
**REPORT OF THE 3rd MEETING OF THE AEWA EUROPEAN GOOSE
MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP¹**

20-21 June 2018, Leeuwarden, the Netherlands

Hosted by the Province of Friesland, the Netherlands



AEWA EGM IWG3
20-21 June 2018, Leeuwarden – Friesland

provinsje fryslân
provincie fryslân 

¹ Report finalised after written consultation with the meeting participants.

² Revision published 16 November 2018.

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
Agenda item 2.	Adoption of agenda	The agenda (document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.2/Rev.3) was adopted with no amendments.	
Agenda item 3.	Admission of permanent observers and individual expert observers	Ms Melissa Lewis, was admitted to the EGM IWG3 as individual expert, already admitted permanent observers were welcomed, and the Wadden Sea Forum was approved by the Meeting as permanent observer organisation to the EGM IWG, being present at the meeting.	
Agenda item 5.	EGMP Finance Report for 2016-2018	No objections were brought forward by the Range States on the finance report for 2016-2018 and the report was accepted.	<p>Pledges for the 2018 budget were received from France, the Netherlands and the UK. The Secretariat will send out funding requests for the newly pledged funds.</p> <p>The Secretariat will review the estimated budget after the first full staffing cycle, identifying possible reductions, to be communicated in the EGM IWG4 meeting for 2020.</p> <p>From 2019 onwards, the Secretariat will be including in the budget report contributions by Range States and other donors made outside of the EGMP core budget for activities that provide a direct input into EGMP processes.</p>
Agenda item 6.	EGMP budget for 2019 and scale of contributions for 2019 onwards	The presented budget estimate for 2019 (Annex 1) was agreed with one reservation from Germany.	<p>The Secretariat will produce a preliminary indicative annual costed programme of work for the EGMP for 2019 by autumn 2018.</p> <p>The Secretariat will communicate to the Range States in January 2019, after MOP7,</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
		<p>Scenario 5 of the scale of contributions from 2019 onwards, with a 15% cap (Annex 2), was accepted by the nine paying Range States as indicative figures for their contributions, with contributions remaining voluntary, as before.</p> <p>regarding potential adjustments to next year's costed programme of work and any possible revisions of the 2019 budget.</p> <p>The Secretariat will prepare new proposals for scale of contributions with minimum contributions of 2,000 EUR from Range States to be considered at EGM IWG4 in June 2019 for 2020 onwards.</p>
<p>Agenda item 7.</p>	<p>Analysis of National Reports 2018 and National Reporting Format</p>	<p>The EGM IWG took note of the analysis of the EGMP national reports for 2017-2018 and agreed to continue with a similar reporting format in the future.</p> <p>Prior to launching a new annual reporting cycle, the Secretariat will be sending out a revised national reporting format for consultation with the Range States. The IWG Chair will approve the final format.</p> <p>Range States agreed to monitor the effectiveness of management measures applied and share experiences with other countries, regarding agricultural conflict and damage.</p> <p>The Range States of the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose will continue to raise awareness, particularly amongst the local hunting communities, on their role and responsibility to participate in the management of the population.</p> <p>The Range States of the Taiga Bean Goose Eastern 1 MU agreed to ensure the implementation of the activities of the biannual Taiga Bean Goose implementation plan 2017-2018 and include the activities in</p>

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			<p>consecutive implementation plans and intensify the work on the MU.</p> <p>The Range States of the Central and Western MU resolved to strengthen the goose identification skills and raise awareness on the status of different goose (sub-) populations amongst the hunters, as well as communicate achievements on Taiga Bean Goose conservation. The Taiga Bean Goose Central MU range will administratively remain as it is; however, Germany will be recognized as contributing state and share data and information on the MU as they become available.</p>
Agenda item 8.	Guidance on implementation of Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) through domestic legal regulations	The draft guidance on implementing AHM through domestic legal regulations was adopted by the Meeting, subject to the minor amendments that were raised in the course of the discussion.	
Agenda item 10.	Pink-footed Goose (Svalbard population) AHM update and recommendations	The recommendation to keep using AHM based on the nine models for predictions in population size was confirmed for the following year for the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose, to be examined again next year, with the possibility to use a new Integrated Population Model from 2019 onwards. The harvest quota for 2018 was set at 27,000, with the recognition that it was unlikely to be attained.	The harvest quota will be divided between Denmark and Norway according to an agreed 70:30 ratio. The countries will implement national harvest regulation to regulate the harvest for the coming 2018-2019 hunting season.

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
Agenda item 11.	Report and recommendations from the Pink-footed Goose Task Force	The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2018/2019 of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force as presented in Annex 3.	
Agenda item 13.	Taiga Bean Goose AHM update and recommendations	The Meeting agreed to continue using the constant harvest quota of 3% for the next year, revisiting the issue in 2019. The harvest quota for 2018 has been set at 1,610 individuals.	Finland, Sweden and Denmark take the necessary steps to implement harvest regulations to adjust the harvest for the coming 2018-2019 hunting season. The Taiga Bean Task Force will investigate possibilities for better monitoring to address the issue of unreliable counts resulting in variable quotas.
Agenda item 14.	Report and recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force	The extension of the period of the non-AHM workplan from 2017-2018 until 2020 with small amendments (Annex 4) was agreed by the members of the EGM IWG.	The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will establish a thematic sub-group, as agreed by the EGM IWG, including external goose monitoring experts, for the development of a monitoring framework. Range States are encouraged to provide expertise on a temporary basis by appointing relevant national monitoring experts to the Task Force and will consider provision of data as well as funding for national monitoring experts and TF members as appropriate and possible. The EGM IWG mandated the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force to word a letter in cooperation with the Secretariat, to be sent by the EGM IWG Chair to Belarus, to highlight the requirements of the Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP, raise awareness on the impact of

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			<p>spring hunting and request to limit the impact with hunting restrictions.</p> <p>The Data Centre will assess the suitability of the IPM for the Taiga Bean Goose and report to EGM IWG4.</p>
Agenda item 15.	Report and recommendations from the Agriculture TF	The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2018/2019 of the Agriculture Task Force as presented in Annex 5.	
Agenda item 16.	Revision of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG	The proposed changes to the Modus Operandi in Rule 3, paragraph 1 and Rule 5, paragraph 1 were adopted with the caveat of the draft ISSMPs for the Barnacle Goose and the Northwest/Southwest European population Greylag Goose being proposed for adoption at MOP7.	The Netherlands will bring forward the request for a further change to the EGMP Modus Operandi regarding changing the wording in Rule 3 paragraph 2 to “adaptive flyway management”; to be brought to the next EGM IWG meeting in line with the Modus Operandi.
Agenda item 17.	Election of the new country to Chair the EGM IWG	Denmark was elected as new Chair to the EGM IWG for the duration of two years until June 2020 in accordance with the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG.	
Agenda item 18.	Next AEWA EGM IWG meeting	The delegates agreed on the dates for the 2019 annual meeting, to be held 18-20 June 2019, held back-to-back with EGMP Task Force meetings. The United Kingdom offered to host the meetings in Scotland and the offer was accepted by the EGM IWG.	

Agenda item 1. Opening

1. Representing Norway, the Chair of the AEWA European Goose Management International Working Group (EGM IWG), Mr Øystein Størkersen opened the meeting, giving a short introduction, outlining activities of the EGMP during the last year, as well as the main objectives of this third annual Meeting of the AEWA EGM IWG (EGM IWG3), which would deal with operational issues as well as management planning for the coming harvest period and a presentation on the implementation of Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) through a domestic legal framework and the adoption of a guidance on that matter).

Agenda item 2. Adoption of agenda

Decision:

The agenda (document AEWA/EGM IWG 3.2 Rev.3) was adopted with no amendments.

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

2. The Chair introduced one individual expert who had been invited to this meeting to contribute to specific agenda items, i.e. Ms Melissa Lewis, Environmental Law Expert on the AEWA Technical Committee, who was admitted by the Meeting.

3. The specialised observer organisations represented at the Meeting were:

- The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)
- BirdLife International
- The European Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation (FACE)
- Migratory Birds of the Western Palearctic (OMPO)
- Wetlands International

4. Two further specialised observer organizations requested to be admitted to the process were:

- The Nordic Hunters' Alliance
- Wadden Sea Forum

5. In accordance with the EGM IWG Modus Operandi, organizations can only be admitted when a representative is present. No representative of the Nordic Hunters' Alliance was present at the meeting, therefore, the organization could not be admitted.

6. The Chair invited the admission of the Wadden Sea Forum, which was present in the room, as a permanent observer to the Working Group. There have been no objections from the EGM IWG. The Wadden Sea Forum has been admitted as permanent observer organisation to the EGM IWG.

