



East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership

Fourth Meeting of Partners, Songdo, Republic of Korea 23 and 24 February 2010

DRAFT, version 6

Report (Minutes) of the Fourth Meeting of Partners

A summary table of actions arising from the Fourth Meeting of Partners starts on page 19.

Participants

Partners represented at the Meeting:

Australasian Wader Studies Group – Ken Gosbell, Phil Straw
Australia – Paul O'Neill, Dwayne Purdy
BirdLife International – Noritaka Ichida, Simba Chan, Nobuhiko Kishimoto, Chin Aik Yeap
Convention on Migratory Species Secretariat – Douglas Hykle, Bert Lenten
Indonesia – Agus Sriyadi Budi Sutito, Dewi Malia Prawiradilaga
International Crane Foundation – James Harris
Japan – Zuiten Tsukamoto, Naoki Nakayama
The Philippines – Anson Tagtag
Ramsar Convention Secretariat – Taej Mundkur (WI) on behalf of Lew Young
Republic of Korea – Yeon-Man Jeong, Jong-Won Choi, Sung-Hyeon Jang, Jin-Han Kim
Royal Government of Cambodia – Sunleang Srey, Kimsan Eng
Russian Federation – Evgeny Syroechkovsky
United States of America – Douglas Alcorn
Wetlands International – Doug Watkins
Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust – Baz Hughes
WWF – Bena Smith, Satoshi Maekawa

Potential Partners represented at the Meeting:

Bangladesh – Tapan Kumar Dey
Malaysia – Hasdi bin Hassan
Thailand – Nirawan Pipitsombat
Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia – Seung-Oh Suh, Maurice Lineman

Other international observers:

African – Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement – Bert Lenten (also listed under CMS)
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Association (BANCA), Myanmar – Lunn Zau
Japanese Association for Wild Goose Protection (JAWGP), Japan – Masayuki Kurechi
Spoon-billed Sandpiper Recovery Team – Christoph Zockler

Other domestic observers:

Republic of Korea, Ministry of Environment – In-Hye Jang, Hwa-Jung Kim, Gou-Nee Sung, Kyoung-Hee Oh
Republic of Korea, Incheon City Government – Chang-Gu Lee, Sang-Ik Lee, Jung-Lyang Lee, Gwang-Chan An, Kuk-Hwa Lee
Republic of Korea, other local government – Sung-Woo Han, Yoong-Goo Kim (Gunsan City Government); Min-Cheol Park, Chang-Hoe Kim (Seosan City Government); In-Hwan Cha, Kil-Wook Yeo (Suncheon City Government); Tae-Uk Kwon (Gumi City Gov't).

Birds Korea – Nial Moores, Meena Park, Seong-Uk Cho
Gwanghwa Tidal Flat Center, Korea – Sun-Rae Kim
Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation, Korea – Namue Lee
Korea Waterbird Network (Crane Network) – Gi-Sup Lee, Hwa-Youn Jeong
Korea Wetland NGO Network – In-Sik Lee
Korea Wetland Project – Hyeon-Ju Lee
Kyeong-Hee University, Korea – Sun-Young Park
National Park Research Institute, Korea – Young-Soo Kwon
PGAI Korea – Dong-Uk Han
Ramsar Environment Foundation – Jin-Hae Park
Republic of Korea Bird Institution - Sun-Chang Song
Saemangeum Life-Peace Cheonbuk Union - Yong-Ki Ju
Seoul National University, Korea - Woo-Shin Lee
University of Seoul, Korea - Kyeong-Won Kim
Wetlands & Birds Korea - Kyung-Cheol Kim

Day 1, 23 February 2010

Agenda Item 1. Introductory session

Agenda Item 1.1 Opening speeches: Host Country and Host City

1. Chair of the Partnership, Dr. Yeon-Man Jeong, and the Vice-Mayor of the Host City, Mr. Chang-Gu Lee, were introduced by the EAAFP Chief Executive (Mr. Roger Jaensch).
2. Chair of the Partnership, Dr. Yeon-Man Jeong (Director-General, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of Environment, Republic of Korea) opened the meeting and welcomed delegates to Korea. The Chair expressed his concerns on climate change and the loss of biodiversity and pointed out that the concrete actions of the EAAFP can be a solution to these matters. He also encouraged governments and relevant organizations to participate in such actions.
3. Vice-Mayor of the Host City (Incheon), Mr. Chang-Gu Lee, made welcoming remarks expressing his gratitude to participants and noting that this meeting would contribute solutions to climate change. He expressed his willingness to fully cooperate with the Partnership and support its activities.

Agenda Item 1.2 Appointment of Meeting chairperson and rapporteurs

4. Partnership Chair expressed his sincere thanks to Partnership Vice-Chair, Mr. Zuiten Tsukamoto (Japan), for taking the role of Chairperson for MoP4.
5. Partnership Chair also appointed rapporteurs: Dr. Chang-Yong Choi and Ms. Aram Lee (EAAFP Secretariat), and Mr. Suh Seung-Oh (Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia). Mr. Maurice Lineman of RRCEA assisted Mr. Suh, with the endorsement of the EAAFP Chief Executive.
6. Photos were taken with the Partners and other participants.

Agenda Item 1.3 Approval of the Provisional Agenda for the 4th Meeting of Partners

7. Chief Executive referred delegates to Agenda Document version 3 and the provisional Meeting Agenda therein. The Partners accepted that agenda for the 4th Meeting of Partners.

