

 <p>AEWA Pink-footed Goose International Working Group</p>	<p>AEWA Svalbard Pink-footed Goose International Working Group</p>	<p>Doc.: SPfG IWG Inf. 1.8 Date: 14.11.2013</p>

1st Meeting of the AEWA Svalbard Pink-footed Goose International Working Group
23 April 2013, Copenhagen, Denmark.

FINAL REPORT OF THE MEETING



Image courtesy of Christine Verscheure

Participants:

Front row, left to right: Jesper Madsen, Erling Krabbe, Fred Johnson, James Williams, Øystein Størkersen, Gitte Høj Jensen.
Back row, left to right: Pål Krister Langlid, Paul Harald Pedersen, Cy Griffin, Niels Henrik Simonsen, Sergey Dereliev, Niels Erik Jørgensen, Marco Brodde, Ingunn Tombre, Sarah Roggeman, Henrik Lykke Sørensen, Eckhart Kuijken, Christine Verscheure, Arild Espelien.

Supported by the Norwegian Environment Agency,
the Danish Nature Agency and Aarhus University.

Organized by Aarhus University, Denmark



Contents

Welcome and Introduction.....	3
Adoption of the Agenda	3
Election of the Chair	3
Introductions and Confirmation of Observers	3
Coordination Unit Update	3
Budget.....	3
IWG Website.....	4
IWG Logo	4
Range State Updates	4
Belgian Summary	4
Danish Summary	5
Norwegian Summary	5
Adaptive Harvest Management Progress Report.....	5
Adaptive Harvest Management Discussions	6
Regulatory cycle.....	6
Hunting season emergency closure.....	6
Hunting pressure and mortality	7
Crippling of birds	7
Reporting of annual harvest bag	7
Sharing an annual harvest bag	8
Alternative Management Actions.....	8
Alternative Management Discussions	8
Grubbing in Svalbard	8
Managing goose conflicts with agricultural interests.....	8
Habitat restoration projects	9
Summing-up, Agreements and Further Actions	9
Abbreviations.....	11
Participants.....	11

Welcome and Introduction

AEWA Technical Officer *Sergey Dereliev* welcomed the participants to the meeting on behalf of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. He thanked the hosts, the Danish Nature Agency for providing the venue and as financial donors, along with the Norwegian Environment Agency and Aarhus University, for supporting the work of the Coordination Unit and Dr. Fred A. Johnson of the USGS.

Dereliev stated this was a historic meeting for European waterbird management as it was held to discuss and agree the strategy and actions needed to implement, over the next few years, the International Species Management Plan (ISMP) for the Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose. The ISMP is the first of its kind in Europe. It sets out to collaboratively manage the habitats and population size of the Svalbard Pink-footed Goose following the principles of adaptive management.

Adoption of the Agenda

A draft agenda was presented. It was noted that as this was a single day's meeting so concentrated discussions where needed.

Decision: The proposed agenda was adopted.

Election of the Chair

In prior consultation with the Range States, Norway volunteered to be the Chair for this meeting with Øystein Størkersen as their representative.

Decision: Øystein Størkersen, the Norwegian National Focal Point, was accepted and appointed Chair for this meeting and for the period until the next meeting of the IWG.

Introductions and Confirmation of Observers

After introductions by the National Delegations, *Dereliev* introduced a number of other participants, not part of the national delegations. Dr. Fred A. Johnson, from the USGS, was attending as an international expert who had developed the Population and Adaptive Harvest Management models for the Svalbard population of the pink-footed goose, assisted by Gitte Høj Jensen, from Aarhus University. Cy Griffin was attending as an observer from the Federation of Associations for Hunting & Conservation of the EU [FACE]. James H. Williams, from Aarhus University was attending as part of the SPfG Coordination Unit. Mikko Alhainen and Arto Marjakangas, both from the Finnish Wildlife Agency were also attending as observers in their capacity in leading the development of a new AEWA International Species Management Plan for the Taiga Bean Goose. *Dereliev* also confirmed that the Netherlands were unable to send a delegation and that they had sent an apology.

Decision: Non-national delegation participants and observers were accepted and welcomed.

