- *A minimum of **one designated national expert** from national scientific or expert institutions and organizations:*

It is the aim of the EGM IWG to function as the coordinating and decision-making body of the European Goose Management Platform with most of the scientific background and decision documents prepared and consulted in advance of the meetings. Varying topics which require expert input and advice are nonetheless expected to feature on the agenda of the Working Group meetings as well.

It is therefore recommended to include at least one designated national expert in the national delegation with broad experience and responsibilities attaining to the wider management and conservation issues being dealt with under the EGMP.

- ***Additional experts** relevant to the issues dealt with by the EGM IWG:*

In addition to the designated experts, it may also be useful to include additional national experts in the national delegation, relevant to the agenda items at specific meetings.

As outlined in the Modus Operandi, specific Task Forces will be established to work on dedicated topics or specific species/populations between the meetings of the Working Group. Additional national scientific or expert institutions and organizations can also be nominated to take part in these Task Forces according to their interest and expertise.

- ***Involvement of national stakeholder organizations**:*

Ensuring a transparent process as well as the subsequent engagement and support of relevant national stakeholders in the implementation of the conservation and management decisions taken by the Working Group is a key issue.

As defined in the Modus Operandi, national stakeholder organizations can attend the meetings of the Working Group if included in their country's national delegation. National organizations cannot be admitted as permanent observers to the EGM IWG. This decision was taken both for pragmatic reasons related to the size of the Working Group, but also because it is assumed that an appropriate consultation

with national stakeholders on the issues discussed at the EGM IWG takes place in each range state (see roles and responsibilities below).

Range States are, however, in addition to national consultations encouraged to include representatives from national stakeholder organizations in their national delegations, as appropriate. National stakeholder organizations can also be nominated to take part in the Task Forces mentioned above.

Role and responsibilities of the designated government representatives

A core task of each designated government representative is the responsibility to coordinate (or to organize/provide for the coordination of) the national implementation of the respective Action or Management Plan and to function as the link between the International Working Group and the National Working Group or other national bodies dealing with the implementation of the Plan. This includes, but is not limited to, facilitating national implementation of activities pursuant to decisions taken by the Working Group and the AEWA MOP and consulting with relevant national stakeholders throughout the EGM IWG decision-making and implementation process, as appropriate.

The national government representative is also tasked with ensuring the timely delivery of any agreed national reports, data etc. to the Working Group and the EGMP Data Centre.

Role and responsibilities of the designated national experts

The role of the designated national experts in the Working Group – beyond actively contributing to the work of the Group based on their expertise – is to strengthen and maintain the technical and expert network relevant for the species in question in their country. In addition, designated experts are also expected to function as the link between the international and national expert networks.

APPENDIX 2

AEWA EGM IWG Task Forces

Generic Terms of Reference⁴

Role

The role of the EGM IWG Task Force is to:

- 1) Assist the EGM IWG in coordinating and catalysing the implementation of [*species Task Force: Action/Management Plan / thematic Task Force: thematic activities*] under the EGMP;
- 2) Assist the EGM IWG in stimulating and supporting Range States in the implementation of [*species Task Force: Action/Management Plan / thematic Task Force: thematic activities*]; and
- 3) monitor and report on the implementation of these activities to the EGM IWG via the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and the National Reports to the EGM IWG, as appropriate.

Tasks

The EGM IWG Task Force will:

[Species Task Force:

- *support the EGM IWG by suggesting implementation priorities;*
- *assist the EGM IWG in coordinating international implementation;*
- *assist with the regular and thorough monitoring of the species populations in cooperation with the EGMP Data Centre;*
- *stimulate and support scientific research in the species necessary for conservation and management;*
- *facilitate internal and external communication and exchange of scientific, technical, legal and other required information;*
- *lead on updating the international ISSAP/ISSMP as required;*
- *assist in other ways as requested by the EGM IWG.*

[Thematic Task Force: list tasks as defined by the EGM IWG]

Membership

The EGM IWG Task Force will be open to (1) designated governmental representatives of all [*species Task Force: key Range States / thematic Task Force: EGMP Range States*], (2) representatives of national expert and stakeholder organisations as designated by the state authorities from all [*species Task Force: key Range States / thematic Task Force: EGMP Range States*], (3) representatives of admitted observer organisations, and (4) other experts as required.