Decision:

Ms Melissa Lewis, was admitted to the EGM IWG3 as individual expert, already admitted permanent observers were welcomed, and the Wadden Sea Forum was approved by the Meeting as permanent observer organisations to the EGM IWG, being present at the meeting.

Agenda item 4. Reports of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre

7. On behalf of the European Goose Management Platform (EGMP) Secretariat, the Head of Science, Implementation and Compliance Unit at the AEWA Secretariat, Mr Dereliev gave a short summary of events since the last meeting of the EGM IWG in June 2017.

8. Referring to the document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.3/Rev.1, *Reports of the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre*, an overview of the structure of the Platform was given.

9. Three Task Forces dealing with issues specific to Taiga Bean Geese, Svalbard Pink-footed Geese, and Agricultural Conflicts, have been established, whose membership consists of experts from different institutions with technical expertise, individually to be confirmed by the Range States and reaching beyond the membership of the EGM IWG.

10. The EGMP Secretariat and the Data Centre are now fully staffed with Ms Eva Meyers as Coordinator and Ms Christina Irven as Programme Management Assistant joining the AEWA Secretariat in July and November 2017 respectively. Mr Sergey Dereliev is overseeing the programme. His time is currently not covered by the EGMP budget. In the Data Centre Mr Jesper Madsen oversees operations as Coordinator with around 15% of time covered by EGMP budget, Ms Gitte Høj Jensen has joined the team as Goose Monitoring Coordinator full time and a 50% post for modelling work is shared by Mr Fred Johnson, Professor Anthony Fox and Mr Kevin Kuhlmann Clausen.

11. Under the auspices of the EGMP Data Centre the International Modelling Consortium has been established, bringing together research expertise to support the development of population models.

12. The EGMP currently comprises 15 Range States; 14 countries and the EU. Further Range States along the flyways are still to be brought into the process, with Russia and Spain being specifically targeted for recruitment. Poland, being a non-Party Range State to AEWA, has abstained from participation in all AEWA processes and has, until now, not communicated interest in joining the EGMP, and Ireland only has Barnacle Geese on offshore islands, opting out to join the EGMP for now. Lithuania has indicated their wish to leave the Platform and is currently considered a non-participating EGMP Range State.

13. A short overview was given on the budget and funding received, meetings organised during the last year, national reporting to the EGMP and other project activities. Some communications and outreach work has been completed in the last months, including banners, stickers and pencils, as well as a new EGMP website including a password-protected Workspace for the IWG's members to be launched.

14. Professor Jesper Madsen, as Head of the EGMP Data Centre, gave an overview on the activities of the Data Centre in the last year, including a gap analysis of monitoring activities, work on the new management plans on the Barnacle Goose and Greylag Goose, population status reports and harvest assessment reports. The Data Centre staff also had the possibility to attend a large number of meetings and workshops, presenting the work of the EGMP.

15. A clarification was given by the Secretariat in respect to the species under the EGMP. Formally the development of the International Single Species Management Plans (ISSMPs) for the Barnacle and the Northwest/Southwest European population of Greylag Goose are undertaken under the umbrella of AEWA. Whilst the two species were mandated in Resolution 6.4 as priority species for the EGMP, only once the plans are adopted by the Meeting of the Parties (MOP), will the implementation and coordination of the plans fall under the EGMP.

Agenda item 5. EGMP Finance Report for 2016-2018

16. Referring to the document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.4 *EGMP Finance Report 2016-2018*, Mr Sergey Dereliev presented the financial situation of the EGMP in the last triennium, during which the funding for the Platform has been provided on a voluntary basis, as decided by the Range States when the Platform was established.

17. The financial status during the three years was explained in detail and separately for the EGMP Secretariat and the EGMP Data Centre. The Range States had agreed to the EGMP core budget for Secretariat and Data Centre together of 466,000 EUR annually, during the establishment of the Platform 2016-2018.

18. The Secretariat received the amount of 225,000 EUR from Norway in 2016, allowing to finance the majority of the phase-in and enabling the recruitment of two positions in the Secretariat. During the establishment of the Platform Mr Sergey Dereliev and Ms Nina Mikander's time spent on the operations was not financed through the EGMP budget.

19. The set-up of a reserve fund has been decided for the EGMP in 2017 at a level around 50% to finance the first half of each annual cycle until new yearly funding from the Range States is available. For the Secretariat the reserve has been set a little above 50% (160,000 EUR of 282,000 EUR) to take into account the organisation of the IWG meeting in the first half of the year. The Data Centre's reserve fund is established at 50% of the annual budget (92,000 EUR of 184,000 EUR).

20. The EGMP Secretariat budget for 2016-2018 has been agreed at 282,000 EUR annually. In 2017 the Secretariat received only a low level of funding (60,000 EUR); however, was able to operate due to low expenses resulting from filling the two positions only in July and November of the year. Still, a deficit of 171,785 EUR remained in the income for 2017 while taking into account the 65,000 EUR carry over from 2016. In 2018 131,423 EUR were received as voluntary contributions to the EGMP Secretariat, leaving a balance of 70,423 EUR to be covered for the year yet. The reserve for the Secretariat remains untouched. Furthermore, the Secretariat will allocate the amount of 32,100 EUR from their funds to the reserve fund of the Data Centre in order to bring the reserve up to the envisaged full level.

21. The finances for the EGMP Data Centre are managed directly by the Aarhus University, separately to the EGMP Secretariat. The budget for the Data Centre for the period 2016-2018 was agreed at 184,000 EUR annually. In 2016 funding at the level of 92,500 EUR was received, with 59,900 EUR allocated to the reserve after expenses during the year. In 2017 the Data Centre has been fully funded with 184,647 EUR received. For 2018 only 100,000 EUR have been received in the Data Centre until now, leaving a funding deficit of 56,694 EUR for the year.

22. Total funding received for the EGMP in the triennium so far amounted to 793,570 EUR from nine Range States. Belarus and Ukraine have communicated an inability to contribute to the budget generally, whilst Estonia, the EU, Iceland and Latvia have not contributed to the EGMP budget yet. The distribution of the funding of the EGMP budget was presented in detail for each year and Range State. Some additional funding had been received for communication materials, as well as indirectly from the hosts of the EGM IWG meetings. The EGMP was able to weather the cumulative funding gap of 171,877 EUR in 2017 due to the late staff recruitment in the Secretariat. However, in 2018 the current funding deficit of 127,117 EUR will result in a reduction in services if more funding is not provided by the Range States. The Range States were requested to review their possibilities to contribute and consider filling the gap in funding for 2018.

23. Regular contributions from the Range States are deemed indispensable by the Secretariat to the operations of the EGMP to ensure quality of services. Separate funding for projects is needed, i.e. for the communication strategy. The Secretariat stated that after the completion of the first full cycle of staffing (end of 2018) the actual staff expenditures will be looked at, which could possibly lead to the generation of some savings. For 2019 the full EGMP core budget is expected to remain at 466,000 EUR but could be reduced for the following cycle. The new budget estimates for 2020 will be presented to the EGM IWG at the 4th meeting in June 2019.

24. It was noted that funding for the development of the ISSMPs for the Barnacle and Northwest/Southwest European population of Greylag Goose has been received from France, the Netherlands and Norway and is administered separately. The contributions towards the Secretariat of EUR 40,000 in total will appear in the

Secretariat report to MOP 7. If the plans are adopted by the MOP, the future funding and expenditure for the plans will be included in the EGMP report.

25. France made a pledge for 40,000 EUR contribution to the 2018 budget to be distributed between the Secretariat and the Data Centre. The Netherlands also pledged a total of 49,000 EUR from the Ministry and the Provinces to the 2018 EGMP budget. Later in the meeting the UK also made a pledge for 25,000 GBP, thereby leaving only a funding gap of less than 10,000 EUR for 2018. The Secretariat stated that it may be able to optimise expenditure to be able to operate on the budget pledged and will report later in the year if the gap proves critical. The Secretariat and the Chair thanked the three Range States for their contributions to the 2018 budget.

26. The Range States also requested a more detailed reporting by the EGMP, breaking down expenditure items against activities in a costed programme of work (see also paragraph 32). All future financial reporting of the Secretariat and Data Centre will be against activities specified in the annual programme of work.

27. The Chair voiced the suggestion to form a sub-committee on finance to be established by the Range States for advice and guidance, should this become necessary in the future. However, the finances were very well accounted for in the last three years without a committee.

Decisions and Actions:

No objections were brought forward by the Range States on the finance report for 2016-2018 and the report was accepted.

Pledges for the 2018 budget were received from France, the Netherlands and the UK. The **Secretariat** will send out funding requests for the newly pledged funds.

The **Secretariat** will review the estimated budget after the first full staffing cycle, identifying possible reductions, to be communicated in the EGM IWG4 meeting for 2020.

From 2019 onwards, **the Secretariat** will be including in the budget report contributions by Range States and other donors made outside of the EGMP core budget for activities that provide a direct input into EGMP processes.