Coordination Unit Update

Budget

Professor Jesper Madsen, from Aarhus University and lead of the Coordination Unit, gave a brief overview of the operational budget for the Coordination Unit; having formalised an agreement with AEWA on the 1st April 2013 for Aarhus University to act as the Coordination Unit. *Madsen* confirmed that James H. Williams had been contracted on a part-time basis for a 3 year period as part of the Coordination Unit. In addition, *Madsen* confirmed that funding for the Coordination Unit and the work by Dr. Fred A. Johnson, to develop and maintain the Adaptive Harvest Management models, had been secured for 3 years. This funding was kindly provided by the Danish Nature Agency, the Norwegian Environment Agency and Aarhus University.

Discussion:

Ingunn Tombre asked whether the budget included funding for additional face to face meetings for the International Working Group (IWG).

Madsen stated that the budget for the Coordination Unit was very limited and such funding was not included. Financial support would be sought for future face to face meetings, as well as other operational activities, from the Range States or elsewhere. Securing long-term funding was important.

IWG Website

Madsen confirmed that a dedicated AEWA website for the Svalbard Pink-footed Goose IWG would be available for publically communicating its work, as well as a pass-word protected area for communications within the IWG. *Dereliev* added that there had been a delay in creating the required template websites but one would be available for the SPfG IWG, as part of the AEWA family of websites, during the course of the summer.

Decision: It was confirmed the SPfG Coordination Unit would be responsible for developing and maintaining the content of the website.

IWG Logo

Madsen presented the proposed logo for the SPfG IWG, created by Marco Brodde from the Danish Ornithological Society and layout produced by the Aarhus University Graphics Workshop.

Decision: The logo was accepted and adopted by the IWG.

Svalbard Pink-footed Goose Population Status Update

Madsen gave an update on the latest estimate for the population size for the Svalbard Pink-footed Goose. It was expected to be around 80,000 but this was to be confirmed. The 2012 count, traditional undertaken in November, had been questionable as it was believed a large proportion of the population had been missed (estimated 5-8k) due to the geese using new sites. *Madsen* added that no firm conclusions could be made until after the planned spring count on the 5th May 2013.

Discussion:

Eckhart Kuijken commented that the issue of missing birds and double counting raised issues for the accuracy of the population models.

Madsen stated that considerable effort was made to ensure that counts were coordinated to minimise double counting. There was always the potential to miss birds if they used previously unknown sites, but the second count in spring would also help ensure the accuracy of the population estimate.

Range State Updates**Belgian Summary**

Sarah Roggeman led an update by the Belgian delegation. *Roggeman* stated a Flemish Working Group had been set-up and had met before the delegation's attendance at the IWG meeting. This was a useful regional working group to agree common management objectives and act as a forum to exchange information. *Roggeman* outlined the Belgian strategy for managing crop damage conflicts by scaring and, where unsuccessful, by paying compensation to affected farmers but only within SPAs. In addition the restoration of traditional grasslands was considered of high importance, although this was on a voluntary basis and stated there was insufficient protection for existing grasslands outside SPAs. *Kuijken* gave an update on recent trends and observations of the overwintering population in Flanders. It seemed that the SPfG preferred wet fields and grass lands, most foraging in areas outside SPAs, with some feeding on crop remains. It was hoped that grassland restoration would encourage birds back to SPAs.

Discussion:

Øystein Størkersen asked whether there were any new calls for sustainable hunting in Belgium.

Roggeman confirmed that the hunting of SPfG was still closed in Belgium and there was no real desire amongst stakeholders to have an open season. Nevertheless, if the ISMP suggested more widespread hunting, it would be considered after discussions with stakeholders.

Danish Summary

Henrik Lykke Sørensen firstly presented the Danish National Delegation, adding there were no immediate plans to setup a national working group as two of the three key national stakeholders were part of the national delegation for the IWG. A National Working Group maybe set-up when needed. In addition, *Jesper Madsen* (the Danish National Expert) had presented the ISMP to the National Wildlife Board, representing a board cross-section of national stakeholders. *Sørensen* went on to outline the current focus for goose management within Denmark, particularly related to hunting. There were two main initiatives: 1) Re-launch of a national campaign focused on reducing crippling rates as part of a Danish Crippling Action Plan. 2) A joint project, organized between the Danish Nature Agency, Danish Hunting Association and Aarhus University, to improve the regional organization and effectiveness of hunting for pink-footed geese. *Sørensen* confirmed that no compensation is paid for goose damage to crops. Affected farmers may be loaned and given advice on the use of scaring devices and derogations were permitted to shoot geese outside the open season.