The Coordinator of the EGM IWG Task Force may invite and admit international expert and stakeholder organisations as well as individual experts to the Task Force via the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and in consultation with the relevant Range States, as necessary.

To ensure coordination with the activities carried out by the EGMP Data Centre, the Data Centre will be represented by a staff member in each of the Task Forces.

⁴ As adopted by EGM IWG2, 15-16 June 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark

Officers

A voluntary Coordinator, ideally from one of the major Range States or organizations/institutes with expertise on the subject matter of the Task Force, will be identified by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat to oversee the operations of the Task Force in close cooperation with the Secretariat and the EGMP Data Centre.

Communication

The Task Force will mainly conduct its work electronically via the EGM IWG website and intranet as well as via email, Skype and other online communication platforms, as appropriate.

Meetings

No specific funds are allocated under the EGMP for the EGM IWG Task Forces. However, Task Forces are encouraged to have annual face-to-face meetings directly before the meetings of the EGM IWG. In addition, Task Force Coordinators and members are also encouraged to arrange face-to-face meetings if opportunities present themselves, for example in the margins of other international meetings or conferences.

Reporting

A brief report on the general progress of the Task Force (convening, membership, activities etc.) will be presented by the Coordinator via the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat to each meeting of the EGM IWG. This will include the presentation of any specific Task Force outputs, as requested by the EGM IWG.

Overall National Reports will be prepared by each EGMP Range State according to a format and reporting schedule agreed by the EGM IWG. Task Force members are requested to contribute to these National Reports regarding the implementation of activities relevant to the Task Force, as appropriate.

Financing

No specific funds are allocated under the EGMP for the Task Forces. The operations of the Task Forces, including that of the voluntary Coordinator, are therefore to be financed primarily by its members and observers such as through in-kind support in form of personnel time or separate funding. Neither the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat nor the EGMP Data Centre can commit regular financial support and may only provide such if possible.

APPENDIX 3

AEWA EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force

Terms of Reference⁵

Role

The role of the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force is to:

- 1) Assist the EGM IWG in coordinating and catalysing the implementation of activities related to goose management and agriculture under the EGMP;
- 2) Assist the EGM IWG in stimulating and supporting Range States in the implementation of activities related to goose management and agriculture; and
- 3) monitor and report on the implementation of these activities to the EGM IWG via the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and the National Reports to the EGM IWG, as appropriate.

Tasks

The EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force will:

- develop and support the implementation of an international interdisciplinary cooperation framework for dealing with interaction between geese and agriculture;
- assist in other ways as requested by the EGM IWG.

Membership

The EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force will be open to (1) designated governmental representatives of all EGMP Range States, (2) representatives of national expert and stakeholder organisations as designated by the state authorities from all EGMP Range States, (3) representatives of admitted observer organisations, and (4) other experts as required.

The Coordinator of the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force may invite and admit international expert and stakeholder organisations as well as individual experts to the Task Force via the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and in consultation with the relevant Range States, as necessary.

To ensure coordination with the activities carried out by the EGMP Data Centre, the Data Centre will be represented by a staff member in the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force.

Officers

A voluntary Coordinator, ideally from one of the major Range States or organizations/institutes with expertise on the subject matter of the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force, will be identified by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat to oversee the operations of the Task Force in close cooperation with the Secretariat and the EGMP Data Centre.

⁵ As adopted by EGM IWG2, 15-16 June 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark

Communication

The EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force will mainly conduct its work electronically via the EGM IWG website and intranet as well as via email, Skype and other online communication platforms, as appropriate.

Meetings

No specific funds are allocated under the EGMP for the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force. However, the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force is encouraged to have annual face-to-face meetings directly before the meetings of the EGM IWG. In addition, Task Force Coordinator and members are also encouraged to arrange face-to-face meetings if opportunities present themselves, for example in the margins of other international meetings or conferences.