Agenda Item 1.4 Welcome to Partners (existing and new) and Admittance of Observers

8. Chief Executive acknowledged a good representation of Partners (16). He also mentioned apologies from those Partners (5) that could not attend the meeting and their wishes to participate

in future activities of the Partnership.

9. In accordance with Paragraph 8 of the Partnership Document, recognising that no objections had been raised in the allotted time, the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) was admitted to the meeting as a new Partner. The Chief Executive welcomed Dr. Baz Hughes, representing WWT at MoP4, and advised that a Certificate of Participation would be prepared by the Secretariat and shortly presented to WWT.
10. Chief Executive also welcomed Potential Partners: Thailand, Malaysia, and Bangladesh (participating in its MoP), and Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia. He also gave a special welcome to supporters of the Partnership in the Host Country including Professor Woo-Shin Lee of Seoul National University, Dr. Kyoung-Hee Oh and Dr. Jin-Han Kim of the National Institute of Biological Resources of the Republic of Korea.
11. An attendance list was provided to participants during the meeting once latecomers had registered: there were 31 international and 39 domestic (total 70) registered participants as well as Secretariat staff (7) and volunteers (6). [Note: number of domestic participants is uncertain.]

Agenda Item 1.5 Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of Partners

12. The Report of the Third Meeting of Partners held on 6-7 November 2008 in Incheon, Republic of Korea, had been posted on the website for an extended period. It was accepted by the Partners as a true record.

Agenda Item 2. Overview reporting

Agenda Item 2.1 Overview reporting: Brief report from the Secretariat

13. Chief Executive introduced the Secretariat staff to the partners: Mr. Eui-Yeon Lee (Deputy), Mrs. Woo Mee-Hyang (Administration Officer) and Mr. Hyeong-Mun Kim (Finance Officer), who are seconded from Incheon City Government; also Dr. Chang-Yong Choi (Science Officer), Ms. Aram Lee (Communication and Information Officer) and Ms. Min-Seon Kim (Publications Officer). Recruitment has now concluded.
14. Chief Executive briefly explained the history of establishing the permanent Secretariat in Korea and administrative activity during 2009. He thanked the Interim Secretariat (Maki Koyama) for her work up to mid 2009 which included support to establishing the MoU for hosting of the Secretariat by Korea. He also thanked the seconded staff for setting up the Secretariat office before his employment started in November 2009.
15. He tabled the report of the auditor (BDO Daejoo LLC) for July to December 2009, showing expenditure of KRW 173 million. Accounts were operated on a cash (single entry) basis for 2009 due to particular requirements of the funder. Full funding for year 2010 from Incheon City Government has been secured and Japan has committed to provide funding to support attendance of representatives from developing countries at MoP4.
16. Matters arising from the 3rd Meeting of Partners were settled during 2009 or will be addressed in other agenda items of the present meeting.
17. The Partners accepted the report.

Agenda Item 2.2 Brief update from EAAFP Working Groups

Agenda Item 2.2.1 Crane Working Group

18. BirdLife International – Asia presented this Group's report and recognized the many contributors to the Group's work over an extended period as well as its present advisors. The list of advisory

board members should be finalized in the next two months. It referred to the adoption of Terms of Reference for the Group in 2008 and the Group's desire to increase opportunities for cooperation under the Partnership. Since MoP3, meetings of the Group were held in Gumi, Korea and Harbin, China and recent activities have included the Anbyon project.

19. AWSG asked what the source of funding for Group activities was and BirdLife answered that funding came from grants programs (JFGE), Ministry of the Environment Japan, international NGOs such as ICF, other national and local governments, and others. Some contributions are in-kind rather than cash.

Agenda Item 2.2.2 Shorebird Working Group

20. AWSG presented this Group's report and indicated that the Group hoped to maintain focus on the Objectives of the Partnership and that its expert members were available to advise Partners. It requested that discussion of issues raised in the report be referred to small group discussion during the meeting followed by discussion among all Partners. These issues included further defining the role of Working Groups.

Agenda Item 2.2.3 Anatidae Working Group

21. Group Chair, Masayuki Kurechi (JAWGP), presented the report as in the Agenda Document.

Agenda Item 2.2.4 Seabird Working Group

22. There was no representative from this Group at the Meeting. USA reiterated the circulated advice that Kent Wohl, ex-chair of the Seabird WG, had been a member of the non-game migratory bird program of the US Government but had retired. Consequently, it seems there were no activities of the Group during the reporting period.
23. BirdLife International stated that seabirds are under severe threat and that BirdLife International is very interested in reviving the Seabird Working group, before the next MoP, acting as Chair if required. It suggested holding a meeting a day before MoP5, to re-organize the Seabird Working Group. The Chief Executive thanked BirdLife on behalf of the Partnership.

Agenda Item 2.2.5 Avian Influenza Working Group

24. Ramsar Secretariat's representative presented the report and gave an apology from FAO (Scott Newman) who is keen to continue cooperation with EAAFP. The Group started after 2006, has conducted many cooperative activities with international organisations such as FAO and hopes to cooperate with the Partners. The Group did not meet in 2009 but is developing tracking of waterbird migration patterns and routes. Information is available on the internet.
25. USA advised that US agencies (USGS, USFWS) have conducted satellite-tracking studies and that relevant materials are available from the USGS website or as printed copy.