Norwegian Summary

Ingunn Tombre gave an update on the 'Skogn' case-study, a local initiative to organise hunting among several landowners in central Norway. *Tombre* presented some initial results which indicated that: reduced hunting pressure and better organization of hunting effort appears to work, providing more hunting opportunities and increasing the harvest of geese. It was reiterated these were early unpublished results. This study has also been beneficial in facilitating dialog between stakeholders and may also provide the foundations for a national pilot study. *Arild Espelien* finished the Norwegian update stating that, apart from these positive local initiatives, it was very much business as usual for the management of geese in Norway as presented in Svalbard (August 2012).

Adaptive Harvest Management Progress Report

Dr. Fred A. Johnson, of the U.S. Geological Survey, gave a presentation outlining the development of a model framework to support the Adaptive Harvest Management of the Svalbard Pink-footed Goose. This was one of the main focuses for the meeting, as a key element of the ISMP is the sustainable harvest of this quarry species in order to maintain a stable population size, at around 60,000 individuals. *Johnson* along with other experts from Aarhus University, Denmark had developed a process for a three-year, adaptive cycle of decision making for setting harvest quotas for the SPfG. The process involves alternating between: (a) an optimization procedure, which identifies a harvest quota based on resource conditions and the weight of evidence on nine alternative models of population dynamics; and (b) an adaptation procedure, which compares model predictions of population size with observations from the monitoring program to update model weights, which reflect the level of confidence in each of the alternative models. The optimal harvest strategy provides a three-year harvest quota (increments of 5k) for every potential combination of the number of young and adults in the autumn population and the number of temperature days (i.e., days above 0°C) in May in Svalbard as an indicator of the breeding conditions and offspring produced prior to the hunting season. *Johnson* noted that opting for a 3 year cycle did have some limitations. The ability to stabilise the population at the agreed target was more problematic without the ability to make annual changes to the harvest quota. In the long term harvest quotas for a 3 year cycle tend to have greater variability with more significant changes in harvest quotes, although they were likely to be more conservative. *Johnson* also added that recent harvests have been slightly below what appear to be optimal to stabilize the population around 60,000 individuals.

Full details of the work carried out by *Dr. Fred A. Johnson* and colleagues are available on the [AEWA Pink-footed Goose International Working Group website](#) and summarized by in a [Briefing Summary](#) provided for this meeting.

Adaptive Harvest Management Discussions

The working group discussed the requirements for implementing a sustainable harvest strategy.

Regulatory cycle

Arild Espelien reiterated that at this stage only 3 year regulatory cycle was realistically feasible in Norway but in the future the possibility of switching to 1 year regulatory cycle could be considered. *Espelien* noted that any changes would need to be discussed with his counterparts in Denmark as both regulation systems need to align. *Henrik Lykke Sørensen* agreed and added that a 3 year cycle was the agreed decision taken in Svalbard. *Fred Johnson* stated that the initial models suggested that the harvest could be around 15,000 birds per year over a 3 year period. A harvest at this level was unlikely to put the population at risk. A key decision point would then be in 2016.

Marco Brodde stated that 1 year cycle would be preferable from the Danish Ornithological Societies perspective but accepted that a 3 year cycle was more practicable in the short term. *Brodde* added that the option of an emergency stop would be highly desirable.

Cy Griffin said it would be preferable for hunters to have a more stable regulatory system (e.g. 3 year) rather than move to a one year cycle straight away. Once the benefits of AHM can be demonstrated it would be easier to sell a switch to a 1 year cycle to hunting groups, particularly as hunting quotas are to be based on scientific evidence rather than just a political decision.

Brodde asked what would be needed to handle a 1 year cycle?

Øystein Størkersen commented that changing national hunting legislation e.g. varying hunting seasons annual would be difficult given that for most quarry species reviews were on a 5 yearly cycle in Norway, whilst it had been agreed to change this to 3 years for the SPfG.

Erling Krabbe added that introducing annual changes would be difficult within Denmark.