Agenda item 6. EGMP budget for 2019 and scales of contributions for 2019 onwards

28. Mr Dereliev presented the *EGMP budget for 2019 and proposals for possible scale of contributions to the EGMP budget for 2019 onwards*, referring to document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.5.

29. The 2019 EGMP budget estimate was presented with a total of 466,000 EUR, split into 282,000 EUR for the Secretariat and 184,000 EUR for the Data Centre, thereby remaining at the same level as currently.

30. The Chair invited the Range States to agree and adopt the budget for 2019 (Annex 1). Germany stated reservations on the validity of a 2019 budget, as a possible adoption of the ISSMPs for the Barnacle and Northwest/Southwest European population of Greylag Goose could change the workplan significantly, adding tasks, and therefore influencing the budget. Statements from the Secretariat and the Data Centre clarified that the associated increase in the level of work is likely to be able to be borne by the currently projected EGMP budget for 2019 but might need additional funding for certain activities. It was agreed the Secretariat will communicate to the Range States in January 2019, after MOP7, regarding adjustments to next year's workplan and any possible changes of the 2019 budget.

31. Moving on to the scale of contribution, five scenarios were presented to the Range States for review. The first two scenarios – equal split between the Range States and split by UN scale of assessment – were presented as requested by the Range States at EGM IWG2 in June 2017. In order to offer a larger range of possibilities

to find the best and fairest scenario for all Range States, the Secretariat also presented scenario 3 with a split by number of populations and three further scenarios (4-6), combining the first three scenarios, allocating half of the budget by different methods of distribution respectively. Ten contributing Range States have been used as basis to the scenarios, taking into account Belarus, EU, Germany, Latvia and Ukraine as non-paying Range States according to their communications of inability to contribute overall, or in any other way than ad hoc. Germany specifically had communicated they can only provide contributions to the EGMP budget on a voluntary basis and depending on the particular fiscal situation. The scenarios have been sent for two consultation rounds requesting input and statements of preference from the Range States. No clear overall favourite could be identified on the basis of the information given.

32. During the meeting, the Range States stated their position on the given options of scale of contributions to the EGMP. A majority of countries expressed a preference for scenario 5 as an acceptable option. France and the United Kingdom expressed worries concerning the level of contribution of their country in scenario 5. Belgium, Finland, France, Iceland, Netherlands and the United Kingdom stated that any contribution will have to remain voluntary and will be decided on an annual basis in their Ministries. Also, the need for a costed programme of work to underpin the scale of contributions annually was expressed by several countries. The Secretariat will prepare a preliminary indicative costed programme of work for the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre to be presented in autumn 2018, for Range States to be able to use it for planning purposes in the 2019 budget cycle. The Secretariat indicated that the costed programme of work may be slightly adapted, in case the ISSMPs for the Barnacle Goose and Northwest/Southwest European population of Greylag Goose are adopted by the MOP in December 2018.

33. Estonia, communicated shortly before the meeting that they did not consider themselves part of the EGMP and therefore will not be able to contribute and should be excluded from the scenarios. Germany stated that due to the EGMP budget not being part of the regular AEWA budget, it cannot commit to contribute to the EGMP in a regular manner and thus no inclusion of their country in the cost scenarios is possible. On the basis of a costed programme of work and after adoption of the ISSMPs, project-based contributions on a voluntary basis with a commitment for up to three years may be possible for Germany. Belgium, Finland and France stated that it was an unfortunate circumstance to lose countries from the scale of contributions scenarios.

34. Taking the expressed reservations into account, as well as excluding Estonia from the calculation as requested, reducing the number of paying Range States to nine, the Secretariat recalculated Scenario 5 with two variations, capping the contribution at 20% and 15% respectively. It was agreed to continue the voluntary approach to contributions, but to add an element of predictability to the funding for Range States, by using Scenario 5 with a 15% cap (Annex 2) as guidance when allocating funding. The scenario has been decided to be acceptable for the nine Range States included in the calculation, even though in some cases the amount is more than the countries had earmarked. A proviso was agreed, to title the table of contributions as “indicative” and “voluntary”. Any funding to the EGMP outside the scale of contributions will be considered as extra and lead to lower contributions in the next period. The chair pointed out that with around 50,000 EUR contributions for the larger Range States, the programme is of good value. Once funding is coming in, results and outcomes will also be presented at a more predictable and regular rate.

35. The need to include a minimum contribution from Range States to show involvement and commitment to the EGMP as a shared international process, was reiterated by France, Denmark, UK and the Netherlands. It was decided that the budget of the EGMP will be revisited at the next EGM IWG meeting in June 2019, once it has become clear if the costed programme of work will include the ISSMPs for the Barnacle and Northwest/Southwest European population of Greylag Goose. If Range States marked as non-paying at this stage are able to reconsider their position on contributions, the amounts for each Range State might also be lower. A minimum contribution of 2,000 EUR will also be added in the proposed scenarios, as requested. At

EGM IWG4, the Range States will decide if from 2020 onwards a possibility other than ad hoc funding is feasible.

36. Germany requested a change in wording in the footnote in the indicative table of contributions, currently categorizing Germany as “non-paying Range State”. Germany declared that it has a reservation on the proposed budget and the scale of contribution and will decide on its contributions on the basis of finalized management plans and a costed programme of work. It was agreed by the Range States to change the footnote accordingly.

Decisions and Actions:

The presented budget estimate for 2019 (Annex 1) was agreed with one reservation from Germany.

Scenario 5 of the scale of contributions from 2019 onwards, with a 15% cap (Annex 2), was accepted by the nine paying Range States as indicative figures for their contributions, with contributions remaining voluntary, as before.

The **Secretariat** will produce a preliminary indicative annual costed programme of work for the EGMP for 2019 by autumn 2018.

The **Secretariat** will communicate to the Range States in January 2019, after MOP7, regarding potential adjustments to next year’s costed programme of work and any possible revisions of the 2019 budget.

The **Secretariat** will prepare new proposals for scale of contributions with minimum contributions of 2,000 EUR from Range States to be considered at EGM IWG4 in June 2019 for 2020 onwards.

Agenda item 7. Analysis of National Reports 2018 and National Reporting Format

37. According to Rule 32 of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG, Range States shall report on their activities to the EGM IWG annually. A draft format for the national reporting has been circulated to the Range States and launched in February 2018 after taking into account comments received on format and analysis. A presentation was given by Ms Meyers on the basis of document AEWA /EGMIWG/3.6 *Analysis of EGMP National Reports for the period 2017-2018*, outlining the scope of activities implemented in the period by the Range States.

38. 13 of 14 countries submitted national reports in 2018, with one late submission not included in the analysis. The reporting format is split into three sections:

- General non-species-specific reporting
- Pink-footed Goose (Svalbard population)
- Taiga Bean Goose (Eastern Management Unit (MU) and Western & Central MU)

39. Regarding the management measures applied to manage agricultural conflict related to geese in the agricultural sector, the Range States agreed to monitor the effectiveness of such measures that are applied and share experiences with other countries, for example via the Agriculture Task Force.

40. The level of work on the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose is quite advanced in the Range States with activities implemented in all Range States, national and/or regional working groups established, and key sites protected. The Range States resolved to raise awareness, particularly amongst the local hunting communities on their role and responsibility to participate in the management of the population. This work could also be underpinned by the EGMP communication strategy, which is yet to be developed.

41. In the Eastern 1 MU of the Taiga Bean Goose, knowledge still needs to be improved and dedicated monitoring programmes developed. Especially amongst hunters, awareness and identification skills need to be improved to complement the legislation changes, where funding allows. The Range States agreed to ensure

the implementation of the activities included in the biannual Taiga Bean Goose implementation plan 2017-2018, include the activities in consecutive implementation plans and intensify the work on the MU.

42. The Range States of the Central and Western MU resolved to strengthen the goose identification skills and raise awareness on the status of different goose (sub-) populations amongst the hunters, as well as communicate achievements on Taiga Bean Goose conservation, i.e. through the EGMP communication strategy.

43. A question was raised regarding the inclusion of Germany as a Range State to the Central MU of the Taiga Bean Goose, with the Data Centre stating that the MU's flyway stretches from Finland, Sweden, Norway, the UK and Denmark infrequently into the north-eastern states of Germany. After discussions in a small break-out group it was agreed that the Taiga Bean Goose Central MU range administratively will remain as it is; however, due to birds from the Central MU potentially mixing with the Eastern 1 MU during cold winters in Eastern Germany, which forms part of the Central MU flyway as a cold-weather refuge, Germany has agreed to make efforts to improve monitoring and share data and information on the MU as appropriate. Since for the time being it is not possible to distinguish between Taiga Bean Geese belonging to the Eastern 1 MU and to the Central MU in this region, Germany's national reporting will focus on the Eastern MU with strengthened monitoring activities. How Germany will produce and deliver the data on Central unit is still an ongoing process and will be confirmed at a later stage.