Agenda Item 2.2.6 Additional reporting on Cranes

26. ICF and CMS/AEWA introduced the activities of ICF and UNEP/GEF on two crane flyways of Asia and plans for publications and for continuing the project on a larger scale. The Siberian Crane project is site oriented but benefits many waterbird species.

Agenda Item 3. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities: Brief reports on 2009 and focus on plans for 2010

Agenda Item 3.0 Summary of Partner reports submitted to Secretariat (using the template)

27. Chief Executive illustrated how to use the Partner Report template, to report the results, and to access the full results compiled in Excel spreadsheet format. Reports from seven Partners (4 government, 3 non-government) and one Working Group were received in time to be analysed; some other reports arrived late or could not be submitted due to technical difficulties. Responses in the reports, organised under the 14 Outcomes of the Partnership Implementation Plan, give guidance to the Partnership on priority subjects for Partner collaboration, including:
- case studies on management of threats to Flyway Network sites
 - identification of knowledge gaps regarding internationally important sites
 - development of habitat monitoring programs
 - enhanced international collaboration between researchers
 - establishment of national capacity building networks
28. The Secretariat will incorporate late reports in the analysis and consider the results in reviewing its work plan for 2010.

Agenda Item 3.1 Objective 1: Develop the Flyway Site Network

Agenda Item 3.1.1 Current status of Flyway Site Network and recent or proposed nominations

29. Chief Executive reminded Partners that the Flyway Site Network is a foundation of the Partnership and reported that only one site (Kejo-numa, Japan) was added to the Network since MoP3 (total number of sites now is 98). He indicated that Partners should follow up with the Secretariat to complete the transfer of sites from the old networks to the new Network, strive to increase the proportion of known important sites in the Network, and determine ways to raise the profile of the Network.
30. Wetlands International noted that the Network provides linkage across the Flyway, thanked the Government Partners for their efforts, encouraged further investment and asked how the Partnership could assist them, eg. with case studies?
31. Indonesia replied that it knows the potential Network sites but lacks capacity to nominate them.
32. Australia advised that it hopes to significantly increase the number of its Network sites in 2010 and is keen to assist other Partners if required.
33. Cambodia said that institutional consolidation is required to minimize crossover issues with respect to departments, that nomination is a slow constitutional process and that it needs more research and information and help to nominate new sites.
34. Russia asked that Secretariat advise how Russia could complete the transfer of sites. Wetlands International replied that a letter from the appropriate agency to the Partnership is required.
35. Japan advised that supporting site managers and local governments is important and that awareness materials are needed for this task.
36. Republic of Korea informed that potential new sites are under evaluation and advised that public awareness and financial incentives are needed to promote designation of Network sites. It also called for collaboration between the central and provincial governments to promote the Network.
37. Bangladesh mentioned that it had sites potentially suitable for the Flyway Site Network and asked if Ramsar criteria for nomination will also be applied to the Network. The Chief Executive, backed

by the Ramsar Secretariat, replied that if a site meets the waterbird-related criteria of Ramsar in most cases it will be acceptable as a Network site and expressed the Partnership's willingness to assist Bangladesh.

38. BirdLife International reminded Partners that Network designation tends to be easier than Ramsar designation, that many Ramsar sites are good candidates for the Flyway Site Network, that Important Bird Areas also provide some candidate sites, and that Russia and China have potential sites but it is not clear which agency should endorse those sites.
39. Thailand requested the Secretariat to provide guidelines on procedure for Network Site designation and noted that knowing how to manage a site once listed is the key question.

Agenda Item 3.1.2 Procedure for the Secretariat on processing and formalising new nominations

40. The present procedure, outlined in Agenda Document 3.1.2, was endorsed by the Partners.

Agenda Item 3.1.3 Improving access to information on Network sites

41. Chief Executive mentioned the scope of information available online for Ramsar Sites and asked the Partners to identify Network Site information that should be made available to Partners and others, on the EAAFP website.
42. Ramsar Secretariat encouraged the Partnership to pursue this task and commended the use of geographic presentations and of live-links to existing web sites/pages (of Ramsar and others) and to upcoming event information. Many Network sites are featured online as Ramsar sites.
43. CMS, supported by Japan, said that it was helpful to have good models to emulate and Ramsar Secretariat commended the websites of AEWA, Important Bird Areas (BirdLife) and Asian Waterbird Census (Wetlands International) as models and/or for linkage.
44. Wetlands International promoted the inclusion of high profile material such as specific migration links between Network sites, eg. the godwit migration story (New Zealand > NE Asia > Alaska).
45. Korea (NIBR) suggested inclusion of graphs, maps and landscape photos of Network sites.

Agenda Item 3.2 Objective 2: Enhance communication, education and public awareness

Agenda Item 3.2.1 Translation of Partnership documents: status and gaps

46. Chief Executive gave an update on the status of Partnership documents that have been posted on the EAAFP website in Partner languages and requested Partners to set priorities for addressing gaps. He noted that many documents in Korean will soon be available thanks to Dr Kim Jin-han and advised that the Secretariat has budget in 2010 for translation work.
47. Japan advised that it can supply many of the documents in Japanese.
48. Wetlands International requested that all important documents be translated into the first language of each Partner and as soon as possible. The Partners themselves and some NGOs may be able to assist whereas specialists will be expensive. Partners should check the drafts.

