



*AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF
AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS (AEWA)*

**REPORT OF THE 1st MEETING OF THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE
MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP¹²**
14 – 16 December 2016, Kristianstad, Sweden

Hosted by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency



SWEDISH ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY

¹ Meeting documents are available on the AEWA website:

<http://www.unep-aewa.org/en/meeting/1st-meeting-aewa-european-goose-management-international-working-group>

² Report finalised after a process of consultation with the AEWA EGM IWG1 participants.

EGM IWG1 – Decisions and Actions

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
Agenda item 2.	Election of the Chair of EGM IWG1	Belgium was elected unanimously as Chair of the EGM IWG1.	
Agenda item 3.	Adoption of Agenda	The agenda (document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.2 Rev.1) was adopted with no comments.	
Agenda item 4.	Admission of Observers	The Meeting agreed to admit the observers present at the meeting.	
Agenda item 6.	Adoption of the European Goose Management Platform International Working Group (EGM IWG) Modus Operandi	The Modus Operandi was revised according to amendments requested and agreed on during the meeting and subsequently adopted. The final Modus Operandi is attached to this report in Appendix 1.	A short guidance document on the composition, role and responsibilities of national delegations in the international context and how to transpose those into the national process would be useful and could be considered for the next meeting of the EGM IWG.
Agenda item 7.	European Goose Management Budget 2016-2017		Range States to the EGMP will continue their efforts to provide funds to the budget of the Platform on the basis of voluntary contributions, in order to close the remaining budget gaps for 2017 and 2018.
Agenda item 9.	Taiga Bean Goose Session		
	<i>Structure of the Annual Iterative Phase of the Adaptive Harvest Management Process and Harvest Quota Division between Range States</i>	The EGM IWG adopted the proposed structure for the TBG Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) annual cycle, which is subject to further adjustments in forthcoming meetings, as necessary.	The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat will produce a costed project concept looking into national legislation systems, 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, and communicate this project concept to the IWG.

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
		The EGM IWG adopted the proposed harvest quota division between the relevant range states in each MU, which is subject to possible adjustment in future.	
	<i>Adaptive Harvest Management Programme (predictive models and management alternatives)</i>	The EGM IWG adopted document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.8 containing initial elements of an Adaptive Harvest Management programme for Taiga Bean Geese developed on the basis of predictive models.	
		<p>1) The EGM IWG adopted the continuation of the closed hunting season for the Western and closure of hunting for the Eastern 1 & 2 MUs until such time as further management alternatives could be possibly outlined for consideration on the basis of strengthened datasets.</p> <p>2) For the Central MU, the EGM IWG decided to defer the decision on one of the management alternatives until the next EGM IWG Meeting in June 2017, subject to the availability of a better information basis following the mid-January counts.</p>	
	<i>Monitoring Programme</i>	The EGM IWG adopted the outline of the proposed monitoring programme and committed to supporting, to the extent possible, its further development and effective implementation financially and by other means.	
	<i>Reducing Taiga Bean Goose Crippling</i>		Efforts would be made to look into crippling of TBG and using the example of the Danish campaign in the case of the PfG.

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
<p><i>Raising Identification Skills and Awareness Amongst Hunters</i></p>		<p>1) The Secretariat would produce a costed project concept for the development of a coherent communication strategy with external communicators and will share this with the IWG;</p> <p>2) In the meantime, Professor Madsen would approach the Communications Officer at Aarhus University to prepare an information document to inform stakeholders of the concept behind the EGMP;</p> <p>3) Regarding the development of identification skills amongst hunters, it was agreed that national hunting associations in the Range States should be approached by the national representatives in the IWG with regard to training programmes while cooperation with BirdLife partners and other conservation NGOs should be encouraged;</p> <p>4) Information materials regarding the identification of different species would be coordinated by the EGMP Coordinator and disseminated on the EGMP website and amongst relevant national stakeholders by the IWG members.</p>
<p><i>Developing an International Framework for Resolving Agricultural Conflicts Which Include the Taiga Bean Goose</i></p>		<p>1) A Task Force would be established with the aim of developing an international interdisciplinary cooperation framework for dealing with agricultural conflicts caused by geese. The Secretariat would convene this by correspondence in January 2017, inviting the IWG designated representatives and relevant observers to appoint representatives;</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			2) Standardised national statistics on goose damage assessment (i.e. the costs of each goose species to each crop type) should be placed in a shared repository through annual data submission to EGMP Data Centre to the best ability of each range state.
	<i>Development of Work Plan for Other Actions than those related to Adaptive Harvest Management</i>		All Range States would provide for the implementation of the actions they prioritised (See Appendices 2 and 3). During the next IWG meeting in June 2017, it would be discussed how to report on their implementation.
Agenda item 12.	Election of the Chair for the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group	Norway was elected unanimously as Chair for the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group.	

Agenda item 1. Opening

1. On behalf of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, AEWA Technical Officer, Mr Sergey Dereliev welcomed the delegates to the meeting. He thanked the Swedish Environmental Agency (SEPA) for hosting the meeting and providing exceptionally good facilities.

2. Introducing the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), he explained that its purpose was to serve as the main coordinating and decision-making body of the AEWA European Goose Management Platform (EGMP). He noted that the current meeting was a historical event whereby it marked the transition from the pilot single species management approach towards a multi-species one. Despite a certain amount of scepticism, the constructive approach of the many dedicated stakeholders boded well for the establishment of a well-functioning platform.

3. The EGMP, would almost certainly lead to the need of a significant change and adaptation of management systems of some Range States and those countries were requested to embrace necessary changes and to commit to implementing them. The EGMP process ultimately has the potential to bring a new approach to the management of, not only geese and other migratory waterbirds, but all migratory bird taxa in Europe. In this light, he declared the meeting open and wished the delegates an enjoyable time in Kristianstad.

4. On behalf of the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Mr David Schönberg Alm warmly welcomed everyone to the meeting. He was very pleased to be able to have this opportunity to meet all the stakeholders and was looking forward to a fruitful meeting. He thanked the meeting organisers at SEPA and the Secretariat for taking care of all the preparations.

Agenda item 2. Election of the Chair of EGM IWG1

5. Mr Dereliev introduced this agenda item, explaining that preliminary consultations had taken place with Belgium, the current Chair of the AEWA Pink-footed Goose International Working Group (PfG IWG), which was elected at the close of the last PfG IWG, but never had the opportunity to chair a meeting of this IWG due to its transition to the EGMP. Belgium had agreed to chair the current meeting and was therefore proposed for the role of Chair by the Secretariat. Since there were no further proposals from the floor, Belgium was elected unanimously as Chair of the 1st meeting of the EGM IWG (EGM IWG1).

6. On behalf of Belgium, Mr Michiel Vandegehuchte thanked the Meeting for being given this opportunity to chair; he had been involved in the PfG process since 2014 and had seen the mutual trust and understanding between the range states grow and the progress made in the international management of this population of the PfG and looked forward to a fruitful meeting.

Decision: Belgium was elected unanimously as Chair of the EGM IWG1.

Agenda item 3. Adoption of Agenda

Decision: The agenda (document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.2 Rev.1) was adopted with no comments.

Agenda item 4. Admission of Observers

7. The Chair explained that the issue of permanent observers to the EGM IWG would be dealt with in the context of the EMP IWG Modus Operandi later in the agenda. He noted that it was useful to have observers from different stakeholders at the current meeting and thanked those present for attending. There were no objections, thus the observers (see Appendix 4, document AEWA/EGM IWG Inf. 1.7 Rev. 2 *Provisional List of Participants*) were welcomed to the meeting.

Decision: The Meeting agreed to admit the observers present at the meeting.

Agenda item 5. Introduction to the European Goose Management Platform (EGMP)

8. Mr Dereliev went on to introduce the multispecies [European Goose Management Platform](#), which had been established according to the mandate of MOP6 through [Resolution 6.4](#). The kick-off Meeting took place in Paris in May 2016, the outcome of which was a [Declaration](#), addressing the way forward for managing and ensuring the sustainable use of six populations of four goose species. Four Range States had not yet confirmed their participation in the EGMP: The Russian Federation, Poland, Ireland and Spain. Dereliev asked countries to use their contacts and reach out to these countries and provide them with any information they may need in order to facilitate their decision-making processes. Greenland had decided to opt out for the time being because of the limited relevance of the current taxonomic coverage by the EGMP.