Reporting

A brief report on the general progress of the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force (convening, membership, activities etc.) will be presented by the Coordinator via the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat to each meeting of the EGM IWG. This will include the presentation of any specific Task Force outputs, as requested by the EGM IWG.

Overall National Reports will be prepared by each EGMP Range State according to a format and reporting schedule agreed by the EGM IWG. Task Force members are requested to contribute to these National Reports regarding the implementation of activities relevant to the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force, as appropriate.

Financing

No specific funds are allocated under the EGMP for the EGM IWG Agriculture Task Force. The operations of the Task Force, including that of the voluntary Coordinator, are therefore to be financed primarily by its members and observers such as through in-kind support in form of personnel time or separate funding. Neither the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat nor the EGMP Data Centre can commit regular financial support and may only provide such if possible.

APPENDIX 4

Feedback from range states on implementation between December 2016 and June 2017 (marked in grey)

Work plan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions of the AEWA Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan (2017-2018) – Eastern 1 Management Unit (Range States: Belarus, Estonia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, Ukraine)⁶

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
<i>Result 1.1. Legal harvest does not jeopardise an increase of adult survival rates</i>					
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.	<p>1.1.1.1 Prepare and adopt legislative proposals for the closure of hunting of Taiga Bean Geese (including the use of flexible hunting seasons in Belarus and Russia) to allow for Taiga Bean Geese to pass legislation before goose hunting is opened</p> <p>Range States: ALL</p> <p>Belarus reported that there was currently no separation between sub-species among hunters. In 2017 new hunting legislation was being put into place. In previous years, the spring hunting season had amounted to 28 days for geese. A project was being prepared with hunting organisations for the next two years to establish a shorter hunting period, despite pressure from government, as hunters from Russia, Italy and France constituted an important source of income.</p> <p>Latvia reported that it was already compliant as spring hunting is not allowed and autumn hunting starts in September after the TBG have passed.</p> <p>Ukraine reported that consultations had been carried out with scientists from protected areas during the last six months (i.e. since early 2017 and efforts were being made to identify TBG during the spring in Eastern Ukraine, where over 11,000 individuals were counted. Creating new protected areas or</p>	Responsible government authorities	2017-2018	none	Discussions amongst responsible national authorities and national experts regarding the closure of hunting should commence as soon as possible, even if it may not be possible to close hunting immediately

⁶ Highlighted in yellow are countries which attended EGM IWG1 in December 2016 and are also attending EGM IWG2.

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
	<p>extending existing ones was being considered in this region, which was a hot-spot for biodiversity.</p> <p>In autumn, very few geese occur in western Ukraine (up to 2,000) and very limited hunting (100-200 birds) was permitted. It was planned to prepare new legislation for 2018 to exclude TBG from the list of huntable species, which was proving to be a difficult process.</p>				
	<p>1.1.1.2 Improve knowledge on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese in all Eastern Management Unit Range States</p> <p>a) Ensure national monitoring of Taiga Bean Geese at all known key sites (including providing identification training & equipment to people carrying out the monitoring where possible)</p> <p>Range States: ALL</p> <p>Belarus reported that monitoring had not started and was not planned for 2018. Action: Mr Dereliev pointed out that Wetlands International could be approached in this case for support with setting up monitoring.</p> <p>Latvia reported that no action had been taken as yet.</p> <p>Ukraine reported that monitoring programmes had started in national parks in western and north-eastern Ukraine.</p>	Responsible government authorities (Ministries of the Environment etc.)	2017-2018	unknown	<p>Increased knowledge on the occurrence, distribution, migratory patterns etc. of Taiga Bean Geese is an essential step in order to be able to propose appropriate changes to the hunting legislations in each Range State.</p> <p>In this context, it will be useful to develop a joint project for the Eastern Management Unit with the aim of implementing the activities identified under this action (for example EU LIFE)</p>