Agenda Item 3.2.2 Further development of the Flyway Partnership website www.eaaflyway.net

49. Chief Executive thanked all who helped to make the present website and noted that many features can be expanded or improved. He proposed that the present webhost, Melbourne IT (Australia), be retained for the time being – renewal is due mid March 2010. Any proposal to shift to a Korean webhost would need to consider the capacity of users in countries with low bandwidth (Korea has very high speed internet) to access features that require high-level internet capacity.
50. AWSG asked if all Partners have been able to access the present site and all confirmed 'yes'.

51. Bangladesh recommended that website visitations be monitored after any changes are made.

Agenda Item 3.2.3 Proposed global workshop on waterbird flyways

52. Ramsar Secretariat referred to plans well developed by Ramsar, CMS, Wetlands International and others for a global workshop of invited experts to share lessons learnt and develop greater cooperation. The workshop has been endorsed by Ramsar STRP and CMS Scientific Council. A date in mid-late 2010 and venue in Korea have been proposed; duration would be four days including a field trip.
53. Chief Executive indicated that the EAAFP Secretariat could contribute a portion of the costs and drew attention to availability of (already busy) key experts being a critical factor in setting the date.
54. Russia suggested that this workshop could be held in connection with EAAFP MoP5.
55. USA suggested the option to link it with the International Seabird Conference to be held in September 2010 in Canada; otherwise delay till 2011.
56. Wetlands International and Ramsar Secretariat indicated that it would not be a large workshop – having around 30 invited participants – and thus not complex to organise.
57. Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia referred to the scheduled 3-day meeting of the Changwon Declaration Network at Changwon, Korea, in November 2010 and offered the possibility of financial support for a small workshop if held in connection with that event.
58. Ramsar Secretariat thanked RRCEA for its offer, proposed to discuss it further and committed to inform the Partners of firm plans for date, venue and host of the global flyways workshop.

Agenda Item 3.2.4 Proposed EAAFP side event at CBD CoP10, Japan

59. Japan referred to its proposal to hold a side event on the Partnership at CoP10 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nagoya, Japan, October 2010. With 10,000 participants/visitors anticipated, this presents an opportunity for high exposure of EAAFP and its work. Some of the resources used for a similar side event at Ramsar CoP10 may be available.
60. Wetlands International congratulated Japan on taking this initiative and encouraged Partners to liaise with relevant ministries to ensure that migratory waterbird issues are adequately addressed during CBD CoP10. It also asked the Secretariat to brief Partners on how they can best contribute to CBD CoP10.
61. Bangladesh asked if EAAFP could participate in CBD CoP10. Vice-Chair explained that the Partnership is not a Party to CBD so it cannot attend the formal meeting but it can attend side events. Chief Executive encouraged Bangladesh to contact its national focal point for CBD.

Agenda Item 3.2.5 Translation and regular dissemination of relevant scientific & other articles

62. Australia referred to its proposal on translation and regular dissemination of relevant scientific and other articles, involving annual or other regular review and reporting by the EAAFP Secretariat.
63. Wetlands International endorsed the proposal.
64. Chief Executive thanked Australia for the proposal and committed to follow up.

Agenda Item 3.3 Objective 3: Enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, knowledge and information exchange

Agenda Item 3.3.1 Monitoring: Asian Waterbird Census; launch of 20 Year Review

65. Wetlands International provided copies of the publication Status of Waterbirds in Asia – Results of the Asian Waterbird Census: 1987-2007 to Partners and the Vice-Chair. The Census involved 27 countries, and over 6700 sites including 55 EAAF Network Sites. Many populations seem to be in decline whereas some are stable or even increasing. The book is downloadable from the website of Wetlands International.

Agenda Item 3.3.2 Monitoring: Shorebirds

66. AWSG reported on shorebird research and monitoring in Australasia and introduced the Shorebirds 2020 program and MYSMA (Monitoring Yellow Sea Migrants in Australia) Program, which aim to produce trends in shorebird population sizes and if possible identify the causes of population declines. Initial results show shorebird numbers are declining across most species. Geo-locator studies are producing large gains in knowledge of migration routes. AWSG is keen to share Australian experience and expertise with Partners.

Agenda Item 3.3.3 Monitoring: Monitoring sites 1000 (Japan)

67. Japan reported activities and results from the Monitoring Sites 1000 program in Japan. Steady increases in numbers of some ducks and geese have been detected.

Agenda Item 3.3.4 Monitoring: proposed monitoring of site/habitat condition

68. Wetlands International addressed the Agenda Document about a proposed technical workshop (possibly in May or June 2010) to develop a Decision Support Tool that would enhance national and flyway-wide monitoring of waterbirds and their habitats. The small workshop would establish principles and mechanisms for the design of the DST.
69. Chief Executive advised that the Secretariat has capacity to host such a workshop and to play appropriate roles in coordinating and/or supporting monitoring activities at the Flyway scale.
70. BirdLife International and ICF encouraged linking/integration with IBA, national and other monitoring programs, to increase overall use of resources and sharing of data.
71. Wetlands International, in response to Russia and Australia, advised that the types of decision support tool envisaged could link all sets of vital data related to species and sites and thereby assist decision makers. Models exist elsewhere (eg. WoW project) and there has been discussion at previous MoPs. Partners to help cover participation costs for the small workshop.
72. A task force was formed to explore the proposal further in the MoP4 small group sessions: WI (Doug Watkins), AWSG (Ken Gosbell), ICF (Jim Harris), WWT (Baz Hughes), WWF (Bena Smith), BirdLife (Simba Chan), Indonesia (Agus), Ramsar (Taej Mundkur), and observers Bangladesh (Tapon Dey) and Birds Korea (Nial Moores), agreed to join. Objectives of the initiative were identified as: to improve existing activities; to apply information to management of waterbirds and important sites; to review and improve waterbird monitoring; to build capacity; to improve links to Avian Influenza monitoring; and funding enhancement. Better sharing of data between Partners would be a helpful precursor. A meeting of up to 10 invited persons is envisaged; some may be self-funded.
73. Wetlands International, BirdLife International and AWSG committed to developing the workshop and subsequent activities.