Agenda item 6. Adoption of the European Goose Management Platform International Working Group (EGM IWG) Modus Operandi

9. AEWA Associate Programme Officer, Ms Nina Mikander introduced document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.3 *Draft Modus Operandi for the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group*, which had been compiled by the Secretariat, explaining that a clear framework was needed to guide the work of the EGM IWG. The Chair proceeded to go through the Modus Operandi rules one by one and requested the country delegations to present their suggestions for amendments.

Decision: The Modus Operandi was revised according to amendments requested and agreed on during the meeting and subsequently adopted. The final Modus Operandi is attached to this report in Appendix 1.

Action: A short guidance document on the composition, role and responsibilities of national delegations in the international context and how to transpose those into the national process would be useful and could be considered for the next meeting of the EGM IWG.

Agenda item 7: European Goose Management Budget 2016-2017

10. Mr Dereliev introduced this agenda item, explaining that the Secretariat managed the funding for the EGMP. The overall estimated annual budget amounted to 466,000 EUR. It was hoped to be able to bring the figures down in time; it would be easier to estimate the average annual costs after at least one full cycle.

11. He presented a table with an overview of the pledged funds to date. Six countries had already provided funding amounting to 295,000 EUR for 2016. After deduction of the cost of the current meeting, amounting to ca. 4,500 EUR, the balance came to 290,500 EUR. The deficit for 2017 amounted to 120,500 EUR. The next EGM IWG meeting was scheduled for mid-June 2017. The delayed recruitment of the two foreseen staff

members (probably mid-2017), based at the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat represented a certain saving, however the funding gap needed to be bridged in order to be able to deliver against the Action Plans of the Pink-footed Goose and the Taiga Bean Goose. Once the deficit had been accrued, the management plans for the Barnacle Goose and the Greylag Goose could be rolled out.

12. The Chair reiterated that sufficient funding was crucial for the data and models to run if the platform was to operate as planned. He appealed to the countries to consider how to fill the funding gap for next year. The Netherlands confirmed that it would continue providing 30,000 EUR per year.

13. Answering a question from Norway, if a scale of contribution, e.g. 25,000 EUR per participating country had been considered, Mr Dereliev reported that it was premature for countries to commit to a scale and that it had been decided at the meeting in Paris in May 2016 to provide funding on a voluntary basis until 2018. A discussion on this issue could be opened again at the next meeting in order to formulate an agreed option from 2019 onwards. This suggestion was seconded by the Chair.

14. Finland confirmed its commitment to the platform and the IWG and that an additional contribution was foreseen for 2017, however, no concrete pledge could be made as yet. Sweden also confirmed that although no commitment could be made as yet, efforts were being made to secure further funds for 2017.

15. France also confirmed that efforts were being made to secure funds for 2017 and that France was keen to start the process for the Greylag Goose, regardless of the status of funding for the EGMP running costs.

16. The Chair thanked all the countries which had already provided funds as well as the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland and France for planning to commit further funds and confirmed that Belgium was also working on additional funding for 2017.

17. Mr Dereliev also thanked the countries for making an effort to get additional funding. He asked them to communicate with the Secretariat as soon as they could in early 2017 with regard to the relevant administrative procedures. Replying to a question on whether the EU had been approached with regard to funding, Mr Dereliev confirmed that this had been briefly discussed, however the EU was not in a position to provide funds to MEAs in the same way as countries. He hoped that the EU would be able to join the next meeting and inform on funding possibilities.

18. Replying to a question by France on the progress of the accession of Poland to the Agreement, Mr Dereliev reported that the Secretariat was making every effort and would continue working with Poland. Both Poland and the Russian Federation were non-Party Range States to AEWA.

19. Representing Wetlands international, Mr Szabolcs Nagy briefly reported that as requested by AEWA Resolution 6.3, a monitoring fund had been established within Wetlands international. The key activities were to support the monitoring of waterbird populations, key sites and activities and decision-making for waterbird conservation. A website was already being set up. Monitoring activities would not be possible without the national programmes. In this context, Mr Nagy honoured Dr Leif Nilsson from Lund University for his long years of dedication in coordinating the monitoring scheme in Sweden.

20. The Chair also thanked Mr Nilsson for his absolute commitment and stressed the necessity of so many dedicated people involved in monitoring activities.

Action: Range States to the EGMP will continue their efforts to provide funds to the budget of the Platform on the basis of voluntary contributions, in order to close the remaining budget gaps for 2017 and 2018.

Agenda item 8. Pink-footed Goose (PfG) Session

Update from the PfG International Species Management Plan (ISMP) Coordination Unit

21. Representing the Coordination Unit for the Pink-footed Goose, Professor Jesper Madsen presented the main activities in 2016. The transition of the ISMP to the EGMP had been lengthy. The PfG process had been presented at various meetings and scientific environments. He stressed that it was important that the work was made available to the academic environment in peer-reviewed journals.

Mr Dereliev reported that in the context of the transition of the PfG coordination from Aarhus University to the EGMP, it had been agreed that the Secretariat take over the overall coordination work and that the scientific assessment will remain with Aarhus University in their capacity of Data Centre for the Platform. He expressed his thanks for the very professional and dedicated work of the Aarhus team in running the PfG coordination unit, which was reiterated by the Chair, speaking on behalf of Belgium.

Population Status Update

22. Professor Madsen expressed his thanks to the fantastic network of people contributing to the population status update. There had been a drop in the population in 2015 and it had been necessary to propose to the Range States that they stop hunting. Further evidence however, had shown this to be an underestimate and a change in migration patterns had been observed which explained why some of the birds had not been counted. More reliable ways of estimating population size were being looked into (based on capture-mark-recapture procedures), which requires statistical assessment. Work would continue with counts available, with the aim of attaining best estimates. The projection for 2016 was that it had been a good breeding season (reported on <http://pinkfootedgoose.aewa.info>).

Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM)

23. Dr Fred Johnson from the U.S. Geological Survey, presented this item explaining that AHM was about monitoring and learning to make better decisions in the future. Decision science was applied to give a more analytical structure to the problem with the aim of trying to manage geese populations and reducing conflicts with humans. Adaptive Harvest Management was based on a transparent and rigorous decision-making process, enabling harvest decisions that matched the abundance of the relevant population. Forecasts for the 2017 hunting season have been produced (reported on <http://pinkfootedgoose.aewa.info>).

Range State Updates

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

Organising Goose Hunting and Management Through Voluntary Agreements

25. Professor Madsen and Dr Ingunn Tombre reported that much goose hunting took place on private property. Experiments were set up and designed in a dialogue between hunters and scientists in Norway and Denmark in order to optimise hunting practices, including advanced modelling to simulate effects of various types of hunting regulations, land use changes and interactions between different goose species on goose distribution and harvest. The results had been disseminated in scientific articles, magazines and at user conferences and the recommendations had been implemented in hunting practices by local hunting groups in both countries.

26. As a result, there were fewer hunting days in organised areas and thus less disturbance for the goose flocks, also more experienced hunters were attracted, leading to less crippling.

The Chair agreed that this was something that could be taken further, building on what was already in place with regard to improving hunting practices on a voluntary basis. All the relevant papers could be found on the PfG IWG website (<http://pinkfootedgoose.aewa.info>). He went on to stress that communication, understanding and building trust was very important to achieve progress in the field with different stakeholders.

Pink-footed Goose Crippling Rate

27. Professor Madsen reported that observations had shown that the crippling rate was going down, it had remained at around 20% during the last decade and was dropping. Taking into account the observed increase in harvest rate in the population, this represented a five-fold improvement since 1995. At the last PfG IWG meeting in Ghent in 2015, it had been agreed that there should be continued focus on efforts by relevant organisations to promote good hunting practices to maintain the decreasing trend in crippling. Since 1990, large numbers of geese had been caught and x-rayed for pellets, in order to determine a proportion of crippled birds. A Danish awareness-raising campaign had been established to reduce crippling, which had led to a good response.