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
	<p>b) Carry out satellite/GPS-tagging of Taiga Bean Geese in the wintering/staging areas to further identify and map potential key sites as well as migratory patterns (potentially tag birds in Eastern Germany, Lithuania, Belarus or in Ukraine)</p> <p>Range States: best location for implementation to be decided</p> <p>No action had been taken in any range state as yet.</p>	TBG Task Force (<i>to be established</i>)	2017-2018	unknown	
	<p>c) Increase efforts to engage Poland and Russia (especially Kaliningrad)</p> <p>Mr Dereliev reported that this action had been suggested by Lithuania, which was not represented at the meeting. Finland and Norway had not yet managed to approach Russian colleagues. The Secretariat had been making efforts and would continue to do so.</p> <p>Denmark reported that collars had been provided to Russia.</p>	Lithuania Finland? Norway?	2017	none	
Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels					

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	1.2.2.1 Prepare and implement an awareness-raising campaign for hunters to complement suggested legislation changes, including guidance on the identification of grey geese. Range States: Belarus, Ukraine Belarus reported that this was in progress and would be started in 2018. Ukraine reported that no action had been taken as yet and that assistance from the Secretariat would be appreciated.	National NGOs and research institutes in cooperation with the TBG Task Force	2018	unknown	
	1.2.2.2 Produce and disseminate special publication on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese Range States: Ukraine Ukraine reported that no action had been taken to date, however this was planned for the future.	National NGOs and research institutes	2017	unknown	Collation of available information

Germany reported that TBG was huntable in Germany. Hunting was allowed in the Federal State Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and there was currently no intention to change the legislation. It was being considered to prepare a resolution only to hunt when the visibility was sufficient to be able to distinguish between Taiga and Tundra Bean Geese. No reply had been received from the Federal State Brandenburg, where it was thought that Taiga Bean Geese occur.

Ms Sonia Rozenfeld of the Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution in **Russia** reported that tagging had been carried out in the Eastern 1 and 2 MUs on three adult females and nine young birds. A map of movement during moulting of females with broods had been compiled and it was clear that the Eastern 2 MU population was migrating south to Kazakhstan or Kyrgyzstan. A map of spring and autumn distribution of the Eastern 1 population had been prepared and hunting free zones had been established, using inspectors and aerial control, which also helped to catch poachers. A map had been compiled of where the Eastern 1 and 2 populations probably occur in temporarily protected state areas, the borders of which would hopefully be enlarged. Birds had been measured and in July 2017 it was being planned to fit birds with transmitters (12 were available) to gain more knowledge of the migration route.

Despite the huge hunters' lobby, there had been a consensus that the TBG should be included in the Red Book of Russia in 2017 or 2018 making it automatically non-huntable; this had been prepared by Ms Rozenfeld and her colleague, who hoped that it would be useful for work on federal level.

Feedback from range states on implementation between December 2016 and June 2017 (marked in grey)

Work plan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions of the AEWA Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan (2017-2018) – Western and Central Management Units (Range States: Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, UK)⁷

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
<i>Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels</i>					
Action 1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	<p>1.2.2.1 Investigate TBG shooting NE Jutland & Zealand</p> <p>Range States: Denmark</p> <p>Denmark reported that this had not been carried out to date but will be done in autumn 2017 based on the new bag statistics that are now available. In order to avoid any illegal harvest of TBG, public announcements of hunting seasons will be restructured to stress the importance of the geographical restrictions applying to Bean Goose hunting in Denmark.</p>	SVANA	2017	None	
<i>Result 1.3. Impact of huntable native predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced</i>					
Action 1.3.1. Maintain and strengthen predator control measures in breeding and moulting areas	<p>1.3.1.1 Undertake annual campaign amongst hunters in the breeding areas to strengthen fox management</p> <p>Range States: Finland</p> <p>Finland reported that this will start later this year for the up-coming hunting season.</p>	Finnish Wildlife Agency + hunting association	2017 + 2018	none	

⁷ Highlighted in yellow are countries which attended EGM IWG1 in December 2016 and are also attending EGM IWG2.