Espelien did suggest that the national authorities could advise local hunting groups to narrow a hunting season or adjust harvest e.g. bag limits as a voluntary mechanism.

Griffin agreed that the feasibility and benefits of voluntary agreements, and working with hunters, shouldn't be underestimated.

Størkersen added that the IWG was an advisory body to the relevant national agencies. The group could give advice regarding bag limits, season lengths or closures but it was the responsibility of national agencies to implement these, whether legislative or voluntary.

Jesper Madsen commented that not much was known about the relationship between these regulatory mechanisms and their effects on harvest bags. Hunters can change behaviour and impact pink-foot behaviour in different ways, whilst regulatory changes may not have the desired effect. There are also different regulatory situations in Norway and Denmark. *Madsen* called for more work to understand the relationships between hunting season length, harvest bags and hunter behaviour etc. to assess the effectiveness of various mechanisms to manage hunting and the SPfG population.

Hunting season emergency closure

Madsen asked whether it was possible to implement an emergency hunting season closure for 1 year, as suggested at the meeting in Svalbard?

Johnson added as part of the AHM process the predictive models could be used annually to assess the need for an emergency closure. *Johnson* provided a short explanation of the hunting season closure graph (please see [Adaptive Harvest Management Briefing Summary](#), Fig 4).

Sørensen stated it should be possible both practically and politically to close a hunting season if the models suggested this was needed, particularly if this was accepted as a voluntary agreement by the hunting organizations.

Størkersen added that a strong signal from the IWG would be enough and would be taken seriously by the Norwegian agencies to act and implement a season closure.

Griffin indicated that emergency closures could be acceptable (for hunters) if these were for a single year with the potential to be opened again, subject to review.

Johnson stressed the need to agree to rules for when an emergency closure was needed and what conditions that may mean, and to stick with these.

Dereliev said there is a need for forward thinking to ensure that regulatory mechanisms used matched the needs for implementing the ISMP in a flexible way.

Madsen added it was important to agree to a 3 year AHM cycle, accepting the principle for implementing emergency closures if needed.

Hunting pressure and mortality

Tombre asked whether hunters believed they could increase the hunting pressure on the SPfG to reach a possible 15,000 harvest quota.

Paul Harald Pedersen suggested that it may be possible for the Norwegian hunters to achieve a harvest quota of around 5,000.

Madsen advised that a regional project in collaboration with the Danish Hunters Association was currently underway to improve the effectiveness and local organization of hunting SPfG in Denmark. In addition, an extension of the SPfG hunting season was also under consideration to include January. An estimated 2000 additional birds maybe harvested by extending the season.

Kuijken queried the assumption that 50% of mortality was caused by hunting?

Johnson responded saying that the weight of evidence indicates that the hunting mortality is additive, although it was not certain that the 50% was still a valid proportion. The survival rate is a critical assumption. This was determined from data in a period where there was hunting but not at the same harvest levels as now, which are higher.

Kuijken also asked about the vulnerability of young, when hunted, in comparison to adults?

Johnson responded that based on a paper by *Madsen* vulnerability of juveniles was treated as constant, with juveniles twice as vulnerable as adults, adding this matched other species.

Madsen added that the knowledge of survival rates will be improved over the coming years with continuous monitoring and the models can then be adjusted accordingly.

Johnson went on to say that through the process of adaptive management and monitoring, learning is gained helping to determine which are the better predictive models.

Crippling of birds

Madsen opened a brief discussion about crippling (the wounding of birds) stating there was a need to gain agreement between Denmark and Norway to reduce crippling rates. *Madsen* emphasised that this was a shared problem between the two countries and there was a need to set a desirable and feasible international target.

Kuijken questioned how crippling was observed in the field?

Madsen replied that it was difficult to do but there had been a monitoring of programme in Denmark whereby captured birds were x-rayed. This gave an indication of crippling rates but was unable to account for birds that didn't survive. *Madsen* added that the Danish hunting legislation required hunters to take a retrieval dog, which seems to have helped reduce lost birds due to crippling. *Madsen* also stated there was a need to take account of crippling rates as part of hunting bags and this was for future consideration.

Espelien commented that ways to reduce crippling are part of hunter training in Norway and they (Environment Agency) could look at the possibilities of a crippling rate awareness and education and campaign in Norway.