28. Representing the Norwegian Farmers' Union, Mr Ove Martin Gundersen reported about a course on the theory of shooting practice and hunting training at a range using clay pigeons, with the goal of reducing crippling.

On behalf of the Danish Hunters' Association, Iben Hove Sørensen reported of a similar Danish campaign to improve goose hunting practices with the goal of minimising crippling in geese. Courses had been organised from 2013 to 2015 and would be continued. Guidance had also been produced for hunters with regard to goose hunting. X-raying of geese would be continued in 2017.

Update on Monitoring and Minimising Agricultural Conflicts and Tundra Degradation Monitoring

29. Representing Norway, Ms Ingunn Tombre described a subsidy scheme, which related to some of the actions in the Pink-footed Goose International Species Management Plan (PfG ISMP). There had been some intense conflicts with geese directly competing with livestock in the fields. In 2006, a subsidy scheme had been established, covering two counties in Norway with 557,000 € available in 2016. Payments were not for the purpose of compensation but to provide refuge areas for geese.

30. Conflict had been highest with farmers who had grass fields. A new system (costing an extra 1 million NOK/110,000 €) is being tested in 2017 with new grass types as refuge for the birds before they go to Svalbard. Farmers with grass fields near goose roosting sites, often representing bird protection reserves, and certain grazing animals were eligible for compensation.

31. There is a slow rate of recovery from disturbance of tundra on Svalbard. Grubbing is particularly widespread in breeding colonies, sometimes resulting in huge vegetation free craters. All relevant papers are available on the PfG IWG website (<http://pinkfootedgoose.aewa.info/publications>).

Cost-benefit Analysis for the PfG Management Process

32. Representing the PfG ISMP Coordination Unit, Mr James Henty Williams presented document AEWA/EGM IWG1.6 *Evaluating the AEWA Svalbard Pink-footed Goose International Species Management Plan: Costs, benefits and preferences of stakeholders* which outlined the first cost-benefit analysis (CBA) of the ISMP to assess if anticipated gains outweighed the costs of implementation.

33. The CBA indicated that the ISMP had the potential to deliver considerable net benefit in avoided crop damage payments in comparison to the operational costs of running the ISMP annual management cycle. Additional, preference analysis showed that environmental outcomes were valued most across all stakeholder groups, while economic and social outcomes were given an almost equal lower priority. This mixed analysis demonstrated that the ISMP could deliver outcomes that are highly valued by stakeholders, realising a broader range of benefits would not have been addressed effectively had it not been for the ISMP process.

34. The Chair thanked Mr Williams for his enthusiastic and comprehensive presentation, which showed that the PfG ISMP could deliver and give value for money.

Involvement of Sweden and Finland in the Implementation of the PfG ISMP

35. Professor Madsen referred to a new trend in PfG migration routes, which included Sweden and Finland and had been confirmed by Finland as being far more widespread than expected. This could be due to increasing competition for resources on the traditional spring migration route, causing the geese to look for alternatives.

36. Mr Dereliev reported that the Secretariat had been in communication with Finland and Sweden in advance of the meeting and both Finland and Sweden went on to re-confirm their willingness to continue as observers to the process for the time being. Finland was willing to participate in PfG monitoring. Sweden would like to increase monitoring efforts but was not able to make a commitment. Goose counting in Sweden was mainly for Taiga Bean Geese, however the PfG in the flocks could not be separately counted; more work was needed on the ground in these areas.

37. The Chair confirmed that this would be a challenge and would need to be dealt with on the national level. He went on to thank the presenters for their excellent presentations and particularly the PfG ISMP Coordination Unit, based at Aarhus University, which would cease to exist after the Meeting. The implementation of the PfG ISMP had been running for four years and the Range States were truly involved in the process with interesting ongoing national and international projects on various aspects. It was very valuable to be able to share this experience with the EGM IWG and not to lose the momentum and stimulating interactions.

Agenda item 9. Taiga Bean Goose (TBG) Session

Summary of the Taiga Bean Goose International Single Species Action Plan

38. Mr Dereliev presented document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.7 *The implementation of the AEWA International Single Species Action Plan for the Taiga Bean Goose (TBG ISSAP) action framework*. The TBG ISSAP had been initiated in 2013 by Finland, which hosted the action-planning workshop attended by most of the relevant range states and experts. The ISSAP had been approved by MOP6 in November 2015 and had been kindly printed by the Finnish Government. The geographic scope was large and the goal ambitious. The favourable conservation status amounted to 165,000 - 190,000 geese.

39. A work plan for each Range State would be created to take the action framework to a new level and to make it more detailed for the next two years, specifying timescales, deadlines and responsibilities for national-level planning. The implementation of Adaptive Harvest Management was an essential development and one that required implementation at international level. Other Identification skills of hunters needed to be improved and awareness raised amongst hunters on the need to reduce crippling; this is another set of actions that would benefit from an internationally coordinated approach. The development and implementation of an international framework for resolving agricultural conflict was also crucial.

40. The precondition for the credibility and impact of the actions to be implemented under the framework of the ISSAP and the subsequent adaptive harvest management process was the involvement and commitment of all stakeholders involving administrations at all relevant levels and farming, hunting and conservation NGOs. The involvement of Poland and the Russian Federation, which had not yet joined the EGMP was crucial, in order to achieve the objectives of this plan.

Outline of the Proposed Adaptive Harvest Management Programme for the Taiga Bean Goose

41. Also referring to document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.7, Mr Mikko Alhainen, one of the compilers of the TBG ISSAP outlined the Adaptive Harvest Management Programme for the Taiga Bean Goose, the set-up of which would be decided by the stakeholders, whose involvement was very important so that the international process for all four TBG Management Units would be ready to start in 2017. The PfG ISMP had established a structured

annual cycle for data collection, AHM assessment and decisions for international harvest quota. For reasons of cohesion and coordination between the management of different goose species and populations, it was recommended that the TGB AHM process followed the established structure of the PfG AHM process as far as possible and both processes be adjusted where necessary. The definition of the TGB Management Units and the set-up and iterative phases are described in document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.9.

Sustainable Harvest Assessment

42. Dr Johnson presented document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.8, on the development of an Adaptive Harvest Management Programme for Taiga Bean Geese, explaining this was very preliminary due to the fact that much less data was available for the TGB than for the Pink-footed Goose. Appropriate harvest levels for first rebuilding the population of the Central Management Unit and then maintaining it near the goal specified in the TGB ISSAP were determined as well as time estimates for rebuilding the depleted populations in the Western and Eastern Management Units under ideal conditions. In order to reduce population uncertainty, the minimum information necessary would be the total population size and the level of harvest; information on productivity and survival rates would enable more reliable estimates. More information on the level of misidentification of Taiga versus Tundra Bean Geese in the field was also needed.

Setting up the Adaptive Harvest Management Programme

Management Units and Population Targets for the Taiga Bean Goose

43. Referring to document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.9, Mr Alhainen and Professor Fox presented the setting up of the AHM programme and the population targets for the Management Units (MUs).

44. Professor Fox explained the rationale behind the MUs and that due to increased knowledge, it could be determined that populations were sufficiently discreet to be able to manage on the basis of separate units; the **Western sub-population, Central sub-population, Eastern 1 sub-population and Eastern 2 sub-population**. There were different targets for each MU, however many uncertainties remained and there was a long way to go to get a good understanding of numbers and distribution.

45. The long-term population targets in each of the MUs, as adopted by the Meeting of the Parties through the ISSAP, were as follows:

Western MU: 5,000 – 10,000 birds

Central MU: 60,000 – 80,000 birds

Eastern 1&2 MUs: 100,000 birds

46. A robust assessment of populations over time was necessary. Basic monitoring by way of an annual census of total numbers was needed. Mid-winter would probably be the best time for the annual census because the populations tended to be concentrated, although spring would be optimal. It was difficult to distinguish the age of birds; thus the annual estimate of young geese was best done in mid-autumn.