44. The Range States took note of the analysis of EGMP national reports for 2017-2018 and agreed to continue with a similar reporting format in future cycles, ensuring continuity of data to monitor implementation of the management plans and identify major implementation gaps. Prior to launching an annual reporting cycle, a round of consultation with the Range States will take place to fine tune the format, which will consecutively be approved by the Chair of the IWG.

Decision and Actions:

The EGM IWG took note of the analysis of the EGMP national reports for 2017-2018 and agreed to continue with a similar reporting format in the future.

Prior to launching a new annual reporting cycle, the **Secretariat** will be sending out a revised national reporting format for consultation with the Range States. The **IWG Chair** will approve the final format.

Range States agreed to monitor the effectiveness of management measures applied and share experiences with other countries, regarding agricultural conflict and damage.

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

The **Range States of the Taiga Bean Goose Eastern 1 MU** agreed to ensure the implementation of the activities of the biannual Taiga Bean Goose implementation plan 2017-2018 and include the activities in consecutive implementation plans and intensify the work on the MU.

The **Range States of the Central and Western MU** resolved to strengthen the goose identification skills and raise awareness on the status of different goose (sub-) populations amongst the hunters, as well as communicate achievements on Taiga Bean Goose conservation. The Taiga Bean Goose Central MU range will administratively remain as it is; however, Germany will be recognized as contributing state and share data and information on the MUs as they become available.

Agenda item 8. Guidance on Implementation of Adaptive Harvest Management (AHM) through domestic legal regulations

45. Ms Melissa Lewis, Environmental Law Expert on the AEWA Technical Committee, presented on the *Guidance on Implementation of AHM through Domestic Legal Regulations* (document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.7) to the Range States. The EGM IWG2 had mandated the Secretariat to outsource the development of these model legal approaches for transposing annual international decisions concerning harvest quotas and season opening/closure into national decision-making processes and collecting comprehensive harvest data to suit the AHM process annually. The document was produced in consultation with the EGMP Secretariat and Data Centre and draws from the lessons learned by those European states that are already endeavouring to implement AHM. Two drafts were circulated for comments to the Range States and other stakeholders, and revisions were made accordingly.

46. The document describes “ideal” approaches to be used once processes for AHM are in place within the framework of an ISSAP or ISSMP. The guidance is not legally binding. Its purpose is to assist Range States in assessing and adjusting their domestic legislation as necessary. It is up to Range States to determine whether and how to implement the recommended actions, bearing in mind their obligations under AEWA and other legal instruments. The document is not intended to provide general guidance on hunting legislation. It is specifically directed towards domestic implementation of flyway level AHM and it is specific to species with regular hunting seasons, not species that can only be hunted under derogation.

47. The document identifies factors to be considered nationally when regulating hunting seasons/quotas annually in response to decisions of the EGM IWG and makes suggestions regarding the approaches and legislative provisions that can facilitate domestic implementation of these decisions in an expeditious manner. The document also provides recommendations on the types of legislative provisions that can be used to support the collection of hunting bag data and the communication of this data to the AEWA Secretariat. Model language for domestic legislative provisions implementing the document’s recommendations is suggested in an appendix to the document.

48. The European Commission stated that controlling species under derogation is not the same as controlling species by hunting and requested that this distinction be expressed more clearly throughout the document. It was suggested that examples of appropriate amendments might include changing the title of section 2.3 to “Hunting seasons and derogations” and including a separate point in the document’s summary of recommendations concerning compliance with Article 9 of the Birds Directive. It was agreed that a series of minor amendments would be made, in consultation with the European Commission, in order to reflect this concern and clearly distinguish between hunting and derogations.

49. On the request of France, part 4 of the appendix will be reworded to “...the hunter’s name [and/or] identification number...”.

Decision:

The draft guidance on implementing AHM through domestic legal regulations was adopted by the Meeting, subject to the minor amendments that were raised in the course of the discussion.

Pink-footed Goose Session

Agenda item 9. Pink-footed Goose (Svalbard population) status update

50. Referring to document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.8, the *Pink-footed Goose Population Status Update 2017-2018*, Professor Jesper Madsen presented the summary of the population status for the Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose. The compilation of the annual monitoring data is used to assess population development and provide input for the modelling of an optimal harvest strategy for the next season (2018/2019) as part of the AHM framework to support the implementation of the ISSMP for the Pink-footed Goose Svalbard population. An overview on annual routines in the monitoring, as well as assessment and decision making in AHM was given.

51. The Svalbard population of the Pink-footed Goose was estimated at c. 72,000 individuals in the autumn count 2017 (used as the estimate for the 2017/2018 season) and c. 67,000 individuals in the spring count 2018, showing a slight decrease after a poor breeding season due to low temperatures in May 2017. No data from Germany has been available to be included in these figures. Breeding in 2018 is expected to be high due to record high temperatures in Svalbard in May 2018.

52. By mid-May the harvest data is collected from the Range States. The harvest of the Pink-footed Goose of the Svalbard population has been increasing in the last 10-15 years with especially high numbers in two of the three years in which January harvest has been permitted (2014/2015 and 2016/2017).

53. Various indicators of agricultural damage related to Pink-footed Geese have been compiled from Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium. This will also flow into the revision of the ISSMP in 2020.

54. There have also been some dramatic changes to the migration path, with flocks of 4,000-5,000 staging in Sweden and Finland. The full extent of the change in migration is not known yet, but neck banding with GSM transmitters has taken place in spring 2018 and will hopefully give a fuller picture to be reported to the next EGM IWG meeting in June 2019.

Agenda item 10. Pink-footed Goose (Svalbard population) AHM update and recommendations

55. Taking reference to the *Adaptive Harvest Management for the Svalbard Population of the Pink-footed Goose. 2018 Progress Summary* (Document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.9), Mr Fred Johnson, outlined the current progress on the development and implementation of AHM measures for maintaining Pink-footed Goose near their target level population of 60,000.

56. Using the Adaptive Management process, the optimal harvest strategy is calculated using nine population models and their associated weights. Model weights are updated by comparing the predictions with the observed change in abundance, where models that are better predictors of observed population size gain more weight.

57. Based on the November 2017 population counts, the optimal harvest quota for the 2018/2019 hunting season is approximately 27,000. The decrease of harvest quota compared to 2017/2018 (36,000) is largely due to an apparent decline in population size. The national quotas for Norway (30%) and Denmark (70%) for 2018/2019 will lie at 8,100 and 18,900 respectively. The harvest quota is unlikely to be reached, as it never has been exhausted in the past, but it is likely to be sufficient to stabilise the abundance of the Pink-footed Goose population.

58. Since about 2008 it can be seen that the nine models have lost accuracy predicting the actual population size (mostly underestimating the population) and therefore alternative prediction models have been explored. The currently ongoing development of an Integrated Population Model (IPM) was presented to the delegates, using all demographic data of the Pink-footed Goose in one single analysis. The optimal harvest quota for 2018 using IPM is lower, with a recommendation of 15,000, because the IPM estimate of the November population is lower than the November count, and the IPM model does not consider May temperatures in Svalbard.

59. For the long-term, exploring the viability of using IPM, especially when experiencing reduced availability of monitoring data, will be part of the research undertaken, since monitoring is costly and may not be sustainable at the same level at all times. The outcomes may be valuable not only for Pink-footed Goose, but also for other monitoring programmes. The development of IPM is going well and once the analysis and external peer review are concluded, hopefully the IPM model can be recommended for use at the EGM IWG meeting 2019.

60. The recommendation for the next year is to continue using AHM to stabilise the population of Pink-footed Goose at 60,000 and continue using the nine models until the IPM has been fully developed and is ready for recommendation.

61. Denmark will keep the current hunting season and adopt the recommended quota. Also, Norway will recommend the suggested quota.

Decision:

The recommendation to keep using AHM based on the nine models for predictions in population size was confirmed for the following year for the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose, to be examined again next year, with the possibility to use a new Integrated Population Model from 2019 onwards. The harvest quota for 2018 was set at 27,000, with the recognition that it was unlikely to be attained.

The harvest quota will be divided between **Denmark** and **Norway** according to an agreed 70:30 ratio. The countries will implement national harvest regulation to regulate the harvest for the coming 2018-2019 hunting season.

Agenda item 11. Report and Recommendations from the Pink-footed Goose Task Force

62. Professor Jesper Madsen, Coordinator of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force, presented the Task Force's work and recommendations to the IWG, referring to document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.10/Rev.1 (*Report and recommendations of the EGMP Pink-footed Goose Task Force and Workplan for 2018/2019*). The Task Force's membership has good representation from the Range States with governmental, NGO and scientific backgrounds (Annex 3). An overview on meetings held and key activities, as well as recommendations to the EGM IWG was given.