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
	<p>1.3.1.2 Communicate to the Forestry & Parks Service the importance of continuing and strengthening fox management in the northernmost Finland</p> <p>Range States: Finland</p> <p>Finland reported that this will start later this year for the up-coming hunting season.</p>	Finnish Wildlife Agency	2017	none	
Result 1.4. Impact of alien predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced					
Action 1.4.1. Maintain and strengthen alien predator control and eradication measures in breeding and moulting areas	<p>1.4.1.1 Carry on the eradication of raccoon dog in Lapland & Sweden</p> <p>Range States: Finland, Sweden</p> <p>Finland reported that this work was ongoing and would continue for four years. Funding had been provided by Norway and Sweden and the results were very promising so far.</p> <p>Sweden reported that this was ongoing and good progress was being made.</p>	Finnish Wildlife Agency / Swedish Hunters' Association	Ongoing	FI: Secured (150,000 EUR) SE: secured (800,000 EUR)	
Result 2.2. Interspecific competition in spring staging areas is reduced					
Action 2.2.1. Maintain the unharvested-fields-for-birds programme (within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union, if applicable)	<p>2.2.1.1 Continue implementing the fields for geese programme</p> <p>Range States: Sweden</p> <p>Sweden reported that this was ongoing, although not exclusive for TBG.</p>	County Administrative Boards	Ongoing	secured	

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
	<p>2.2.1.2 Ministry of Agriculture to maintain this programme in the national CAP starting form 2020</p> <p>Range States: Finland</p> <p>Finland reported that this would be discussed in more detail in future once the negotiation and planning for the CAP in Finland starts.</p>	Ministry of Agriculture	2017 + 2018	none	
	<p>2.2.1.3 Demonstrate the benefits of the programme to the Agriculture Department of the Ministry of Agriculture</p> <p>Range States: Finland</p> <p>Finland reported that this was also related to the preparation of the next CAP.</p>	Finnish Wildlife Agency	2017 + 2018	none	
Result 3.1. Impact of forestry works is reduced					
Action 3.1.1. Continue the adaptation of forestry operations to take into account wildlife, in particular Taiga Bean Goose	<p>3.1.1.1 Working models for Wildlife Friendly Forests management and forestry related habitat restorations are developed in co-operation with forestry sector and promoted at large to forest owners and corporations to reach implementation in practice. Actions implement the national management plans for the grouse species and the Bean Goose.</p> <p>Range States: Finland</p> <p>Finland reported that this was ongoing and progressing surprisingly well. The Finnish Forest Centre was to create a layer of valuable forest and marsh habitats. Funding was available for the next couple of years.</p>	Finnish Wildlife Agency	Ongoing	none	

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
Action 3.1.2. Continue restoring mires used by Taiga Bean Geese that have been affected by past drainage	3.1.2.1 Implement annual goals for mire restoration by Parks & Wildlife Finland set by the Ministry of Environment Range States: Finland Finland reported that this was ongoing work.	Parks & Wildlife Finland	Ongoing	Dependent on available resources	
	3.1.2.2 Develop and submit LIFE application to the EC Range States: Finland Finland reported that LIFE Project funding was expected in future. They would submit further details from the Ministry of Environment.	Parks & Wildlife Finland	2017 + 2018	none	
Result 3.3. Breeding, staging and wintering habitats are not further lost due to oil and gas or renewable energy developments					
Action 3.3.1. Take account of Taiga Bean Goose breeding, staging and wintering habitats in the planning of new oil and gas and renewable energy developments	3.3.1.1 Continued monitoring of collision risk posed to Taiga Bean close to the Special Protection Areas identified as their important wintering sites Range States: Denmark Denmark reported that two test sites were being investigated. Birds were avoiding the turbines and no large birds had been found under the turbines. A further site had showed no collision risks. Monitoring was ongoing and results would be obtained soon, however this did not seem to be a major cause for concern.	SVANA / Aarhus University/ Windfarming company	Ongoing	Secured	

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
Result 3.4. Impact of agriculture on natural Taiga Bean Goose habitats is minimised					
Action 3.4.1. Restore wet grassland habitats in staging and wintering areas	3.4.1.1 Increase the area of managed coastal grassland under CAP Range States: Finland Finland reported that the area had been increased and would continue to increase.	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	2017-2018	secured	

The **United Kingdom** reported that two flocks existed in eastern England, which had declined in the last four years. Scotland hosted 260 birds, which constituted a 10% increase. Monitoring took place at monthly intervals in England and weekly intervals in Scotland. A Masters study into the dynamics of the Scottish flock was being carried out. A study of GPS tags in Scotland elucidated migration routes and significantly increased knowledge. The species was protected in the UK and no known hunting was occurring. A study group in Scotland had substantially helped to facilitate knowledge of birds occurring in Scotland. Work should be carried out in eastern England to investigate the rapid decline.