Niels Henrik Simonsen said that a crippling rate campaign in 2002 in Denmark had been effective and it was a standard part of Danish hunter education.

Tombre suggested it would be useful to have a similar crippling awareness campaign in Norway, with collaborations between the Danish and Norwegian hunting associations.

Reporting of annual harvest bag

Sørensen & *Espelien* led a short discussion about the reporting of annual hunting bags within Denmark and Norway.

Espelien stated that annual harvest bag reports were normally provided in late summer by the central bureau of statistics but for the SPfG there was a commitment to provide these in May, as required by the ISMP. This did raise a slight concern that the data would not be 100% complete as Norwegian hunters had up until the 1st May to report individual hunting bags.

Sørensen added it was a similar situation in Denmark as Danish hunters were obligated to report by the 31st March.

Madsen remarked the situation was also complicated by a switch to on-line reporting in Denmark and there had been a decline in the reporting of hunting bags. There had been discussions about linking the reporting of hunting bags to the renewal of annual hunting licences. This was currently in April but may be altered to September. In addition, there was also a need to validate hunter skills in species recognition to ensure accurate reporting of species harvest bags.

Sørensen & Espelien recognized there were some potential issues but the relevant national authorities would try to address these and improve harvest bag reporting as part of on-going discussion with the national hunting organizations.

Johnson commented that biased report was a potential issue for the AHM models, so any biases needed to be known to correct or account for them.

Madsen noted that a key step forward was Norway's and Denmark's commitment to provide reliable harvest bag data in May as required for the AHM annual cycle.

Sharing an annual harvest bag

Sørensen led an update about discussions held between Denmark and Norway on how any international harvest bag quota could be divided between the two countries. *Sørensen* stated any agreement would only come in to effect if there was a need to reduce the annual harvest bag, instigated at the request of the IWG. Then the relevant agencies within Denmark and Norway would take the suggested annual harvest quota and use a simple ratio to determine the share for each country. The ratio would be calculated based on the average harvest bags for each country over the preceding 3 year period. The ratio would only be calculated when needed. This proposal would be formalised after further discussions with the Danish and Norwegian hunting organizations.

Alternative Management Actions

Tombre gave a short presentation and led a discussion about alternative management actions. *Tombre* stated that ISMP was more than just regulating the population by hunting. It also focused on alternative management actions, particularly in relation to:

1. 'Grubbing' in Svalbard and the monitoring of arctic habitat degradation.
2. Managing goose conflicts with agricultural interests.
3. Habitat restoration projects.

Tombre noted that there are different issues to be faced along the SPfG flyway which, potentially, need different management solutions and initiatives.

Alternative Management Discussions

Grubbing in Svalbard

Tombre commented that recent research indicated that there had been an increase in 'grubbing' in the last 5 years. The implications and full extent could not be established at present. What was needed was continued monitoring and observation, and the development of an Arctic tundra action plan.

Espelien added that the affected SPfG breeding areas in Svalbard were important habitats for other species and biodiversity. *Espelien* agreed continued monitoring was needed.

Dereliev asked why grubbing was an issue now?

Madsen responded stating it seemed to be an issue now because of the continued increase in the SPfG population size, as well as a possible link to warmer springs in Svalbard. The planned monitoring in Svalbard, to be carried out in the summer of 2013, would set a base line and help evaluate the situation.

Managing goose conflicts with agricultural interests

Tombre stated that there was a subsidy scheme (supported by the Norwegian Agricultural Authority) available for farmers in two key regions in Norway, Vesterålen and Nord-Trøndelag, where crop damage by geese (pink-footed and barnacle geese) is an issue. *Tombre* noted that a recent published paper highlighted the benefits of the subsidy scheme and concluded that it was important that the scheme continued to keep goose conflicts with agriculture at a low level. Please see: [Tombre, I. M. Eythórsson, E. & Madsen, J. 2013.](#)

Pål Krister Langlid agreed that subsidy schemes were important to reduce goose conflicts with agricultural interests. However, many farmers do not get subsidies as they are outside the priority areas designated for the subsidy schemes.

Paul Harald Pedersen added that on top of the actual loss of crops there were other associated costs such as the cost of bring in additional feed.