63. The Task Force constitutes a good forum to support and discuss the ongoing activities of monitoring the progress of the implementation of the ISSMP on AHM and non-AHM monitoring activities. It supports the improvement of the organisation of hunting in Denmark and Norway to support the AHM strategy and acts as a review panel for annual monitoring and assessment reports for the Pink-footed Goose ISSMP and other activities. A need for improved data on socio-economic impact of geese and on tundra degradation has been identified by the Task Force. Regarding the tundra degradation, the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose has just become part of a new initiative in Norway, an integrated long-term ecological monitoring programme (Climate-ecological Observatory for Arctic Tundra - COAT). Data might be available on this programme in one to two years.

64. The EGM IWG accepted the proposed recommendations of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force and activities to be included in the workplan of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force for 2018/2019 as presented in Annex 3.

65. The Netherlands requested to add the aspect of damage reduction/prevention, as clear target of the management plans into the work of the Task Forces and their recommendations, not solely focussing on hunting and harvest. Mr Madsen explained the point is implicitly contained in the proposed criteria for revising the ISSMP.

66. It was stated by Norway that the figures on damage derived from subsidy schemes can in some cases be skewed, since compensation is a political tool correlating with damage, but not necessarily showing increases.

Decision:

The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2018/2019 of the Pink-footed Goose Task Force as presented in Annex 3.

Taiga Bean Goose Session

Agenda item 12. Taiga Bean Goose population status update

67. Referring to document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.11, *Taiga Bean Goose Population Status Report 2017-2018*, Ms Gitte Høj Jensen from the EGMP Data Centre presented an update on the Taiga Bean Goose population in the four MUs (Western, Central, Eastern 1 and Eastern 2). The annually compiled monitoring data is used to assess the population development of Taiga Bean Geese and provides input to the modelling for the optimal harvest strategy and quota.

68. The Western Unit with a latest count estimate of 948 in 2018 in the wintering grounds in Denmark and UK, is slightly declining in numbers. The Western Unit is protected from hunting. The data might not show to be complete, since the counts in Denmark are still preliminary, difficulties in locating birds in Jutland and some geese may be “short-stopping” on the continent instead of carrying on to Denmark and UK for wintering.

69. In the Central unit telemetry data have shown that Taiga Bean Geese wintering in the Netherlands partially belong to the Central Unit, expanding the original Range States Sweden (with a large majority of the birds), Denmark, Finland, Germany and Russia. The total population numbers from the 2017/2018 counts are 38,717, with no data available for Germany, signifying a decline from the last years or incomplete counts – the latter being most realistic as count during autumn and spring show consistently higher numbers. The Central MU Taiga Bean Geese are legally hunted in Russia, Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Finland.

70. Regarding the Eastern 1 and 2 MUs, no updated data on population counts or hunting bag is available. However, Taiga Bean Geese have been tagged in the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug (YaNAO) region in Russia, making data available on the migration route south to the boarder of China and Kazakhstan. On the request of a Russian researcher, the Chair of the EGM IWG wrote a letter to the governor of the YaNAO region with respect to include the Taiga Bean Goose in the Red Book of YaNAO.

Agenda item 13. Taiga Bean Goose AHM update and recommendations

71. Mr Fred Johnson presented on the *Harvest Assessment for Taiga Bean Geese in the Central Management Unit: 2018* (document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.10/Rev.1) to the Meeting. The management objective for the Central Management unit of Taiga Bean Goose in the ISSMP has been set to 60,000-80,000 individuals in 2015. In 2017 a constant harvest rate (adult) of 3% had been set as an interim strategy to allow for population recovery, whilst providing a limited sustainable hunting opportunity. The quota is shared among the Range States as follows: Russia 15%, Finland 49%, Sweden 26% and Denmark 10%.

72. Currently the Taiga Bean Geese in the Central MU are harvested under a constant harvest strategy, maintaining a low level of harvest regardless of abundance of the Taiga Bean Goose. Mr Johnson also presented a dynamic harvest strategy, mathematically deriving harvest quotas based on management objectives and population dynamics. The dynamic model closes hunting when the population drops below 65,000 and increases the harvest when the population exceeds 70,000. It is not yet an AHM model, as monitoring programmes are still insufficient for providing the necessary feedback for reducing the uncertainty about population dynamics and the impact of harvest. The dynamic harvest strategy can also be applied with weights on the population and harvest objectives, representing a compromise on the population goal to provide for a greater hunting opportunity or other management goals.

73. The constant harvest strategy quota for 2018 lies at 1,610, whereas the dynamic quota is zero, as the abundance must exceed around 65,000 for a hunting quota to be considered. This year particularly there is little confidence in the accuracy of either quota, due to the unreliable January count and the pending hunting bag data from Sweden. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force will prioritize addressing this monitoring issue.

74. The recommendation is to continue following the same principle and maintain the constant quota of 3% for the next year, revisiting the issue in 2019. The harvest quota for 2018 lies at 1,610.

Decision:

The Meeting agreed to continue using the constant harvest quota of 3% for the next year, revisiting the issue in 2019. The harvest quota for 2018 has been set at 1,610 individuals.

Finland, Sweden and Denmark take the necessary steps to implement harvest regulations to adjust the harvest for the coming 2018-2019 hunting season. The **Taiga Bean Task Force** will investigate possibilities for better monitoring to address the issue of unreliable counts resulting in variable quotas.

Agenda item 14. Report and Recommendations from the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force

75. Mr Mikko Alhainen, Coordinator for the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force of the EGMP presented on the work progress and recommendations to the EGM IWG, referring to document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.13/Rev.1. The EGMP Taiga Bean Goose Task Force has been established concurrently with the Pink-footed Goose and Agriculture Task Force in accordance with Rule 29 of the EGMP Modus Operandi. The overview given included information on the members of the Task Force (Annex 4), meetings taken place, key activities and outcomes and recommendations to the EGM IWG.

76. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force developed a prioritized workplan and identified key issues for each of the four MUs of the Taiga Bean Goose. Since the EGMP Task Forces operate without dedicated operational budget, activities were also prioritized taking this factor into account. The Task Force also established two sub-groups dealing specifically with the Western/Central MU and Eastern 1 & 2 MU. Range States are encouraged to build working groups on the national level to support the implementation of the activities of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force.

77. Recommendations of the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force to the EGM IWG:

1. To establish and fund a thematic sub-group to the Task Force including external goose monitoring experts not currently members of the Task Force, for the development of a monitoring framework and Range States to provide data accordingly.
2. Extension of the period of the non-AHM workplan from 2017-2018 until 2020 with small amendments as presented (Annex 4) and allocation of minimum resources for implementation of key actions as listed in the workplan.

78. Mr Alhainen also mentioned that Belarus had recently changed their hunting legislation resulting in a longer spring-hunting period and open access for foreign hunters, thereby increasing the threat to the Eastern1 MU. The Task Force recommended to the EGM IWG to send an official letter to Belarus to highlight the requirements of the Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP, raise awareness on the impact of spring hunting to Taiga Bean Goose and request to limit the impact with hunting restrictions. The letter would be prepared by the Taiga Bean Goose Task Force and the Secretariat in cooperation. Belarus stated that the previous week a letter had been received from the Ministry of Nature Protection proposing a five-year moratorium on spring hunting. A decision to be made is due in the following week, therefore a letter of support from AEWA on avoiding spring hunting for the Taiga Bean Goose, as well as other species, is strongly appreciated.

79. The Taiga Bean Goose Task Force also requested a mandate from the EGM IWG to the Data Centre, to assess the possibilities to use the IPM for Taiga Bean Goose and present the outcome for decision at EGM IWG4, in order to counteract the issue of having to rely solely on a January count, which may bring issues as described in the presentation on AHM by Mr Johnson.

Decision and Actions:

The extension of the period of the non-AHM workplan from 2017-2018 until 2020 with small amendments (Annex 4) was agreed by the members of the EGM IWG.

The **Taiga Bean Goose Task Force** will establish a thematic sub-group, as agreed by the EGM IWG, including external goose monitoring experts, for the development of a monitoring framework. **Range States** are encouraged to provide expertise on a temporary basis by appointing relevant national monitoring experts to the Task Force and will consider provision of data as well as funding for national monitoring experts and TF members as appropriate and possible.

The EGM IWG mandated the **Taiga Bean Goose Task Force** to word a letter in cooperation with the Secretariat, to be sent by the EGM IWG Chair to Belarus, to highlight the requirements of the Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP, raise awareness on the impact of spring hunting and request to limit the impact with hunting restrictions.

The **Data Centre** will assess the suitability of the IPM for the Taiga Bean Goose and report to EGM IWG4.