Action: The UK delegation provided the following activity to be added by the Secretariat to the work plan and the reporting format: “*Review factors possibly contributing to rapid declines in eastern England and implement appropriate management responses, as appropriate*”.

APPENDIX 5

TAIGA BEAN GOOSE HARVEST QUOTA FOR 2017

(Prepared by the Data Centre on 19 June 2017)

January 2017 population size = 56,792

Adult harvest rate = 0.03

Country	2.5%	50%	97.5%
Russia	319	350	397
Finland	1,040	1,144	1,295
Sweden	552	607	687
Denmark	212	233	264
Total	2,123	2,334	2,643

APPENDIX 6

2nd MEETING OF THE AEWAE EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP

15-16 June, Copenhagen, Denmark

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS⁸

BELARUS

Mr Alexey Mekhanikov (NGR)
Integrated Environmental Research Department
Republican Research Unitary Enterprise (RUE)
Belarusian Scientific Research Centre 'Ecology'
76 Yakubova Street
220095 Minsk
Belarus

Tel.: +37 529 702 8534
E-mail: silverhawk@mail.ru

Mr Pavel Pinchuk (NE)
Laboratory of Ornithology
State Research and Production Association
Scientific and Practical Centre of the National
Academy of Sciences of Belarus for Biological
Resources
22 Akademicheskaya Street
220072 Minsk
Belarus

Tel.: +37 529 694 25 04
E-mail: ppinchuk@mail.ru

BELGIUM

Mr Floris Verhaeghe (NGR)
Expert Fauna & Flora
Nature and Forest Agency
Koning Albert I-laan 1/2 bus 74
8200 Brugge
Belgium

Tel.: +32 479 89 01 09
E-mail: Floris.Verhaeghe@vlaanderen.be

DENMARK

Ms Camilla Uldal (NGR)
Head of Section
Nature Protection
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel.: +45 935 879 47
E-mail: cakis@svana.dk

Mr Jens Skovager Østergaard (NGR)
Nature management
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark.

Tel.: +45 408 563 70
E-mail: jenoe@mst.dk

Professor Jesper Madsen (NE)
Head of the AEWAE EGMP Data Centre
Department of Bioscience
Aarhus University
Grenåvej 14
8410 Rønne
Denmark

Tel.: +45 294 402 04
E-mail: jm@bios.au.dk

⁸ NGR – National Government Representative / NE – National Expert

Professor Anthony Fox (NE)
Professor of Waterbird Ecology
Aarhus University
Department of Bioscience
Kalø, Grenåvej 14
8410 Rønne
Denmark

Tel.: +45 206 757 11
E-mail: tfo@bios.au.dk

Ms Iben Hove Sørensen
(Also representing CIC)
Danish Hunters' Association
Molsvej 34
8410 Rønne
Denmark

Tel.: +45 817 716 64
E-mail: ih@jaegerne.dk

Ms Josefine Møller
Biologist / Nature Protection
Danish Environmental Protection Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel.: +45 935 97154
E-mail: josmo@ms.dk

EUROPEAN UNION

Mr Ludovic Le Maresquier
Nature Policy Officer
European Commission
DG ENV
5, avenue de Beaulieu
Brussels
Belgium

E-mail: ludovic.le-maresquier@ec.europa.eu

FINLAND

Dr Esko Hyvärinen (NGR)
Environment Counsellor
Ministry of the Environment
Department of the Natural Environment
P.O. Box 35
00023 Helsinki
Finland

Tel.: +35 840 014 3876
E-mail: esko.o.hyvarinen@ym.fi

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

Tel.: +35 829 516 2338
E-mail: janne.pitkanen@mmm.fi

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

Tel.: +35 850 911 1288
E-mail: mikko.alhainen@riista.fi

Mr Jorma Pessa (NE)
Centre for Economic Development
Transport and the Environment
P.O. Box 86
90101 Oulu
Finland