Dereliev commented that goose grazing may not have significant impact on certain winter crops e.g. winter wheat yields, as recent studies concerning the Red-breasted Goose in Bulgaria showed no impact.

Tombre stated a recent study confirmed that goose grazing does lead to notable reductions in biomass yields of dairy grasslands in Central Norway but the damage experienced by farmers does vary, not necessarily following a linear relationship with goose densities. Please see: [Bjerke, A. W., Bergjord, A.K., Tombre, I. M. & Madsen, J. 2013.](#) This makes effective distribution of subsidies difficult. It was accepted that crop damage caused by geese is an additional pressure for farmers in marginal areas but two key questions remained: 1) how best to monitor the extent of damages on agricultural fields, both national and internationally; 2) is there a relationship between the extent of crop damages and total goose population sizes?

Tombre and Madsen concluded that continued monitoring of subsidy schemes, along with measures for goose related conflicts and crop damage are need throughout the flyway.

Habitat restoration projects

Madsen gave a brief update on a wetland restoration project at Filsø, in western Denmark. Here a private reserve had been created and the management wanted to encourage geese and deer by providing feed. *Madsen* stated the intention was to draw wildlife away from vulnerable cultivated fields in the vicinity; however the likely impact of this was uncertain.

Madsen also noted that grassland restoration projects in Belgium were important part of the ISMP, providing a safe winter haven for geese. However, more research was needed to understand the importance of Belgian sites when adverse winter conditions were experienced in other parts of the flyway.

Kuijken commented that the restoration of grasslands in Belgium was intended to attract geese back to traditional grasslands away from maize, potatoes as well as winter crops helping to reduce agricultural conflicts. Nevertheless, development and intensification of modern agriculture was still considered a threat transforming grasslands into fields.

Tombre concluded that although there was funding for some projects there was still a need to seek further sources of funding for monitoring and conflict mitigation measures, related to crop damage and habitat restoration.

Summing-up, Agreements and Further Actions

Dereliev outlined the key requirements needing to be agreed to implement an adaptive harvest management strategy as part of the ISMP for the Svalbard pink-footed goose. *Dereliev* called for agreement on the following:

1. A three year regulatory harvest management cycle starting in 2013, with a review of the strategy in 2016.
2. An annual assessment of the pink-footed goose population status, along with population model predictions and evaluations.
3. Harvest bags to be provided annually in May by Denmark and Norway.
4. The continued monitoring of the population, with a commitment to conduct an annual population count in May.
5. Provision for emergency management actions, if the annual review indicated a dramatic decline in the population.

Decision: These requirements were accepted by the IWG. It was also agreed that the responsible authorities in Denmark and Norway would collaborate and take immediate action to administratively close a hunting season, for a period of one year if recommended by the IWG. Any closure would be successively reviewed as part of the annual assessment for the Adaptive Harvest Management of the population.

Dereliev briefly summarized a number of other general points raised during the day and further actions required as part of implementing the ISMP.