General Session

Agenda item 15. Report and Recommendations from the Agriculture Task Force

80. Ms Ingunn Tombre, Coordinator of the Agriculture Task Force of the EGMP reported on the activities of the Task Force since inception, membership (Annex 5) and recommendations to the EGM IWG, referring to document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.14/Rev.1.

81. The role of the Agricultural Task Force has been defined to support and develop the implementation of an interdisciplinary cooperation framework for dealing with interactions between geese and agriculture. The Agriculture Task Force is an integrated Task Force, bringing together representatives of Range States and other experts to discuss issues on agricultural conflict with geese, compensation and subsidy schemes, damage

monitoring and other related information from the Range States, compare notes and learn from each other and discuss management systems.

82. The Task Force also brings results from research projects into the discussion, discussing links with real damage and implementation of management of agricultural conflict with geese. The Task Force cooperates closely with the Modelling Consortium, seeking solutions to bring the data from local and regional level to relevance for the national and international level. It was reiterated by Professor Jesper Madsen from the Data Centre that legally the distinction between damage by geese and conflict with geese in agriculture is important, with damage constituting the measurable parameter. The EGMP Task Force deals with damage from geese in the agricultural sector. Measurements of damage need to be comparable and coordinated.

83. The European Commission suggested the Agriculture Task Force could also play a crucial role assessing the impact of agricultural policy on the ground. EU agricultural policy largely influences national policy of EU states, so any project would involve the EC as major contributor. This constitutes a larger area of work and could be outsourced as a project if funding is identified.

84. The source of funding of the EGMP within the Range States in most cases currently is the Ministries of Environment. BirdLife International commented that a discussion should be initiated on this, since the issues dealt with by the EGMP are based on agricultural damage and therefore some responsibility for funding would lie with the Ministries of Agriculture. In reverse, the Agriculture Task Force Coordinator mentioned that this discussion is already ongoing within governments with compensations and subsidies currently being paid by the Ministries of Agriculture, but also argued to be the responsibility of the Environmental Authorities.

Decision:

The EGM IWG adopted the workplan for 2018/2019 of the Agriculture Task Force as presented in Annex 5.

Agenda item 16. Revision of the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG

85. Referring to the document AEWA/EGMIWG/3.15 the Secretariat presented the proposed changes to the Modus Operandi of the EGMP submitted by Norway on 6 April 2018. The changes apply to Rule 3 and Rule 5 of the document, requesting the inclusion of the ISSMPs for the Barnacle and Greylag Goose (Rule 3, paragraph 1), as well as inclusion of France, Iceland, Ireland and Spain to the EGMP Range States for the plans (Rule 5, paragraph 1), following their adoption by MOP7. The Range States agreed to adopt the proposed changes. The change will take effect after MOP7 if the Barnacle and Greylag Goose ISSMPs are approved by the MOP.

86. One further change to the Modus Operandi was suggested changing the wording “adaptive harvest management” to “adaptive flyway management” in Rule 3, paragraph 2. The Chair took note of the request by the Netherlands and suggested the input will be brought to the next EGM IWG meeting, circulating the change to the Range States 70 days before the meeting in line with the Modus Operandi (Rule 35).

Decision and Action:

The proposed changes to the Modus Operandi in Rule 3, paragraph 1 and Rule 5, paragraph 1 were adopted with the caveat of the draft ISSMPs for the Barnacle Goose and the Northwest/Southwest European population Greylag Goose being proposed for adoption at MOP7.

The Netherlands will bring forward the request for a further change to the EGMP Modus Operandi regarding changing the wording in Rule 3 paragraph 2 to “adaptive flyway management”; to be brought to the next EGM IWG meeting in line with the Modus Operandi.

Agenda item 17. Election of the new country to Chair the EGM IWG

87. In line with the Modus Operandi of the EGMP the term of the current Chair's term ends with the closure of the 3rd EGM IWG meeting, bringing about the need to elect a new Chair. The Secretariat has conducted consultations with several countries. Denmark has offered to be put forward to Chair the EGM IWG for the next two-year period, up to June 2020, ending with the EGM IWG5 meeting. No alternative proposals for chairing the EGM IWG were brought forward by the Range States. The Range States unanimously agreed to elect Denmark as new Chair to the EGM IWG.

Decision:

Denmark was elected as new Chair to the EGM IWG for the duration of two years until June 2020 in accordance with the Modus Operandi of the EGM IWG.

Agenda item 18. Next AEWA EGM IWG Meeting

88. Mr Dereliev informed the delegates that the next annual meeting of the EGM IWG was tentatively scheduled to take place during three days within the week of 17-21 June 2019, with EGMP Task Force meetings preceding and 1 to 1½ days for the EGM IWG4 meeting. To allow for national holidays in Finland, Sweden and Iceland on 21 and 17 of June respectively, the dates were set tentatively to 18-20 June 2019. The Range States will be consulted before a final decision is taken.

89. The United Kingdom offered to host the EGMP Task Force and the EGM IWG meeting, which will be held back-to-back.

90. Representing the United Kingdom, Ms Rae McKenzie reiterated that her Government was happy to organise both, the Task Force meetings and the EGM IWG4 in June 2019 in Scotland, with the Scottish National Heritage hosting. She looked forward to welcoming all the participants to Scotland and to a fruitful meeting.

Decision and Action:

The delegates agreed on the dates for the 2019 annual meeting, to be held 18-20 June 2019, held back-to-back with EGMP Task Force meetings. The United Kingdom offered to host the meetings in Scotland and the offer was accepted by the EGM IWG.

Agenda item 19. Next Steps and Closure

91. The Chair acknowledged that whilst a lot of work lies ahead for the next cycle for the EGMP, all the objectives of the Meeting had been achieved. The population modelling work, as well as the Task Forces have picked up speed in their work, but further developments are to be expected. Two Species Management Plans are being implemented and two further might be added to the workplan of the EGMP after adoption at MOP7. Some good discussions ensued during the meeting around budgeting and funding, MUs of species, etc. and some good progress on difficult issues has been made, including agreement on quotas. He thanked those present for their active and productive contributions. Special thanks were due to the EGMP Secretariat and the Data Centre for the excellent substantive and logistical preparation of the meeting and to the Province of Friesland for the exceptionally efficient organisation and for providing very good venues, which contributed substantially to the success of the meeting.

92. Mr Dereliev likewise thanked the Range States and the outgoing Chair in the name of the Secretariat for a well-run, constructive meeting with a high level of engagement and commitment. The budget discussions were dynamic with a positive outcome within possibilities of the Range States, lending much more awareness on the funding needs to be contributed to the EGMP throughout the year. He especially thanked France, the Netherlands and the UK for the pledges made during the meeting towards the 2018 budget, lending

predictability to the EGMP on the ability to deliver on the mandate. He went on to thank the host for making this week in Leeuwarden one to remember and also the venue staff, who had been extremely helpful.

93. Mr Gerben Mensink in the name of the Province of Friesland also thanked all present for contributing to a smooth meeting, producing some positive and encouraging outcomes.

94. With that the Chair declared the Meeting closed.

Annex 1
Budget estimate for the EGMP for 2019

EGMP Secretariat budget	
	2019
EGMP Coordinator (100%)	€142,000.00
EGMP Programme Management Assistant (100%)	€80,000.00
EGMP Secretariat operational budget	€35,000.00
EGM IWG annual meeting	€25,000.00
Total EGMP Secretariat budget	€282,000.00
EGMP Data Centre budget	
	2019
EGMP Goose monitoring coordinator (100%)	€96,000.00
EGMP Population modelling expert (50%)	€48,000.00
EGMP Lead compiler (22.5 %)	€30,000.00
EGMP Data Centre operational budget	€10,000.00
Total EGMP Data Centre	€184,000.00
Grand Total EGMP Budget	€466,000.00

Annex 2

EGMP indicative scale of contribution: Scenario 5 with 15% cap

Budget 2019 Secretariat 282,000 €

Budget 2019 Data Centre 184,000 €

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

* non-member Range States

** non-paying Range States

*** Germany has a reservation on the proposed budget and the scale of contribution and will decide on its contributions on the basis of a costed programme of work

Annex 3

Pink-footed Goose Task Force workplan and membership

Draft workplan for the Pink-footed Goose Task Force 2018/2019

ISSAP / ISSMP Objective/Action/Result	Activity	Lead	Time-frame	Comments
Review of annual assessment reports for the Pink-footed Goose	Comment on draft reports	Data Centre	First half of June 2019	TF members conduct the review
Review of new Integrated Population Model to be implemented in 2019	Review of report	FAJ	February 2019	New action
Proposal for improved hunting organisation in Norway and Denmark	National consultations; compilation of a note	OMG and IHS	March 2019	
Ecosystem services assessment	Proposal for monitoring and assessment; report	IT and JM	March 2019	Needs social scientist to lead
Adjustment of monitoring activities	Report with recommendations to EGM IWG	Data Centre	March 2019	
Ecosystem impacts	Status of tundra degradation; report	JM	February 2019	
Habitat restoration	Belgian project status; report	FV, EK and CV	March 2019	