Agenda Item 3.3.5 Monitoring: East and Southeast Asia Biodiversity Inventory Initiative

74. Japan informed Partners about the East and South-East Asia Biodiversity Information Initiative, which it will host, and its links to CBD CoP10.
75. Republic of Korea expressed its interest in this initiative and asked the difference between Biodiversity Information System, and Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) under CBD, to which Japan and Thailand gave clarification.
76. Wetlands International asked how existing data sets would relate to the initiative, to avoid duplication and Japan reassured that this issue would be addressed.

Agenda Item 3.3.6 Coordination and management of waterbird marking, Flyway-wide

77. Australia spoke to its Agenda Document and stressed the need to review Flyway colour marking schemes and to address problems such as flag losses and colour duplication. It proposed setting up a small task force to progress this and to work on establishing long-term coordination of marking across the Flyway; Australia offered assistance from one of its agency staff.
78. AWSG commented that shorebirds have a marking protocol, though the increased use of colour flags is resulting in reduced availability of colours for flagging, whereas marking protocols may or may not exist for other waterbird groups. It added that the potential for reporting of flag sightings in Asia is enormous, so awareness and education on flagging and reporting are needed.
79. Bangladesh asked for information on colour-marking protocols and Australia offered to send Bangladesh information on the existing protocol for shorebirds.
80. Wetlands International remarked that current protocols, contact information and other data on waterbirds in Asia are available on the WI website; this is a resource, not a controlling mechanism. Experience in the AEWA region is available to draw from. It also agreed that marking is necessary for the management of shorebirds and that 20-year old protocols need updating, with new technologies also to be considered. Wetlands International used the wireless internet to show Partners its web pages on waterbird banding schemes, tools for migration studies, and contact information.
81. JAWGP (M. Kurechi, Anatidae WG) advised that available colours are limited in number for geese and the same colour is often used in several different areas or regions. The large areas occupied by wintering waterbirds present difficulties in tracking their movements.
82. BirdLife International stated that for cranes there is a need for communication and consensus on marking schemes. It also recommended the Secretariat to play a role in communication and hoped that marking problems could be resolved urgently, given the long history of discussion.
83. Republic of Korea (NIBR) contributed that even though there may be unique marking protocols for some taxonomic groups, nevertheless there is often confusion because many researches are involved and so sharing of information among researchers is very important.
84. Chief Executive concluded that, in view of the high level of interest, a task force would be formed to progress the subject in small group sessions during MoP4 and identify a way forward.
85. Australia reported back to plenary that the broad tasks were communication and coordination. Establishment of an email group on marking issues was recommended. Scientific developments in marking for each waterbird group ought to be publicised widely.
86. Australia committed to prepare a paper for MoP5 on coordination issues and options.
87. Bangladesh requested project leaders of satellite tracking activities to inform applicable countries

when birds are located in-country.

88. Indonesia requested greater communication between site managers.
89. Wetlands International recommended preparation of a synthesis of migration strategies of selected species and methods for tracking. Australia agreed this would be helpful to governments for allocating funding to fill knowledge gaps. Korea (NIBR) also indicated its support for the idea.
90. The Secretariat could liaise with Wetlands International (which has an existing online list) to update details on contact officers for banding/marketing schemes.
91. Chief Executive indicated that the Secretariat will take up several of the task forces recommendations.

Agenda Item 3.3.7 Use of the reporting template: how to get best results

92. Chief Executive explained how Partners could use the Reporting Template more efficiently and noted that some Partners had experienced difficulties.
93. Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust remarked that some questions were very general and open-ended and some are more directed at governments than NGOs.
94. Australia advised that use of .exe files (such as the template), even embedded in zip format, may be blocked by agency security systems. Could a web-based system be developed?
95. The Philippines commented that it may be useful to provide additional comments when NO is the answer – not only when YES is the answer.
96. Wetlands International and Ramsar suggested that printable outcomes containing all questions and answers are needed for general overview, especially within government agency hierarchies.
97. Australia offered to advise the Secretariat on available tools, if required.

Agenda Item 3.4 Objective 4: Build capacity to manage waterbirds and their habitats

Agenda Item 3.4.1 National Partnership workshops – Myanmar, Thailand

98. Wetlands International drew attention to its work since MoP3 in facilitating workshops in Thailand and Myanmar on development of national partnerships to locally support the Flyway Partnership. Strong national partnerships would build capacity for countries to become EAAFP Partners. In some countries, linkage of wetland and waterbird conservation to poverty alleviation is desirable.
99. BANCA (observer, Myanmar) and Bangladesh commented that the situation for many waterbirds in their countries was critical and that international support was needed to build in-country capacity for monitoring and research.
100. BirdLife International exhorted the Partnership to continue patiently. Japan had funded some projects on waterbirds in Myanmar and BirdLife will encourage Myanmar to join EAAFP.
101. Bangladesh stated that it will consider becoming a Partner.
102. Chief Executive advised that the Secretariat will follow-up with potential Partners.