47. The Chair summarised that a framework needed to be decided on first. It was clear that in the case of the TGB work would be based on distinct MUs and that harvest would only pertain to the Central MU. The population targets had been fixed in the ISSAP adopted by MOP6.

Structure of the Annual Iterative Phase of the Adaptive Harvest Management Process and Harvest Quota Division between Range States

48. Answering an enquiry from Denmark if the model would allow for a longer timeframe in order to be able to deal with the administrative issues involved with annual adjustments of hunting seasons, Mr Alhainen

replied that although it was a burden for administrations to make annual decisions, an annual cycle was better in order to be able to react to changes in population size in time.

49. Sweden noted that substantial changes in Swedish hunting law would be a political issue, which could not be solved here.

50. Mr Dereliev clarified the implications of failure to roll out the Adaptive Harvest Management, i.e. if there was no implementation as of 2017, the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat would send out a letter to the relevant range state governments informing them that they would have to close down hunting seasons until AHP had been adopted. This was a provision of the treaty. He acknowledged that Sweden faced administrative issues not suited for AHM and proposed a small project to look into the legislation systems in the countries with the purpose of identifying the status quo and producing recommendations for each country individually for aligning legislations and allowing the national administrations to regulate on an annual basis.

51. Finland was already in the process of revising its hunting legislation and could serve as an example. This would best be done from a central level coordinated by the Secretariat with the involvement of the Data Centre, while working with a lawyer to approach all the administrations in the countries. The Secretariat would produce a project concept, identify the budget necessary and communicate this to the IWG.

52. Sweden stressed that it was not opposing the proposed decisions and the intention was to implement the TBG ISSAP, however national consultation was necessary before commitments could be made.

53. Mr Dereliev explained that adopting the principle of the structure did not mean commitment to each of the points yet.

54. Replying to a point made by Belarus, that spring hunting in Belarus and Russia finished in May, Mr Dereliev noted that this could be evaluated in the framework of the project on national legislation and could be in the recommendations for monitoring to Belarus and Russia.

Decision: The EGM IWG adopted the proposed structure for the TBG Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) annual cycle, which is subject to further adjustments in forthcoming meetings, as necessary.

Action: The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat will produce a costed project concept looking into national legislation systems, 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 and communicate this project concept to the IWG.

55. With regard to the proposed harvest quota division, Mr Nagy commented that instead of linking the quotas to historical takes which could reward countries for overharvesting in the past rather than provide an incentive to invest in the restoration of the population, it might be better to link quotas to the respective contributions made by the Range States to the implementation of the TBG ISSAP

56. Following a short discussion on the harvest quota division between range states, which was based on the data provided in the process of compiling the ISSAP, the IWG adopted the proposed harvest quota, which may warrant adjustment in future due to uncertainties in the currently available harvest data, but also in the light of the suggestion made by Mr Nagy.

Decision: The EGM IWG adopted the proposed harvest quota division between the relevant range states in each MU, which is subject to possible adjustment in future.

Adaptive Harvest Management Programme (predictive models and management alternatives)

57. There being no further questions or comments on the decision of the approach of Adaptive Harvest Management for TBG outlined in document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.8, this was adopted by the IWG.

Decision: The EGM IWG adopted document AEWA/EGM IWG 1.8 containing initial elements of an Adaptive Harvest Management programme for Taiga Bean Geese developed on the basis of predictive models.

58. With regard to the Central MU, Finland wanted to consider one of the options with harvest, as opposed to zero harvest, however preferring to await the results of further monitoring data to confirm that the population had started to increase. Thus, Finland proposed to defer this decision until the next meeting of the IWG in June 2017. This proposal was supported by Sweden.

Decision:

1) The EGM IWG adopted the continuation of the closed hunting season for the Western and closure of hunting for the Eastern 1 & 2 MUs until such time as further management alternatives could be possibly outlined for consideration on the basis of strengthened datasets

2) For the Central MU the EGM IWG decided to defer the decision on one of the management alternatives until the next EGM IWG Meeting in June 2017, subject to the availability of a better information basis following the mid-January counts.

Monitoring Programme

59. Range states reported on various aspects of monitoring in their countries, such as the problems related to separating Taiga and Tundra Bean Geese, which could be done using feather collection and analysis, the submission of smart phone photos and the best timing for counts. Professor Fox informed those present of the availability of telemetry devices, which could be used for TBG monitoring.

60. Because Sweden was careful of making a commitment at this stage, the Secretariat proposed to add 'to the extent possible' to the proposed decision, which could be re-visited in June 2017. This was supported by Denmark.

Decision: The EGM IWG adopted the outline of the proposed monitoring programme and committed to supporting, to the extent possible, its further development and effective implementation financially and by other means.

Reducing Taiga Bean Goose Crippling

61. Professor Madsen presented the issue of TBG crippling, explaining that there had been a serious problem with lead shot in the 1970s. In the framework of a Swedish study, birds which had been caught for marking and x-rayed, had been found to contain high levels of lead-shot. It was stressed that any new catches of Taiga Bean Geese should involve x-rays and that efforts to improve hunters' skills should play an important role. Mr Alhainen stressed the importance of following the example of the Danish campaign to reduce crippling of the PfG, whereby a five-fold improvement had been achieved since the early 1990s.

62. Finland stressed the importance of raising awareness of this problem.

Decision: Efforts would be made to look into crippling of TBG and using the example of the Danish campaign in the case of the PfG.

Raising Identification Skills and Awareness Amongst Hunters

63. Mr Alhainen presented this item, reporting that there were many look-alike species (i.e. of grey geese) in Finland. Any knowledge available concerning the migration patterns of geese should be included in hunting regulations. Not all huntable geese were doing well and this needed to be communicated to hunters by using

brochures, identification material, disseminating articles on the EGMP and AHM to journals and magazines at national level. The differences in hunting cultures needed to be considered.

64. Denmark reported that a section was being planned in a hunting magazine on reducing crippling and identification, this could also be translated into different languages for wider distribution.

65. Mr Dereliev noted that there were two issues involved: one was the overall communication for the EGMP and the other was on identification. Regarding communication, there was still a lack of understanding amongst some of the stakeholders as to what the EGMP initiative was actually about. A structured and well thought-through communication should be delivered to the target groups. He suggested the development of a costed project concept, coordinated by the Secretariat, to develop a coherent communication strategy for the EGMP to be outsourced to a group of communicators experienced in the field.

66. More specifically on the identification skills, the overall EGMP Coordinator would, in future, maintain the EGMP website, providing information resources and enabling communication within the group.

Decisions and actions:

- 1) The Secretariat would produce up a costed project concept for the development of a coherent communication strategy with external communicators and will share this with the IWG;
- 2) In the meantime, Professor Madsen would approach the Communications Officer at Aarhus University to prepare an information document to inform stakeholders of the concept behind the EGMP;
- 3) Regarding the development of identification skills amongst hunters, it was agreed that national hunting associations in the Range States should be approached by the national representatives in the IWG with regard to training programmes while cooperation with BirdLife partners and other conservation NGOs should be encouraged;
- 4) Information materials regarding the identification of different species would be coordinated by the EGMP Coordinator and disseminated on the EGMP website and amongst relevant national stakeholders by the IWG members.

Developing an International Framework for Resolving Agricultural Conflicts Which Include the Taiga Bean Goose

67. Professor Fox explained that attracted by the abundance of food provided by intensive agriculture, most goose populations staging and wintering in Europe have substantially increased in numbers during the past decades. This has led to reduced crop yields and damaged pastures so that agricultural conflicts have increased. Measures to prevent crop damage included protective shooting (Sweden, Germany and Estonia), scaring and field guarding. Government subsidy schemes to either prevent damage or compensate for losses were paid to farmers in many European states. Knowledge was lacking as to the actual cost of these goose populations to society.

68. This was a shared problem and needed to be solved on an international level if agricultural conflict was to be reduced. A coordinated approach was needed, in order to produce relevant guidance on best practices. Agricultural organisations including authorities and farmers' bodies, should be involved and close links needed to be established, which was strongly supported by the Netherlands.