FAJ Fred A. Johnson

OMG Ove Martin Gundersen

IT Ingunn Tombre

JM Jesper Madsen

FV Floris Verhaege

EK Eckhart Kuijken

CV Christine Verscheure

Membership of Pink-footed Goose Task Force as of 16 May 2018

Country	Representative	Affiliation
Belgium	Floris Verhaeghe	Species policy expert, Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos
	Frank Huysentruyt	Institute for Nature and Forest Research
	Eckhart Kuijken	Research Institute for Nature and Forest, Flemish Government of Belgium
Denmark	Jesper Madsen (<i>Coordinator</i>)	Aarhus University
	Iben Hove Sørensen	Danish Hunters' Association
	Niels-Erik Jørgensen	Danish Hunters' Association
	Knud Flensted	BirdLife Denmark
	Marco Brodde	BirdLife Denmark
Finland	Jorma Pessa	Centre for Economic Development
Netherlands	Fred Cottaar	Dutch Goose and Swan Working Group
	Kees Koffijberg	Sovon Vogelonderzoek Nederland
Norway	Ingunn Tombre	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Department of Arctic Ecology
	Ove Martin Gundersen (member of the TF until further notice)	Norwegian Farmer's Union
Sweden	Urban Johannson	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

EGMP Data Centre	Fred A. Johnson	Wetlands & Aquatic Research Center U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
EGMP Data Centre	Gitte Høj Jensen	Aarhus University
AEWA Secretariat	Eva Meyers	UNEP/AEWA

Annex 4

Taiga Bean Goose Task Force workplan and membership

Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions of the AEWA Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP (2018-2020)

Eastern 1 & 2 Management Units

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

ISSAP actions ²	Detailed activities ³	Lead ⁴	Time-frame ⁵	Budget ⁶	Priority ⁷
<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	2018-2020		Essential
	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.)	2018-2020		Essential

² From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted blue

³ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted blue

⁴ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Leads on activities are still to be revised and defined

⁵ To be defined

⁶ To be defined

⁷ Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted in blue; the priority of the remaining activities will be revised and defined

Annex 4 Taiga Bean Goose Task Force workplan and membership

ISSAP actions ²	Detailed activities ³	Lead ⁴	Time-frame ⁵	Budget ⁶	Priority ⁷
	<p>b) Carry out satellite/GPS-tagging of Taiga Bean Geese in the wintering/staging areas to further identify and map potential key sites as well as migratory patterns (potentially tag birds in Eastern Germany, Lithuania, Belarus or in Ukraine)</p> <p>Range States: best location for implementation to be decided</p>	TBG Task Force	2018-2020		High
	<p>c) Increase efforts to engage Poland and Russia (especially Kaliningrad)</p>	Lithuania Finland Norway	2018-2020		High
Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels					
1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	<p>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.</p> <p>Range States: Belarus, Ukraine</p>	National NGOs and research institutes in cooperation with the TBG Task Force			
	<p>1.2.2.2 Produce and disseminate special publication on the occurrence of Taiga Bean Geese</p> <p>Range States: Ukraine</p>	National NGOs and research institutes			

Workplan for the implementation of non-AHM related actions of the AEWA Taiga Bean Goose ISSAP (2018-2020)

Western and Central Management Units

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

ISSAP actions ⁸	Detailed activities ⁹	Lead ¹⁰	Time-frame ¹¹	Budget ¹²	Priority ¹³
<i>Result 1.2. Illegal harvest is reduced to non-significant levels</i>					
Action 1.2.2. Raise identification skills and awareness of the status of different goose species amongst hunters	1.2.2.1 Investigate TBG shooting NE Jutland & Zealand Range States: Denmark		On-going since 2017		High
<i>Result 1.3. Impact of huntable native predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced</i>					
Action 1.3.1. Maintain and strengthen predator control measures in breeding and moulting areas	1.3.1.1 Undertake annual campaign amongst hunters in the breeding areas to strengthen fox management Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency + hunting association			

⁸ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted orange

⁹ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted orange

¹⁰ From workplan for the implementation of non-AHM actions of the TBG ISSAP for 2017-2018; Leads on the activities are still to be revised and defined

¹¹ To be defined

¹² To be defined

¹³ Essential and High priority activities identified by the Task Force highlighted in blue; the priority of the remaining activities will be revised and defined

Annex 4 Taiga Bean Goose Task Force workplan and membership

ISSAP actions ⁸	Detailed activities ⁹	Lead ¹⁰	Time-frame ¹¹	Budget ¹²	Priority ¹³
	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			
Result 1.4. Impact of alien predators in breeding and moulting areas is reduced					
Action 1.4.1. Maintain and strengthen alien predator control and eradication measures in breeding and moulting areas	1.4.1.1 Carry on the eradication of raccoon dog in Lapland & Sweden Range States: Finland, Sweden	Finnish Wildlife Agency / Swedish Hunters' Association		FI: Secured (150,000 EUR) SE: secured (800,000 EUR)	
Result 2.2. Interspecific competition in spring staging areas is reduced					
Action 2.2.1. Maintain the unharvested-fields-for-birds programme (within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union, if applicable)	2.2.1.1 Continue implementing the fields for geese programme Range States: Sweden	County Administrative Boards		secured	
	2.2.1.2 Ministry of Agriculture to maintain this programme in the national CAP starting form 2020 Range States: Finland	Ministry of Agriculture			
	2.2.1.3 Demonstrate the benefits of the programme to the Agriculture Department of the Ministry of Agriculture Range States: Finland	Finnish Wildlife Agency			
Result 3.1. Impact of forestry works is reduced					

ISSAP actions ⁸	Detailed activities ⁹	Lead ¹⁰	Time-frame ¹¹	Budget ¹²	Priority ¹³
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			
Action 3.1.2. Continue restoring mires used by Taiga Bean Geese that have been affected by past drainage	3.1.2.1 Implement annual goals for mire restoration by Parks & Wildlife Finland set by the Ministry of Environment Range States: Finland	Parks & Wildlife Finland			
	3.1.2.2 Develop and submit LIFE application to the EC Range States: Finland	Parks & Wildlife Finland			
Result 3.3. Breeding, staging and wintering habitats are not further lost due to oil and gas or renewable energy developments					
Action 3.3.1. Take account of Taiga Bean Goose breeding, staging and wintering habitats in the planning of new oil and gas and renewable energy developments	3.3.1.1 Assessment of new windfarm developments collision risk posed to Taiga Bean close to the Special Protection Areas identified as their important wintering sites Range States: Denmark and other Range States as applicable	National governments, National research institutes and windfarming companies	Ongoing	Secured	High (applied conditional to new wind farm developments)
Result 3.4. Impact of agriculture on natural Taiga Bean Goose habitats is minimised					
Action 3.4.1. Restore wet grassland habitats in staging and wintering areas	3.4.1.1 Increase the area of managed coastal grassland under CAP Range States: Finland	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment		secured	

Annex 4 Taiga Bean Goose Task Force workplan and membership

ISSAP actions ⁸	Detailed activities ⁹	Lead ¹⁰	Time-frame ¹¹	Budget ¹²	Priority ¹³
Action 3.4.2. Review of & responses to rapid declines in England	3.4.2.1. Review factors possibly contributing to rapid declines in eastern England and implement appropriate management responses, as appropriate	(for UK to determine)	(for UK to determine)	(for UK to determine)	(for UK to determine)

Membership of Taiga Bean Goose Task Force as of 12 May 2018

Country	Representative	Affiliation
Denmark	Anthony Fox	Aarhus University
	Iben Hove Sørensen	Danish Hunters Association
	Niels-Erik Jørgensen	Danish Hunters Association
	Knud Flensted	BirdLife Denmark
Finland	Mikko Alhainen (<i>Coordinator</i>)	Finnish Wildlife Agency
Germany	Ulrich Hardt	Ministry of Rural Development, Environment and Agriculture of the State of Brandenburg
Norway	Ingunn Tombre	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Department of Arctic Ecology
Sweden	Per Risberg	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Ukraine	Olesya Petrovych	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (Chief Specialist in Dept. Of Protected Areas)
	Vasyl Kostushyn	Institute of Zoology NAS of Ukraine, Department of Monitoring and Conservation of Animals
United Kingdom	Morag Milne (rep for Scotland)	Scottish Natural Heritage's Wildlife Policy Officer
	Bart Donato (rep for England)	Natural England
Wetlands International	Szabolcs Nagy	Wetlands International
EGMP Data Centre	Fred Johnson	Wetland & Aquatic Research Center U.S. Geological Survey / USGS
Bird Ringing Center	Sonia Rozenfeld	Bird Ringing Center
EGMP Data Centre	Gitte Høj Jensen	Aarhus University
AEWA Secretariat	Eva Meyers	UNEP/AEWA