Tel.: +35 840 025 0040
E-mail: jorma.pessa@ely-keskus.fi

FRANCE

Dr François Lamarque (NGR)
(Vice-Chair of the AEWAs Standing Committee)
European and International Actions Officer
Ministry for the Ecological and Inclusive
Transition (MTES)
Water and Biodiversity Directorate
Tour Séquoia
92055 La Défense CEDEX
France

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

Dr Matthieu Guillemain (NE)
Office National de la Chasse et de la Faune
Sauvage
Migratory Bird Unit
La Tour du Valat
Le Sambuc
13200 Arles
France

Tel.: +33 627 327 188
E-mail: matthieu.guillemain@oncfs.gouv.fr

Mr Alexandre Czajkowski
Director
OMPO
59 rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

Tel.: +33 144 010 516
E-mail: vanneau@ompo.org

GERMANY

Dr Carolin Kieß (NGR)
Legal Officer
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
Division N13 (Species Protection)
Robert-Schumann-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 22899 305-2668
Fax: +49 22899 305-2684
E-mail: Carolin.Kiess@bmub.bund.de

Dr Bettina Holsten (NGR)
Ministry of Energy, Agriculture,
the Environment and Rural Areas
Mercatorstraße 3
24106 Kiel
Germany

E-mail: Bettina.holsten@landsh.de

ICELAND

Dr Gudmundur A. Gudmundsson (NGR)
Ecologist
Icelandic Institute of Natural History
Ecology Department
Urridaholtsstraeti 6-8
212 Gardabaer
Iceland

Tel.: +35 459 005 00
E-mail: mummi@ni.is

LATVIA

Ms Ilona Mendzina (NGR)
Deputy Director
Ministry of Environmental Protection and
Regional Development
Peldu Str 25
1494 Riga
Latvia

Tel.: +37 167 026 432
Fax: +37 167 820 442
E-mail: Ilona.menzina@varam.gov.lv

Dr Oskars Keišs (NE)
Senior Researcher
Laboratory of Ornithology
Latvian University Institute of Biology
Miera 3
2169 Salaspils
Latvia

Tel.: +37 129 236 300
E-mail: oskars.keiss@lu.lv

NETHERLANDS

Ms Wilmar Remmelts (NGR)
Ministry of Economic Affairs
Directorate of Nature and Biodiversity
Postbus 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 638 825 338
E-mail: w.j.remmelts@minez.nl

Mr Gerben Mensink (NGR)
Policy-maker Ecology
Province of Friesland
Postbus 20120
8900 Leeuwarden
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 582 928 955
E-mail: g.mensink@fryslan.nl

Mr Kees Koffijberg
Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland
Department of Monitoring
P.O. Box 6521
6525 ED Nijmegen
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 247 410 410
E-Mail: kees.koffijberg@t-online.de

NORWAY

Mr Øystein Størkersen (NGR)
(*EGMIWG Chair*)
Principal Adviser
Norwegian Environment Agency
P.O. Box 5672 Sluppen
7485 Trondheim
Norway

Tel.: +47 7358 0500
E-mail: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

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

Tel.: +47 415 123 96
E-mail: ares@dirnat.no

Ove Martin Gundersen (NE)
Project Manager
Norwegian Farmer's Union
Hamnegata 33
7714 Steinkjer
Norway

Tel.: +47 922 904 91
E-mail: ove-martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no

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

Tel.: +47 934 667 23
E-mail: ingunn.tombre@nina.no

Mr Vidar Nilsen
Hunting Consultant
Norwegian Association of Hunters and
Anglers (NJFF)
Hvalstadåsen 5
1378 Nesbru
Norway

Tel.: +476 679 2237
E-mail: ws@njff.no

SWEDEN

Mr Per Risberg (NGR)
Desk Officer
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Naturvardsverket
06 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 000
E-mail: per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se

Mr Urban Johansson (NGR)
Officer Research and Wildlife Management
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Wildlife Analysis Unit
Forskarens väg 5 Hus Ub, Östersund
10648 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 08 698 00 00
E-mail: urban.johansson@naturvardsverket.se