1. **Harvest bag sharing:** Although an outline proposal had been prepared between Denmark and Norway as how to divide a possible restricted harvest bag it was agreed that this should be formalized in a publically available document.
Action: Document to be written and agreed between the relevant agencies in Denmark and Norway. It would then to be made publically available and communicated through the IWG.
2. **Crippling rate actions:** Crippling was recognised as an issue and there was general agreement that it needed continued attention. It was proposed that it would be beneficial to set and gain agreement between Denmark and Norway on an acceptable level of crippling.
Action: Coordination Unit is to work with the relevant Danish and Norwegian agencies to prepare a proposal document for consultation within the IWG and then public release.
3. **Arctic tundra action plan:** In addition to regular monitoring it was recommended that an action plan should be prepared to outline the implications of arctic tundra degradation and possible mitigation measures.
Action: Coordination Unit is to work with the appropriate scientific institutions and relevant Norwegian agencies to develop an Arctic Tundra Action Plan.
4. **Monitoring conflicts and crop damage:** Reducing pink-footed goose related agricultural conflicts was a key ISMP objective. It was agreed there was a need to develop ways to gauge the extent of conflicts and crop damage throughout the flyway.
Action: Coordination Unit to prepare a monitoring protocol document in consultation with the IWG to aid the collection and consolidation of data.
5. **Maintaining suitable habitats:** It was agreed that any restoration, protection or development actions, undertaken within the range states, that impacted suitable pink-footed geese habitats would be reported to the IWG as part of national reporting, see below.
Action: Range state delegations to report through their National Focal Points as part of national reporting to the IWG.
6. **National reporting:** A suggested format for national reporting had been proposed but this was considered onerous on an annual basis. It was agreed the report should capture information related to the objectives of the ISMP and it was suggested that it should coincide with the 3 year cycle for reviewing the Adaptive Harvest Management strategy.
Action: Coordination Unit is to produce a revised reporting template and to investigate the possibilities for this to be completed as an online report using the planned SPfG IWG website.
7. **IWG communications:** It was agreed that the IWG should communicate as a single collective voice. It was agreed that the Coordination Unit prepare any IWG communications, for distribution to the group for agreement before being made publically available on the planned AEWA IWG website for the SPfG.
Action: The Coordination unit was tasked with preparing a general statement about the meeting which would be sent to the IWG for approval and public release. The Coordination Unit, in conjunction with and assistance from the AEWA Secretariat, is to develop and launch the SPfG IWG website under the AEWA umbrella.
8. **Next meeting:** No date was set for the next meeting or whether this would be a face-to-face or virtual meeting. It was agreed a face-to-face would be preferable and the next meeting was expected to take place sometime in the autumn of 2014.
Action: Coordination Unit is to setup the next IWG meeting as necessary and to advise the national delegations once a date and location is determined.

Dereliev concluded the meeting by thanking all the delegations and participants for a very constructive and positive meeting, covering a great deal of material in such a short space of time. *Dereliev* thanked the Chair, Øystein Størkensen for ensuring the meeting ran smoothly and that the key decisions needing agreement were taken successfully. *Dereliev* thanked the Coordination Unit for preparing the meeting documents, Dr. Fred Johnson for his work on the population modelling, Ingunn Tombre for the presentation on alternative management actions and the Danish Nature Agency for kindly hosting the meeting.

Abbreviations

- AHM = Adaptive Harvest Management;
- AEWA: African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement
- ISMP = International Species Management Plan;
- IWG = International Working Group;
- SPfG = Svalbard Pink-footed Goose
- SPAs = Special Protected Areas

Participants

Norwegian delegation	Belgian delegation
Øystein Størkersen , National Focal Point, Environment Agency, Ministry of Environment.	Sarah Roggeman , National Focal Point, Government of Flanders, Agency for Nature and Forests.
Arild Espelien , National Expert, Environment Agency, Ministry of Environment.	Eckhart Kuijken , National Expert.
Ingunn Tombre , National Expert, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA).	Christine Verscheure , Delegate, Natuurpunt (Birdlife International partner)
Paul Harald Pedersen , Delegate, Official of the County of Nord-Trøndelag, Coordinator National Working Group.	
Pål Krister Langlid , Delegate, Advisor to Nord-Trøndelag Norwegian Farmers' Union (Bondelag).	
Danish delegation	International delegates
Henrik Lykke Sørensen , National Focal Point, Danish Nature Agency, Ministry of Environment.	Sergey Dereliev , African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), UNEP/AEWA Secretariat.
Jesper Madsen , National Expert & Lead Coordinator, Aarhus University / AEWA SPfG IWG Coordination Unit.	Fred A. Johnson , International Expert, Southeast Ecological Science Centre, U.S. Geological Survey.
Erling Krabbe , Delegate, Danish Nature Agency, Ministry of Environment.	Cy Griffin , Observer, Federation of Associations for Hunting & Conservation of the EU [FACE].
Marco Brodde , Delegate, Danish Ornithological Society.	Mikko Alhainen , Observer Finnish Wildlife Agency.
Niels Henrik Simonsen , Delegate, Danish Hunters' Association.	Arto Marjakangas , Observer Finnish Wildlife Agency.
Niels Erik Jørgensen , Delegate, Danish Hunters' Association.	Gitte Høj Jensen , Observer, Aarhus University.
	James H. Williams , Coordinator, Aarhus University / AEWA SPfG IWG Coordination Unit.
Dutch delegation	
Unable to attend	