69. Lithuania reported that this issue had been discussed with the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture, where currently goose damage compensation was being compiled for geese generally and that this could be taken to the species level in the context of the planned ISMP for the Barnacle Goose.

70. Belgium pointed out that, in many cases, damage compensation was being paid to private land owners, year after year and that it could be an option for the government to buy the land and change to less vulnerable

crops. Technical advisors to farmers should be educated with regard to crop alternatives to help prevent extensive crop damage.

71. Norway stressed the importance of shifting the focus to the agricultural sector, which also had the potential to provide funds.

72. The importance of gathering regular information on crop damage (i.e. the minimum agreed data requirements on the national costs of goose damage to each crop type by each species of geese) from countries and the level of compensation payments, which should go into a centralised place to enable relevant analysis, was discussed, as well as the important role of regional politics. Existing experience and guidelines should be incorporated and multi-disciplinary experts would be needed to understand the attitudes of farmers and the economics involved.

73. Representing the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, Mr Richard Hearn informed the IWG of a PhD study about to start on the subject of agricultural conflicts, which could be a good source of information.

Actions:

1) A Task Force would be established with the aim of developing an international interdisciplinary cooperation framework for dealing with agricultural conflicts caused by geese. The Secretariat would convene this by correspondence in January 2017, inviting the IWG designated representatives and relevant observers to appoint representatives;

2) Standardised national statistics on goose damage assessment (i.e. the costs of each goose species to each crop type) should be placed in a shared repository through annual data submission to EGMP Data Centre to the best ability of each range state.

Development of Work Plan for Other Actions than those related to Adaptive Harvest Management

74. Mr Dereliev reported that the countries had been given the opportunity of preparing for session on the work plan for other non-adaptive harvest management activities in advance, on the basis of a template distributed by the Secretariat. This work plan would be developed for the next two years and priorities would be set according to resources. Thus two break-out groups were formed following the TBG ISSAP, for the Western and Central Management Units and the two Eastern Management Units. The break-out groups reported back to the meeting on the actions decided on (see Appendices 2 and 3).

Action: All Range States would provide for the implementation of the actions they prioritised. During the next IWG meeting in June 2017, it would be discussed how to report on their implementation.

Agenda item 10. General Session

Barnacle Goose (Russia-breeding population) – Research and Modelling

75. Representing the Netherlands, Mr Kees Koffijberg gave an update on a research and modelling project concept focusing on the Barnacle Goose (BG) population breeding in Russia, in anticipation of an AEWA International Management Planning process to be launched for the species in 2017, explaining that there were already many ongoing activities and that the role of the EGMP would be to coordinate monitoring reports from countries via the EGMP Data Centre. He stressed the fact that efforts should be made to get some data from Russia, where the extent of spring hunting was unknown. There was also a strong need to gain knowledge on the extent of agricultural damage and to share expertise. He stressed the importance on the collaboration with Wetlands International and the International Waterbird Census with the EGMP Data Centre

76. Lithuania remarked that both Lithuania and Latvia should be included as a range states for the species.

77. Mr Dereliev confirmed that the intention was that the Coordinator in the EGMP Data Centre would also try to monitor and strengthen the data for all goose species in Europe. This would be done with the help of the Wetlands International African-Eurasian Waterbird Monitoring Partnership and all other relevant stakeholders. An MOC with Aarhus University was being concluded for this purpose. The BG management planning workshop to discuss goals and objectives etc. is tentatively planned to take place on 12-14 June 2017, followed by the EGM IWG2 Meeting. The draft plan would be presented to the AEW A MOP7 in November 2018 and rolled out for implementation in June 2019.

Involvement and Retainment of Volunteer Goose Counters

78. Professor Madsen reported that the monitoring of geese in Europe was basically done by a strong network of very committed volunteers. The reputation of the EGMP process had unfortunately been debated, due to rumours that the information was being used to promote hunting and maximise hunting opportunities on European geese. Counters were concerned and would not be willing to support the process if the information gained was being used for hunting purposes.

79. On behalf of Belgium, Professor Eckhart Kuijken reminded the meeting that similar critical feelings among waterbird counters had already come up in the 1980s and 1990s. Some participants in ornithological and nature conservation organisations expressed their fear about subjective or one-sided use of their results related to shooting. However, this did not express a fundamental rejection of hunting as such, but was a call for careful use and interpretation of counting data.

80. The IWG members need to help to build back the trust and to communicate with the local networks in order to dispel any uncertainties. This point linked back to the urgent need for a common communication strategy for the EGMP as discussed and decided during the Taiga Bean Goose session. The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and the Coordinator of the EGMP Data Centre expressed the will to meet with relevant networks at the invitation of the relevant national focal points, if needed, to provide clarification as to the EGMP process and what was behind it.

81. The Chair concurred that the correct message about what the EGMP is should be disseminated amongst counters and all relevant stakeholders.

Agenda item 11. Next AEW A European Goose Management International Working Group Meeting

82. Mr Dereliev reported that there had been an encouraging amount of interest from countries to engage in the EGMP process and a number of hosting offers had been received, however due to the scheduling of the stakeholder workshop for the Barnacle Goose ISMP in 2017 in Copenhagen, it would make sense in terms of logistical arrangements to hold this back-to-back with the EGM IWG2 and Denmark's generous offer to host both meetings had been gratefully accepted. The dates for both meetings, scheduled to take place in Copenhagen would be as follows:

12-14 June 2017: Stakeholder workshop for the development of an AEW A International Species Management Plan for the Barnacle Goose (East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland; Svalbard/South-west Scotland; and Russia/North-west Europe populations):

15-16 June 2017: Second Meeting of the AEW A European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG2):

Agenda item 12. Election of the Chair for the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group

83. The Chair explained that the term of the elected chair country, represented by a designated national government representative to the IWG, would be for two consecutive years, i.e. until June 2018.

84. Mr Dereliev reported that Norway, which had been a strong supporter of the EGMP, also financially, had submitted its nomination. Norway had also been a pioneering country for the PfG process. Mr Øystein Størkersen, who had a great deal of experience in chairing committees, was nominated as representing Norway.

Decision: Norway was elected unanimously as Chair for the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group.

Agenda item 13. Summary of the Meeting, Next Steps and Closure

85. The Chair thanked the delegates for all the positive interactions and also for the many interesting presentations.

86. It had been an honour to chair this first meeting of the IWG and he thanked the Swedish hosts and the Secretariat once again for preparing everything so well.

87. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr Dereliev thanked Mr Vandeghuchte for his excellent chairing of the meeting, which had contributed greatly in making the meeting so successful.

88. With that, the Chair declared the Meeting closed.



*AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF
AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS*

**MODUS OPERANDI OF THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL
WORKING GROUP³**

PURPOSE

Rule 1

The inter-governmental AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (hereinafter referred to as EGM IWG) is constituted to serve as the coordinating and decision-making body of the AEWA European Goose Management Platform established under the auspices of the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), following AEWA Resolution 6.4, with the goal to ensure the conservation and sustainable use, as well as the favourable conservation status of the migratory goose species and populations to which it applies. The European Goose Management Platform operates in line with existing international obligations and the pertinent legislative frameworks and regulations, as relevant in each range state, including AEWA, the Bern Convention and the EU Birds Directive for the range states to which these apply. The EGM IWG works closely with the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat to ensure consistency and coherence with the legal provisions and work of the Agreement.

ROLE

Rule 2

The role of the EGM IWG is to:

- 1) coordinate and ensure the implementation of the AEWA International Species Action and Management Plans approved by the AEWA Meeting of the Parties which fall under its remit;
- 2) stimulate and support Range States in the implementation of these International Action and Management Plans;
- 3) monitor and report on the implementation and the effectiveness of these Action and Management Plans.

REMIT

Rule 3 – Species/Population Coverage

1. The EGM IWG serves as the coordinating and decision-making body for the implementation of the:

³ As adopted by the 1st Meeting of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group on 14-16 December 2016 in Kristianstad, Sweden.