Agenda Item 3.4.2 Facilitating development and activities of national partnerships

103. Chief Executive commended existing national partnerships/networks for waterbirds and Flyway Network Sites in Japan and Korea as examples for Partners to emulate.

104. Ramsar Secretariat reminded Partners that Ramsar Committees exist in many countries and could facilitate domestic cooperation on Flyway matters; also strong partnerships are needed at each important site.

Agenda Item 3.5 Objective 5: Develop flyway-wide approaches to enhance the conservation status of migratory waterbirds

Agenda Item 3.5.1 Yellow Sea Ecoregion Collaboration

105. Wetlands International drew the Partners' attention to its report on the project *Yellow Sea Ecoregion Collaboration* in the Agenda Document; the project is funded by Australia and implemented by WI and AWSG and aims to collate information on important sites, develop national partnerships and raise awareness with local governments in China and Korea.
106. Korea (NIBR) and WWF (WWF Japan) mentioned work done by their organisations on habitat resources and management and identification of important sites in Korea and/or China.
107. Birds Korea highlighted the Yellow Sea Large Marine Ecosystem Project and encouraged the Partnership to communicate waterbird conservation messages with this and other relevant initiatives in the Yellow Sea Ecoregion.

Agenda Item 3.5.2 Endorsement of action plans for threatened waterbirds: EAAFP role

108. Chief Executive introduced the newly arisen need for EAAFP to determine how it will give formal endorsement to international action plans for threatened waterbirds prepared under CMS authority. With specific requests recently received, EAAFP also needs to consider its relationship to existing recovery planning teams. Formation of a task force on this subject was requested.
109. ICF reported the general discussion on this subject, conducted in the meeting of the Secretariat's Management Committee the previous day. Three levels of recognition may be appropriate under the EAAFP: endorsement; task forces; and Working Groups. Two-way benefit is required: the Partnership needs be informed on the status and outcomes of affiliated or endorsed activities.
110. BirdLife International encouraged working within existing structures (the Working Groups) where possible and cautioned against too-rapid expansion and structures that are too complex.
111. CMS advised that endorsements of action plans, additional to endorsement of CMS, would be beneficial to implementation. It is important to find an NGO or expert to commit to implementing (to champion) a CMS-endorsed action plan.
112. AEWA added that EAAFP could not formally adopt a species plan because unlike CMS it does not have the government credentials to do that. EAAFP could endorse the development of an action plan, discuss a draft plan and recommend to Partner Governments to accept (or not).
113. Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust encouraged the Secretariat to obtain information from AEWA on the levels of endorsement already in use in the African Eurasian region; this was encouraged by AEWA. And it exhorted EAAFP to ensure due process has been followed with any action plan that it endorses.
114. Russia added that endorsement provides the support needed for local response. It sought help with translation of some English terms used in action plans.
115. ICF reported back to plenary on the task force discussion in small group sessions. The term "task force" is appropriate for groups of short life-span; it is captured in the Partnership Document (clause 9.9). Four recommendations were drafted:

- The Scaly-sided Merganser action plan can be produced under the framework and branding of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP), in consultation with and with support from the Anatidae Working Group, as long as it follows the agreed CMS process for action plan production.
- As the Spoon-billed Sandpiper action plan has been produced to the agreed CMS process, an EAAFP Single Species Task Force for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper should be established in consultation with CMS and the Shorebird Working Group.
- The Secretariat should establish a small group to produce a briefing document for MoP5 outlining a suggested EAAFP action planning process and to develop guidelines for terms of reference for EAAFP Single Species Task Forces (based on the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) model).
- The Partnership should use the terminology in the second section of this document [in preparation] regarding Working Groups and Task Forces, and that the mandate and continuance of Task Forces be reviewed every three years.

116. Partners agreed to these four recommendations. However, the task force will finalise its report out of session and a proposal will be brought to MoP5.

Agenda Item 3.5.3 International Action Plans (BirdLife International – Asia report)

117. BirdLife International made a presentation on international action plans for three threatened species: Black-faced Spoonbill (EN), Spoon-billed Sandpipers (CR), and Chinese Crested Tern (CR); these plans had been endorsed by CMS. The plans were major products from an invitation from CMS to BirdLife to spearhead work on three highly threatened waterbirds of the Flyway. For Chinese Crested Tern, actions to be implemented include filling knowledge gaps, greater protection and enforcement, education and training. For Black-faced Spoonbill, an international workshop is to be held 4-7 March 2010 in Fukuoka.
118. CMS conducted a presentation of copies of relevant action plans (Chinese Crested Tern, Spoon-billed Sandpiper), to the Partnership Chair (Korea), Indonesia, Thailand, Myanmar and Bangladesh.
119. Thailand requested that international species actions plans be integrated with Partner's National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Agenda Item 3.5.4 International Action Plan for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper

120. Spoon-billed Sandpiper Recovery Team (Christoph Zockler) made a presentation on the current status, population decline, threats of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper and mentioned other activities of the Team. The species remains critically endangered and help is needed to address hunting on the wintering grounds. Urgent actions are needed on capacity building, public awareness, conservation and management of habitat and species in South-East Asia, particularly Myanmar. The Team has requested a suitable form of affiliation with the EAAFP.
121. The Partners agreed to address this request and asked the relevant task force to include it in their discussion during MoP4. It was recommended by the Secretariat's Management Committee on the previous day that formation of an EAAFP Working Group especially for this species was probably inconsistent with the EAAFP structure.