Annex 5

Agriculture Task Force workplan and membership

Workplan for Agriculture Task Force 2018/2019

ISSAP / ISSMP Objective/Action/Result	Activity	Lead	Time-frame	Comments
1. Overview Range States; Goose-agriculture conflicts	1.1 Adding information to the compensation/ subsidy systems overview for geese, presented at the EGM IW3, giving a broader picture of goose-agriculture perspectives in Range States	I. Tombre, input from Task Force Members	Ongoing	
	1.2 Create an open-access report or scientific publication based on the information from 1.1	I. Tombre, input from Task Force Members	March 2019	
2. Assist the EGM IWG	2.1 Evaluate and provide feedback to various documents from the Modelling Consortium, other Task Forces and the EGM IWG.	Task Force member to be identified depending on the document in question, with input from all Task Force Members	2018 - 2019	

Membership of Agriculture Task Force as of 11 May 2018

Country / Organisation	Representative	Affiliation
Belgium	Joost Vanpeteghem *	Flemish Government, Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Belgium	Bram D'hondt	Flemish Government, Agency for Nature and Forest
Belgium	Frank Huysentruyt	Flemish Government, Institute for Nature and Forest Research
Denmark	Camilla Uldal	Danish Environment Protection Agency
Denmark	Anthony Fox	Aarhus University, Department of Bioscience
Germany	Heinz Düttmann	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate, Protection of Lower Saxony
Netherlands	Bart Nolet	Netherlands Institute of Ecology
Netherlands	Mark Westebring	The Fauna Fund
Norway	Ingunn Tombre (Coordinator)	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
Sweden	Johan Månsson	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Wildlife Damage Center
Sweden	Lovisa Nilsson	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,

Country / Organisation	Representative	Affiliation
		Wildlife Damage Center
Ukraine	Olesya Petrovych	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine, Department of Protected Areas
Ukraine	Vasyl Kostyshyn	Institute of Zoology NAS of Ukraine, Department of Monitoring and Conservation of Animals
United Kingdom	Rae McKenzie	Scottish Natural Heritage
BirdLife International	Ariel Brunner *	BirdLife Europe, BirdLife International
BirdLife International	Nicole Feige	BirdLife Europe, BirdLife International
Copa Cogeca/EU Farmers	Karen Post	Copa and Cogeca, EU Farmers
FACE	Roderick Enzerink	FACE
FACE	David Scallan	FACE
Wetlands International	Szabolcs Nagy	Wetlands International
EGMP Data Centre (AU)	Gitte Høj Jensen	EGMP Data Centre (AU)
AEWA Secretariat	Eva Meyers	AEWA Secretariat

* Not active member, but is informed about activities and may join as desired

Annex 6

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹⁴

BELARUS

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

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

BELGIUM

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

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

Dr Frank Huysentruyt (NE)
Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)
Wildlife Management
Havenlaan 88
1000 Brussels
Belgium

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

DENMARK

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

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

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

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

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

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

ESTONIA

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

Tel.: +37 250 168 69
Email: tonu.talvi@keskkonnaamet.ee

EUROPEAN UNION

Mr Joseph van der Stegen
European Commission, DG ENV
5, avenue de Beaulieu
Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +32 229 969 02
Email: joseph.van-der-stegen@ec.europa.eu

¹⁴ NGR – National Government Representative / NE – National Expert

FINLAND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FRANCE

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

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

Dr Léo Bacon (NE)
Office National de la Chasse et de la Faune
Sauvage (ONCFS)
Tour du valat
13200 Arles
France

Email: bacon.leo@gmail.com

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

Tel.: +33 627 327 188
Tel.: +33 490 972 879
E-mail: matthieu.guillemain@oncfs.gouv.fr

Mr Alexandre Czajkowski
Director
OMPO
59 rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

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

GERMANY

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

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

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

E-mail: Bettina.holsten@melund.landsh.de

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

Email: heinz.duettmann@mu.niedersachsen.de

Dr Timm Reinhardt
Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
Wildlife Conservation
Konstantinstrasse 110
53179 Bonn
Germany

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

ICELAND

Mr Sigurdur Thrainsson (NGR)
Head of Division
Ministry for the Environment and Natural
resources
Department of Land and Natural Heritage
Skuggasundi 1
IS-101 Reykjavik
Iceland

Tel.: +354 840 2419
Email: sigurdur.thrainsson@uar.is

Dr Gudmundur A. Gudmundsson (NE)
Ecologist
Icelandic Institute of Natural History
Ecology Department
PO Box 125
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
Nature Protection Department
Peldu iela 25
LV1494
Rīga
Latvia

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

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

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

NETHERLANDS

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

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

Mr Gerben Mensink (NGR)

Policy-maker Ecology
Province of Friesland
Postbus 20120
8900 Leeuwarden
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 582 928 955

Tel.: +31 615 488 725

E-mail: g.mensink@fryslan.nl

Ms Annegien A. Helmens

Policy Coordinator for Species Protection
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
Department of Nature and Biodiversity
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
Netherlands

Tel.: +31 648 131 335

Email: A.A.Helmens@minez.nl

Mr Kornelis Koffijberg (NE)

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

Tel.: +31 247 410 463

E-Mail: kees.koffijberg@sovon.nl

NORWAY

Mr Øystein Størkersen (NGR)

(EGM IWG Chair)

Principal Adviser
Norwegian Environment Agency
P.O. Box 5672 Sluppen
7485 Trondheim
Norway

Tel.: +47 7358 0500

E-mail: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

Mr Arild Espelien (NGR)

Senior Advisor
Norwegian Environment Agency
P.O. Box 5672 Sluppen
7485 Trondheim
Norway

Tel.: +47 415 123 96

E-mail: ares@dirnat.no

Dr Ingunn Tombre (NE)

Senior Researcher
Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
Department of Arctic Ecology
The Fram Centre
P.O. Box 6606 Langnes
9296 Tromsø
Norway

Tel.: +47 934 667 23

E-mail: ingunn.tombre@nina.no

Mr Ove Martin Gundersen

Project Manager
Norwegian Farmers' Union
P.O. Box / Street
Hamnegata 33
7714 Steinkjer
Norway

Tel.: +47 922 904 91

Email: ove.martin.gundersen@bondelaget.no

SWEDEN

Ms Louise Bednarz (NGR)

Scientific Officer
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Naturvardsverket
Valhallavägen 195
06 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 366

Email: louise.bednarz@swedishepa.se

Mr Per Risberg (NGR)

Desk Officer
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Naturvardsverket
Valhallavägen 195
06 48 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel.: +46 106 981 000

E-mail: per.risberg@naturvardsverket.se

Dr Johan Månsson (NE)

Associate Professor
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Grimsö Research Station
730 91 Riddarhytten
Sweden

Tel.: +46 581 679 325

E-mail: johan.mansson@slu.se

UKRAINE

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

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

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

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

Ms Melissa Lewis
Environmental Law Expert on the
AEWA Technical Committee
Tilburg University
Suite 64, Private Bag X4
3610 Kloof
South Africa

Tel.: +27 661 111 970
Email: M.G.Lewis@uvt.nl

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR GAME AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION (CIC)

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

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr David Stroud (NGR)
Senior Ornithologist
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
PE1 1JY Peterborough
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 1733 566 810
E-mail: David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk

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

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

INDIVIDUAL EXPERTS

OBSERVERS

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

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

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

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

Mr Roderick Enzerink
Conservation Assistant
FACE
Rue Belliard 205
1030 Brussels
Belgium

Tel.: +31 636 323 619
E-mail: Roderick.enzerink@face.eu

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

Dr Thibaut Powolny
OMPO
59, rue Ampère
75017 Paris
France

Tel.: +33 144 010 510
E-mail: Thibaut.powolny@yahoo.fr

WADDEN SEA FORUM

Mr Manfred Vollmer
Virchowstr.1
26382 Wilhelmshaven
Germany

Tel.: +49 4421 910 818
Email: vollmer@waddensea-forum.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

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

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

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

UNEP/AEWA SECRETARIAT

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

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

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

Tel: +49 228 815 2457
Mobile: +49 171 838 56 91
E-mail: eva.meyers@unep-aewa.org

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

Tel.: +49 228 815 2464
E-mail: christina.irven@unep-aewa.org

AEWA EGMP DATA CENTRE

Ms Gitte Høj Jensen
Goose Monitoring Coordinator
AEWA EGMP Data Centre
Aarhus University
Grenåvej 12
8410 Rønne
Denmark

E-mail: ghj@bios.au.dk

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

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

OTHER

Prof Colin Galbraith
45 Mounthooly Loan
EH10 7JD Edinburgh
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland

Tel: 44 77 66 14 47 00
E-mail: colingalbraith3@gmail.com