- AEWA International Single Species Management Plan for the Conservation of the Svalbard Population of the Pink-footed Goose (*Anser brachyrhynchus*);
 - AEWA International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Taiga Bean Goose (*Anser f. fabalis*).
2. Further AEWA International Species Management Plans, as well as such AEWA International Species Action Plans which contain provisions for adaptive harvest management, for migratory goose species/populations within the Western Palearctic may also be included within the remit of this Working Group, following their adoption by the AEWA Meeting of the Parties.

Rule 4 - Tasks

The EGM IWG will:

- set priorities for action and take decisions regarding the conservation and sustainable use of the species/populations covered;
- coordinate the overall international implementation of activities;
- secure funds and other resources for implementation, as decided by its members;
- ensure regular and thorough monitoring of the species/populations which fall under its remit, to the best ability of each Range State, including the timely annual provision of necessary national data to the International Data Centre as per the requirements and timetables established under the EGM IWG;
- regularly monitor the effectiveness of implementation of the AEWA International Species Management and Action Plans under its remit and take appropriate action according to the findings of this monitoring; and
- provide for the update of the AEWA International Species Management and Action Plans under its remit, as required.

MEMBERSHIP

Rule 5 – Range States

1. Membership to the EGM IWG will encompass those Range States regularly supporting the species/populations as per the remit above: *Belarus, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Ukraine, UK, as well as the European Union.*
2. In anticipation of further possible AEWA International Management/Action Plans to be developed and adopted for migratory goose species/populations under AEWA, as per AEWA Resolution 6.4, the following additional Range States are also included as members to the EGM IWG: *France, Iceland, Ireland, and Spain.*

Rule 6 – Range State Representatives

1. The EGM IWG will comprise:
 - a maximum of two designated representatives of national state authorities relevant to the implementation of AEWA; and

- a maximum of two representatives of national scientific or expert institutions and organisations as invited to the national delegations by the state authorities of the respective Range State;
 - a maximum of two representatives from the European Union, represented by the European Commission.
2. Designations of national government and expert representatives will be requested from the AEWA National Focal/Contact Points by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. Possible changes in the national representation to the EGM IWG following the initial designation shall be communicated to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat as soon as possible via email.

Rule 7 – Permanent Observer Organizations

1. In addition, relevant specialised international inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations may, in consultation with the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, be invited by the Chair to participate in the EGM IWG as permanent observers, subject to confirmation by a meeting of the EGM IWG.
2. The Chair of the AEWA Technical Committee will also be invited to join the EGM IWG as a permanent observer by the Chair of the EGM IWG.
3. The admittance of permanent observers to the EGM IWG by the Range States will take place at the first meeting of the EGM IWG where the observer in question will be in attendance.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Rule 8 – EGM IWG Members

Meeting attendance will be open to the designated representatives and admitted permanent observers as outlined above under Rules 5-7, as well as representatives from the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and the International Data Centre.

Rule 9 – National delegations

1. In addition, the designated government representatives may choose to include additional national representatives in their national delegations to the meetings of the EGM IWG. The national delegations to each EGM IWG meeting shall, however, be limited to a maximum number of five participants per country. Additional representatives shall be communicated as part of the respective national delegation to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat in advance of the meeting.
2. For those countries eligible to receive financial support under the EGM IWG for meeting attendance, only up to two representatives per country can be funded.
3. An exception to the rule regarding the size of national delegations shall be made in the case of a host country, whereby the designated government representative in the EGM IWG of the host country will have the right to invite additional national organizations as observers to the meeting as part of their national delegation, bearing in mind that any additional costs related to such observers shall be carried by the host country and cannot be covered by the EGM IWG budget.

Rule 10 – Permanent Observer Organisations

The participation of permanent observer organisations to the meetings of the EGM IWG will be limited to one representative per organisation.

Rule 11 – Additional Individual Experts

In addition, the EGM IWG Chair may, in consultation with the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, invite additional individual experts as observers to meetings of the EGM IWG, to contribute to specific agenda items. Should such experts hail from one of the Range States of the EGM IWG, the Secretariat will consult with the designated government representative(s) prior to the issuance of the invitation. Such additional observers will be admitted by the IWG members during the opening of the specific meeting they have been invited to attend.

MEETINGS

Rule 12 – Timing and Language

Unless the EGM IWG decides otherwise, meetings of the EGM IWG shall be convened by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat annually. The meetings will be conducted in English only.

Rule 13 - Venue

The meeting venue shall be at the seat of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat at the United Nations Campus in Bonn, Germany, unless a voluntary host country is found amongst the EGM IWG Range States.

Rule 14 – Notice of Meetings

Notice of meetings, including date and venue, shall be sent to all EGM IWG members by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat at least 90 days in advance.

Rule 15 - Quorums

1. A quorum for general decisions shall consist of half of the Range States in the EGM IWG which have confirmed their participation in the European Goose Management Platform.
2. A quorum for decisions to be taken regarding the implementation of activities under an AEWA International Species Management or Action Plan shall consist of half of the Range States to the respective Plan which have confirmed their participation in the European Goose Management Platform.
3. A quorum for decisions to be taken regarding the implementation actions within defined populations or management units of an AEWA International Species Management or Action Plan shall consist of half of the Range States to the respective population or management unit which have confirmed their participation in the European Goose Management Platform;
4. No decision shall be taken at a meeting in the absence of a quorum.

Rule 16 – Decisions and Provisions for Voting

Decisions of the EGM IWG shall be taken by consensus unless a vote is requested by the Chair or by three members.

Rule 17

1. Decisions of the EGM IWG by voting (pursuant to Rule 16) shall be passed by a simple majority vote of the members present and voting. In the case of a tie, the motions shall be considered as rejected.
2. Decisions on changes to the Modus Operandi may only be taken at meetings of the EGM IWG. In the case of voting, a qualified majority (75%) of the members present and voting is necessary to adopt the proposed changes.

Rule 18

Only the designated government representatives of the EGM IWG Range States shall exercise voting rights. In his or her absence he or she may name an Alternate from amongst the other members of the national delegation to act in his or her place. The Alternate shall be communicated to the Chair and to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat.

Rule 19

Where two representatives of national state authorities have been designated for one Range State, these shall coordinate amongst themselves and inform the Chair and the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat which representative will be carrying out the vote for the Range State in question.

Rule 20 – Decisions between meetings

1. At the discretion of the Chair, in consultation with the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, EGM IWG business – including voting – may be conducted between regularly scheduled meetings as necessary by email or via conference call, with any actions recorded in the minutes of the next regularly scheduled meeting.
2. For any such decisions between meetings conducted by the remote means listed above, the same quorum and voting principles apply as outlined above in Rules 15-19.

Rule 21 – Meeting Record

A summary record of each meeting shall be prepared by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat as soon as possible and shall be communicated to all the members of the EGM IWG.

Rule 22 – Meeting Documents

The documents for each meeting of the EGM IWG will be made available in English language only and shall be distributed to its members by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat at least 30 days before the opening of the meeting, with the exception of annual assessment reports on adaptive harvest management, which shall be distributed at least two weeks before the opening of the meeting. At the discretion of the Chair, documents may be accepted after this deadline, but not later than one week before the meeting. Typically, documents will be distributed electronically.

STRUCTURE and OFFICERS

Rule 23 - Chair

The EGM IWG Range States shall, amongst themselves elect a Chair country, represented by its designated national government representative to the Working Group. The term for the Chairmanship shall last for two consecutive years, with the elected Range State chairing two consecutive meetings of the EGM IWG. The Chair country shall thus be elected at the end of every second meeting of the EGM IWG, and the newly elected Chair shall assume their functions upon election. A country cannot serve as a Chair for two consecutive terms.

Rule 24

The Chair shall preside at the meetings of the EGM IWG, approve the provisional agenda prepared by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for circulation and liaise with the members between meetings of the EGM IWG as necessary. The Chair may represent the EGM IWG as required within the limits of the EGM IWG mandate, and shall carry out such other functions as may be entrusted to him/her by the EGM IWG.