Agenda Item 3.5.5 International Action Plan for the Scaly-sided Merganser

122. Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust drew Partners' attention to its report on the current status, migration, population decline and threats of the Scaly-sided Merganser and action required for conservation. The species is in decline because of logging, hunting and drowning. Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust

asked the Partnership to give an appropriate form of endorsement to its April 2010 workshop to develop an international action plan for recovery of the species.

123. ICF recommended including research on the effects of PCBs/toxins on this species.
124. BirdLife International and the Anatidae Working Group referred to existing initiatives, action plans and/or task forces for threatened Anatidae species such as Swan Goose and Baikal Teal. Anatidae Working Group indicated willingness to cooperate on the action plan for Scaly-sided Merganser and suggested the need to identify the priority species requiring action plans.
125. The Partners agreed to address Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust's request about workshop endorsement and asked the relevant task force to include it in their discussion during MoP4.

Day 2, 24 February 2010

Agenda Item 3.6 Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities: Reports from break-out sessions

126. A breakout session was held involving four small groups based on the task forces identified from discussion of agenda items for Objectives 1-5 and/or from the meeting of the Secretariat's Management Committee held on 22 February 2010. Groups then reported to plenary. Outcomes have been included above under relevant agenda items.
 - Task Force 1: Monitoring of waterbirds and habitat and decision support tool (3.3.4)
Facilitated by Doug Watkins, 17 participants.
 - Task Force 2: Coordination and review of waterbird colour marking (3.3.6)
Facilitated by Paul O'Neill, 8 participants.
 - Task Force 3: Forms of Partnership endorsement for species action planning (3.5.2)
Facilitated by Jim Harris and Christoph Zockler, 14 participants.
 - Task Force 4: Terms of Reference of the Secretariat's Management Committee (6.3)
Facilitated by Doug Alcorn, 5 participants.

Agenda Item 4. Building the Partnership

Agenda Item 4.1 Partner applications under consideration; potential Partners

127. Chief Executive again welcomed the new Partner, Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, and explained that this NGO has been operating in multiple countries in our Flyway with a range of activities. He also explained the process for applying to become a new Partner based on the Partnership Document paragraph 8 and drew attention to EAAFP practice that NGO applicants should have on-going activities for migratory waterbirds in at least two countries of the Flyway.
128. Vice-Chair presented copies of the book *Invisible Connections* to potential Partners present at MoP4: Bangladesh, Malaysia and Thailand; also Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia. (The book was produced by Wetlands International with support from Royal Dutch Shell and released at Ramsar CoP8; extra copies were brought to MoP4 by Birds Korea.)
129. Thailand expressed its willingness to become a Partner, if possible before MoP5, and explained the internal government process required – this includes Cabinet approval. The national workshop was helpful to Thailand for becoming a Partner.
130. Wetlands International requested that information on each Partner and its relevant activities be placed on the EAAFP website.
131. Secretariat will follow-up with all potential Partners, including Mongolia and Vietnam.

Agenda Item 4.2 Response to requests for elevating the status of the Partnership

132. Chief Executive explained that he has received questions asking why the Partnership does not have the same status as AEWA or other UN-related entities; he sought the Partners' advice on whether or not he should post an explanatory note on the EAAFP website.
133. AEWA pointed out that EAAFP is based on an MoU and a non-legal entity, at the request of the founding Partners, whereas AEWA is a legally binding agreement under which the parties are required to contribute financial dues.
134. Wetlands International indicated that an explanatory note would be beneficial to potential Government Partners and so should have input from existing Government Partners.
135. Chief Executive committed to prepare a draft document and circulate it to all Partners for review before loading on the EAAFP website.

Agenda Item 5. Specific proposed projects and funding required

Agenda Item 5.1 Process for submission and approval of projects for Partnership funding

136. Chief Executive advised the Partners that, thanks to the MoU with the Republic of Korea, EAAFP has access to funds (KRW 100 million) for "Partnership Activities" in 2010. About half of this budget is earmarked for costs of the Meeting of Partners but the remainder is so far unallocated and could be directed to activities commissioned by the Partners during MoP4. Furthermore, the Secretariat, though not intended to be a funding body, has started to receive additional funds and should have a procedure for approval of projects for Partnership funding. A set of project proposals was presented at MoP3 but none had been submitted for consideration at MoP4.
137. AEWA suggested that Proposals could be brought to each Meeting of Partners; approved projects could be funded by the Chief Executive's decision as money becomes available.
138. WWF (Hong Kong), at the invitation of Wetlands International, explained its small grants fund set up with seed funding from Cathay Pacific to support Partnership activities in Flyway. Two or three projects (~USD 4000 each) have been funded per year.
139. Ramsar Secretariat cautioned that EAAFP was not intended to be providing a small grants fund and drew attention to the global Ramsar Small Grants Fund.
140. Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia explained that it supported projects in Mongolia and North Korea in 2009 and will support at least three small projects (~USD 10,000 each) in 2010. It may add a category for single species task forces.
141. Spoon-billed Sandpiper Recovery Team encouraged EAAFP to explore funding from corporate donors and advised that large funding is needed to implement species action plans.
142. Bangladesh indicated that initial funding support from external organisations could induce government budgetary commitment to action plan implementation, or capacity building.
143. Japan commended two well established funds: Japan Fund for Global Environment, and Keidanren Nature Conservation Fund.
144. Secretariat will, at Ramsar's suggestion, create a link on the EAAFP website to small grant funds.