Dr Leif Nilsson (NE)
University of Lund
Department of Biology
Ecology Building
223 62 Lund
Sweden

E-mail: leif.nilsson@biol.lu.se

Ms Mariana Skoglund
National Game manager
Swedish Association for Hunting and
Wildlife Management
Öster Malma
611 91 Nyköping
Sweden

Tel.: +46 703 300 637
E-mail: mariana.skoglund@jagareforbundet.se

Dr Johan Månsson
Associate Professor
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Grimsö Research Station
730 91 Riddarhyttan
Sweden

Tel.: +46 581 679 325
E-mail: johan.mansson@slu.se

UKRAINE

Ms Olesya Petrovych (NGR)
Chief Specialist
Department of Protected Areas
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
35, Vasilya Lipkivskogo Street
Kiev 03035
Ukraine

Tel.: +38 067 784 1153
Fax: +38 044 206 2193
E-mail: petrovych.o@gmail.com

Dr Vasyl Kostyushyn (NE)
Institute of Zoology NAS of Ukraine
Department of Monitoring and Conservation
of Animals
B.Khmelnytskogo str. 15
01030 Kiev
Ukraine

Tel.: +38 050 387 2040
E-mail: v.kostiushyn@gmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr David Stroud (NGR)
Senior Ornithologist
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
PE1 1JY Peterborough
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1733 566 810
E-mail: David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk

Ms Rae McKenzie (NGR)
Policy and Advice Manager
Rural Resources Unit
Scottish natural Heritage
Main Street, Bowmore
PA437JX Isle of Islay
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 1469 8107 11
E-mail: rae.mckenzie@snh.gov.uk

INDIVIDUAL EXPERTS

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

Tel.: +01 352 264 3488
E-mail: fjohnson@usgs.gov

Ms Sonia Rozenfeld
Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution
Bird Ringing Center
Leninsky Prospekt 33
119071
Moscow
Russian Federation

Tel.: +74 991 352 247
E-mail: rozenfeldbro@mail.ru

Ms Melissa Lewis
Environmental Law Expert on the
AEWA Technical Committee
Tilburg University
Dept. of European and International Public Law
P.O. Box 90153
5000 LE
Tilburg
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 619 806 867
E-mail: M.G.Lewis@uvt.nl

OBSERVERS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR GAME AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION (CIC)

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

COPA-COGECA

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

Tel.: +45 333 946 52
E-mail: kpo@lf.dk

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

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

Tel.: +32 491 904 653
E-mail: ariel.brunner@birdlife.org

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

Dr David Scallan
FACE
Rue Frederick Pelletier 82
1030 Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +35 387 950 4563
E-mail: david.scallan@face.eu

**MIGRATORY BIRDS OF THE WESTERN
PALEARCTIC (OMPO)**

Dr Thibaut Powolny
OMPO
59, rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

Tel.: +33 144 010 510
E-mail: Thibaut.powolny@ompo.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

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

Tel.: +31 628 554 823
E-mail: szabolcs.nagy@wetlands.org

WILDFOWL AND WETLANDS TRUST

Mr Richard Hearn
Head of Monitoring
Conservation Science
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
Slimbridge
GL2 7TB Gloucester
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 145 389 1185
E-mail: Richard.hearn@wwt.org.uk

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

UNEP/AEWA SECRETARIAT

Mr Sergey Dereliev
Technical Officer
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2415
Mobile: +49 151 167 890 84
Fax: +49 228 815 2450
E-mail: sergey.dereliev@unep-aewa.org

Ms Nina Mikander
Associate Programme Officer
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2452
Mobile: +49 151 656 112 40
E-mail: nina.mikander@unep-aewa.org

Ms Jolanta Kremer
Programme Assistant
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2455
E-mail: jolanta.kremer@unep-aewa.org

AEWA EGMP DATA CENTRE

Ms Gitte Høj Jensen
Goose Monitoring Coordinator
AEWA EGMP Data Centre
Aarhus University
Grenåvej 12
8410 Rønne
Denmark
E-mail: ghj@bios.au.dk