Rule 25

If, in an election, there is no consensus regarding the proposed Chair country, the proposed Range State which obtains the overall majority will be elected as Chair. If no proposed candidate obtains an overall majority in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be taken, restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If the votes are equally divided in the second ballot, the presiding officer shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.

Rule 26 - UNEP/AEWA Secretariat

The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat will be in charge of servicing the EGM IWG and a dedicated Coordinator situated at the Secretariat will facilitate the day-to-day operations of the EGM IWG in close cooperation with the Chair and the International Data Centre.

Rule 27 – International Data Centre

The necessary scientific analysis, assessments and subsequent proposals for conservation and management options will be provided by the International Data Centre of the European Goose Management Platform.

Rule 28 – National Focal Points

The designated representatives of the national state authorities from the Range States will act as National Focal Points for the EGM IWG and will be the main contact persons for the elected Chair and the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat.

The designated representatives of national state authorities will further coordinate the implementation of national activities as agreed in the EGM IWG and carry out national consultations as appropriate prior to the meetings of the EGM IWG to allow for decisions to be taken at the meetings.

TASK FORCES

Rule 29

The EGM IWG may establish species and/or thematic Task Forces as may be necessary to deal with the preparation and coordination of decision papers and background documents for the EGM IWG as well as to deal with other specific tasks. The EGM IWG shall define the terms of reference and composition of each Task Force.

Rule 30

In so far as they are applicable, these Rules shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings of the established Task Forces.

FINANCING

Rule 31

The annual running costs for the European Goose Management Platform, including for the EGM IWG, will be provided by the Range States to the Platform as decided by the EGM IWG.

REPORTING

Rule 32 – Reporting to EGM IWG Meetings

In addition to the timely provision of the required national data as outlined under Rule 4, reports on the implementation of the AEWA International Species Management and Action Plans within the remit of the EGM IWG, shall be prepared by each Range State according to a format agreed by the EGM IWG and presented at each face-to-face meeting of the EGM IWG.

Rule 33 – Reporting to the AEWA Governing Bodies

In addition, reports will be produced according to a standard format with contributions from all Range States and submitted for inclusion into the general International Review on the Stage of Preparation and Implementation of Single Species Action Plans to the AEWA Meeting of the Parties. Range States will also be requested to provide information to feed into other reporting processes required by the AEWA governing bodies.

FINAL PROVISIONS

Rule 34 – Modus operandi

This Modus Operandi shall be applied at the first meeting of the EGM IWG following its approval by the EGM IWG.

Rule 35 – Changes to the Modus Operandi

This Modus Operandi may be amended by the EGM IWG, as required, in accordance with the provisions of the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement and decisions of its governing bodies. Proposals for changes to the Modus Operandi can be submitted to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat by any of the designated national government representatives 70 days before the next meeting of the EGM IWG. The proposed changes shall then be circulated to the EGM IWG members by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat 60 days before the meeting.

APPENDIX 2

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)

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.	1.1.1.1 Prepare and adopt legislative proposals for the closure of hunting of Taiga Bean Geese (including the use of flexible hunting seasons in Belarus and Russia) to allow for Taiga Bean Geese to pass before goose hunting is opened Range States: ALL	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	
	1.1.1.2 Improve knowledge on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese in all Eastern Management Unit Range States	a) Ensure national monitoring of Taiga Bean Geese at all known key sites (including providing identification training & equipment to people carrying out the monitoring where possible) Range States: ALL	Responsible government authorities (Ministries of the Environment etc.)	2017-2018	unknown	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.
		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)	TBG Task Force (<i>to be established</i>)	2017-2018	unknown	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)

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities		Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
		Range States: best location for implementation to be decided				
		c) Increase efforts to engage Poland and Russia (especially Kaliningrad)	Lithuania Finland? Norway?	2017	none	
Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels						
1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	1.2.2.1 Prepare and implement an awareness-raising campaign for hunters to complement suggested legislation changes, including guidance on the identification of grey geese. Range States: Belarus, Ukraine	National NGOs and research institutes in cooperation with the TBG Task Force	2018	unknown		
	1.2.2.2 Produce and disseminate special publication on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese Range States: Ukraine	National NGOs and research institutes	2017	unknown	Collation of available information	

APPENDIX 3

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)

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	1.2.2.1 Investigate TBG shooting NE Jutland & Zealand Range States: Denmark	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	1.3.1.1 Undertake annual campaign amongst hunters in the breeding areas to strengthen fox management Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency + hunting association	2017 + 2018	none	
	1.3.1.2 Communicate to the Forestry & Parks Service the importance of continuing and strengthening fox management in the northernmost Finland Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency	2017	none	
<i>Result 1.4. Impact of alien predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced</i>					
Action 1.4.1. Maintain and strengthen alien predator control and eradication measures in breeding and moulting areas	1.4.1.1 Carry on the eradication of raccoon dog in Lapland & Sweden Range States: Finland, Sweden	Finnish Wildlife Agency / Swedish Hunters' Association	Ongoing	FI: Secured (150,000 EUR) SE: secured (800,000 EUR)	

ISSAP actions	Detailed activities	Lead	Time-frame	Budget	Comments
<i>Result 2.2. Interspecific competition in spring staging areas is reduced</i>					
Action 2.2.1. Maintain the unharvested-fields-for-birds programme (within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union, if applicable)	2.2.1.1 Continue implementing the fields for geese programme Range States: Sweden	County Administrative Boards	Ongoing	secured	
	2.2.1.2 Ministry of Agriculture to maintain this programme in the national CAP starting form 2020 Range States: Finland	Ministry of Agriculture	2017 + 2018	none	
	2.2.1.3 Demonstrate the benefits of the programme to the Agriculture Department of the Ministry of Agriculture Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency	2017 + 2018	none	
<i>Result 3.1. Impact of forestry works is reduced</i>					
Action 3.1.1. Continue the adaptation of forestry operations to take into account wildlife, in particular Taiga Bean Goose	3.1.1.1 Working models for Wildlife Friendly Forests management and forestry related habitat restorations are developed in co-operation with forestry sector and promoted at large to forest owners and corporations to reach implementation in practice. Actions implement the national management plans for the grouse species and the Bean Goose. Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency	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	Parks & Wildlife Finland	Ongoing	Dependent on available resources	
	3.1.2.2 Develop and submit LIFE application to the EC Range States: Finland	Parks & Wildlife Finland	2017 + 2018	none	
<i>Result 3.3. Breeding, staging and wintering habitats are not further lost due to oil and gas or renewable energy developments</i>					
Action 3.3.1. Take account of Taiga Bean Goose breeding, staging and wintering habitats in the planning of new oil and gas and renewable energy developments	3.3.1.1 Continued monitoring of collision risk posed to Taiga Bean close to the Special Protection Areas identified as their important wintering sites Range States: Denmark	SVANA / Aarhus University/ Windfarming company	Ongoing	Secured	
<i>Result 3.4. Impact of agriculture on natural Taiga Bean Goose habitats is minimised</i>					
Action 3.4.1. Restore wet grassland habitats in staging and wintering areas	3.4.1.1 Increase the area of managed coastal grassland under CAP Range States: Finland	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	2017-2018	secured	



*AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF
AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS*

**1st MEETING OF THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP
14-16 December 2016, Kristianstad, Sweden**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BELARUS

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

Tel.: +375 29 694 25 04
E-mail: ppinchuk@mail.ru

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

Tel.: +37 517 367 9117 / +37 529 702 8534
E-mail: silverhawk@mail.ru

BELGIUM

Mr Michiel Vandegehuchte (NGR)
Agency for Nature and Forest
Koning Albert II-laan 20 bus 8
1000
Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +32 496 5647 82
E-mail:
michiel.vandegehuchte@lne.vlaanderen.be

Dr Frank Huysentruyt (NE)
Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)
Wildlife Management
Gaverstraat 4
9500 Geraardsbergen
Belgium

Tel.: +32 499 865 340
E-mail: frank.huysentruyt@inbo.be

Professor Eckhart Kuijken (NE)
Ghent University
Biology Department
Lindeveld 4
8730
Beernem
Belgium

Tel.: 32 475 285 413
E-mail eckhart.kuijken@scarlet.be

Ms Christine Verscheure
Natuurpunt
Lindeveld 4
8730 Beernem
Belgium

Tel.: +32 477 993 911
E-mail: christine.verscheure@gmail.com

DENMARK

Ms Camilla Uldal (NGR)
Ministry of Environment and Food
Danish Agency for Water and Nature Management
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel.: +45 935 879 47
E-mail: cakis@svana.dk
Professor Jesper Madsen (NE)
Department of Bioscience
Aarhus University
Grenaavej 14
8410 Roende
Denmark

Tel.: +45 2944 0204
E-mail: jm@bios.au.dk

Professor Anthony Fox (NE)
Aarhus University
Department of Bioscience
Grenaavej 14
8410 Roende
Denmark

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

Ms Iben Hove Sørensen
Danish Hunters' Association
Molsvej 34
8410 Rønne
Denmark

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

Mr Niels-Erik Jørgensen
Danish Hunters' Association
Molsvej 34
8410 Rønne
Denmark

Tel.: +45 232 668 90
E-mail: ne-amjorgensen@mail.tele.dk

FINLAND

Dr Esko Hyvärinen (NGR)
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)
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)
Finnish Wildlife Department
Sompiontie 1
00730 Helsinki
Finland

Tel.: +35 829 431 2401
E-mail: mikko.alhainen@riista.fi

Mr Jorma Pessa (NE)
Center 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 AEWA Standing Committee*)
Ministry of Environment, Energy and the Sea
(MEEM)
European and International Actions Officer
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 Birds Unit
La Tour du Valat
Le Sambuc
13200 Arles
France

Tel.: +33 490 972 879

E-mail: matthieu.guillemain@oncfs.gouv.fr

ICELAND

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

Tel.: +35 459 005 00

E-mail: mummi@ni.is

LATVIA

Mr Vilnis Bernards (NGR)
Senior Desk Officer
Ministry of Environmental Protection and
Regional Development
Peldu Str 25
LV – 1494
Riga
Latvia

Tel.: +371 670 265 24

Fax: +371 678 204 42

E-mail: vilnis.bernards@varam.gov.lv

Ms Daiga Vilkašte (NGR)
Ministry of Environment Protection and
Nature Protection Department
Regional Development
Peldu 121
1494 Riga
Latvia

Tel.: +37 129 119 572

E-mail: daiga.vilkaste@varam.gov.lv

LITHUANIA

Mr Saulius Svazas (NE)
(*Chair of the AEWA Technical Committee*)
Nature Research Centre
Laboratory of Evian Ecology
Akademijos 2
08412 Vilnius
Lithuania

Tel.: +37 065 029 680

E-mail: svazas@ekoi.lt

NETHERLANDS

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

Tel.: +31 638 825 338

E-mail: w.j.remmelts@minez.nl

Mr Klaas Talma (NE)
Province of Friesland
Department for Town and Country
Postbus 20120
8900 Leeuwarden
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 629 246 676

E-mail: k.talma@fryslan.nl

Mr Gerben Mensink (NE)
Province of Friesland
Department for Town and Country
Postbus 20120
8900 Leeuwarden
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 615 488 725

E-mail: g.mensink@fryslan.nl

Dr Meinte Engelmoer
Advisor
Province of Fryslân
P.O. Box 201020
8900 HM Leeuwarden
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 58 292 5976
E-mail: m.engelmoer@fryslan.nl

Mr Kornelis Koffijberg
Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland
P.O. Box 6521
6503 GA Nijmegen
The Netherlands

Tel.: +31 24 741 0410
E-mail: kees.koffijberg@sovon.nl

NORWAY

Mr Øystein Størkersen (NGR)
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

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

SWEDEN

Mr David Schönberg Alm (NGR)
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Biodiversity Unit
Valhallavägen 195
106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 688
E-mail: david.schonberg.alm@naturvardsverket.se

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

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

Ms Lotta Lagerberg (NGR)
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Wildlife Unit
Valhallavägen 195
106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 733 549 767
E-mail: lotta.lagerberg@naturvardsverket.se

Ms Linda Ersson (NGR)
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Research and Assessment Department
Valhallavägen 195
106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 010 698 1749
E-mail: linda.ersson@naturvardsverket.se

Ms Mirja Lindberget (NGR)
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Research and Assessment Department
Valhallavägen 195
106 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 378
E-mail: mirja.lindberget@naturvardsverket.se

Dr Leif Nilsson (NE)
Lund Universtiy
Biological Institute
Ecology Building
2223 62 Lund
Sweden

Tel.: +46 705 255 709
E-mail: leif.nilsson@biol.lu.se

Dr Vasyl Kostiusyn (NE)
Institute of Zoology NAS of Ukraine
Department of Monitoring and Conservation of
Animals
B.Khmel'nitskogo str. 15
01601 Kiev
Ukraine

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

UKRAINE

Ms Oleysa Petrovych (NGR)
Chief Specialist of the Department of
Protected Areas
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of
Ukraine
35, Metropolita Vasyl Lypkivskyi
Kiev 03035
Ukraine

Tel.: +38 044 206 21 93
Fax: +38 044 206 21 92
E-mail: petrovych.o@gmail.com

INDIVIDUAL EXPERTS

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Dr Fred Johnson
Wetland & Aquatic Research Center
7920 NW 71 Street
32653 Gainesville
United States

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

OBSERVERS

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.: +45 229 984 83
E-mail: kpo@lf.dk

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF SKÅNE, SWEDEN

Mr Anders Hallengren
Naturvårdshandläggare
Kungsgatan 13
205 15 Malmö
Sweden

Tel.: +46 10 224 1356
E-mail: anders.hallengren@lanssyrelsen.se

Mr Hans Cronert
Nature Conservation Coordinator
Kristianstads Vattenrike Biosphere Reserve
29180 Kristianstad
Sweden

Tel.: +46 708 777 735
E-mail: hans.cronert@kristianstad.se

**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)**

Mr Alexandre Czajkowski
OMPO
59, rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

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

Dr Thibaut Powolny
OMPO
59, rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

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

**NORWEGIAN ASSOCIATION OF
HUNTERS AND ANGLERS**

Mr Vidar Nilsen
Hunting Consultant
Norwegian Association of Hunters and Anglers
(NJFF)
P.B. 94
1378 Nesbru
Norway

Tel.: +47 957 46 100
E-mail: vidar.nilsen@njff.no

NORWEGIAN FARMERS' UNION

Mr Finn Erlend Oedegaard
Norwegian Farmers' Union
P.B. 9354 Grønland
0135 Oslo
Norway

Tel.: +47 928 584 95
E-mail: finn.erlend.odegard@bondelaget.no

Mr Ove Martin Gundersen
The Norwegian Farmers' Union
Hamnegata 33
7714 Steinkjer
Norway

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

**SWEDISH UNIVERSITY OF
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

Ms Lovisa Nilsson
SLU
Wildlife Damage Center
Ecology Department
Grimsö Forskningsstation
730 91 Riddarhyttan

Tel.: +46 738 082 962
E-mail: lovisa.uk.nilsson@slu.se

Dr Johan Månsson
SLU
Grimsö Wildlife Research Station
Ecology Department
730 91 Riddarhyttan
Sweden

Tel.: +46 581 697 325
E-mail: johan.mansson@slu.se

**SWEDISH ASSOCIATION FOR HUNTING
AND WILDLIFE**

Dr Niklas Liljebäck
Swedish Association for Hunting and Wildlife
Department for Hunting and Wildlife
Management
Öster Malma
611 91 Nyköping
Sweden

Tel.: +46 703 300 680
E-mail: niklas.liljeback@jagareforbundet.se

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
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
Conservation Science Department
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-awa.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
E-mail: nina.mikander@unep-awa.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-awa.org

**PINK-FOOTED GOOSE ISMP
COORDINATION UNIT**

Mr James Henty Williams
Aarhus University
Department of Bioscience
Grenaavej 14
8410 Roende
Denmark

Tel.: +45 501 836 12
E-mail: jhw@bios.au.dk