Agenda Item 5.2 Project proposals for possible Partnership funding support

145. USA proposed that the Chief Executive, supplied with criteria, should have authorisation to decide allocation of small amounts of funding to Flyway projects where this is consistent with the Secretariat work plan. The Secretariat's Management Committee could support decision-making if required out of session.

Agenda Item 6. Flyway Partnership Administration

Agenda Item 6.1 Review of operation of the Secretariat

146. Chief Executive briefly reported on the operation systems of the Secretariat indicating administrative and financial systems. Systems largely follow Korean Government systems at present. Some remaining operational challenges will gradually be resolved so that the Secretariat is fully consistent with a typical international organization. For example, transfer to an accrual accounting system is proposed.

Agenda Item 6.2 Delegation of authority between the Chair and Chief Executive

147. Chief Executive requested Partners to consider which matters could be signed off by the Chief Executive and which by the Partnership Chair.
148. USA reported the results of discussion on this matter during the Management Committee meeting on 22 Feb 2010, noting that matters at Partnership level generally would fall to the Chair to sign whereas most Secretariat matters could be signed off by the Chief Executive. The Chair would approve new Network Site nominations and new Partners and sign Certificates for these. The Chief would appoint staff, open bank accounts, sign funding and project contracts and commit to expenditure except where endorsement of the Management Committee seemed prudent. Press releases by the Chief Executive should be copied to relevant Partners. The full Partnership may be consulted where there was significant uncertainty.
149. The Partners agreed that the Chief Executive would work with the Management Committee to complete a list of scenarios and authorisations.

Agenda Item 6.3 Terms of Reference and appointment of the Management Committee

150. Chief Executive reported that the Management Committee has played a valuable support and advisory role to the Chief Executive and Secretariat. Terms of Reference for the Committee were developed as a result of MoP3, especially in relation to settling the hosting of the Secretariat. Some Committee members had requested that, to address the changed ongoing role of the Committee, terms such as the process for appointment to the Committee be reviewed.
151. A task force headed by USA initiated a process of review of the Terms of Reference at the Management Committee meeting on 22 February, with a view to providing a final draft for approval at MoP5. Elements discussed by the task force during MoP4 breakout sessions included: purpose statement; chairing arrangement; composition options; decision making; member appointment and rotation; quorum for responses to emails sent by the Chief Executive; period for reply; and financial oversight. Aspects of the incomplete new draft were discussed in plenary session of MoP4 (Agenda 3.6).
152. The Partners agreed that, in view of this review process, the present eight members of the Committee would continue to serve until the new Terms of Reference have been approved.

Agenda Item 6.4 Criteria for allocating funding sponsorship to attend Meetings of Partners

153. Chief Executive developed a brief rationale for allocation of sponsorship funding to participants attending MoP4. The Management Committee reviewed this on 22 February.
154. Wetlands International advised that the Committee requested the Chief Executive to initiate a review of the long-term strategic considerations in providing sponsorship, especially with respect to potential Partners.
155. BANCA (NGO, Myanmar) thanked the Partnership for supporting it to participate in MoP4 and committed to report to the Government of Myanmar on return.

Agenda Item 6.5 Secretariat's Work Plan 2010: to be revised in line with meeting outcomes

156. Chief Executive circulated a draft Secretariat work plan for 2010 to the Partners; the draft was based on administrative functions and on the five Objectives of the Partnership. It was earlier reviewed and given general endorsement by the Management Committee. Modifications would be made by the Chief Executive in light of actions arising from MoP4.
157. AEWA advocated that the Secretariat monitor issues and developments across the Flyway regions and to be aware of the calendars of relevant regional and international organisations.
158. Ramsar Secretariat, supported by Wetlands International, recommended ensuring exchange and communication with relevant Asian and global frameworks (eg. ASEAN Working Group on Biodiversity; Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network) and producing a newsletter.
159. AWSG advised that any newsletter should be web-posted and alerts sent by email.
160. Partners suggested adjusting the plan to give the Secretariat's administration tasks greater prominence and ensure the plan avoids actions that are primarily the responsibility of Partners.
161. Bangladesh advised the Secretariat to keep up to date with each EAAFP focal point and contacts.
162. Wetlands International noted that Partners could assist the Secretariat with communication and that Ramsar (Lew Young) was keen to develop a newsletter on Ramsar issues.
163. AWSG requested maintaining cross-reference of Secretariat activities to the Partnership Objectives.
164. Wetlands International suggested that because EAAFP was working toward having the Partners work more collaboratively, the work plan may evolve into a different form in the near future.
165. Ramsar Secretariat advised that the work of Wetland Link International was relevant to EAAFP, that WLI was fairly active in Asia and it may be meeting in Malaysia later in 2010.

Agenda Item 6.6 Secretariat's Budget 2010: to be revised in line with the work plan and the meeting outcomes

166. Chief Executive circulated a draft Secretariat budget for 2010 to the Partners; the draft was based on the hosting MoU (Korean core funding) and was earlier reviewed and given general endorsement by the Management Committee. He explained the need to adjust amounts between budget lines, within the same total (KRW 509 million) and without altering amounts for personnel or Partnership activities, due mainly to high office rental costs since commencement in July 2009.
167. AEWA recommended adding a column to express amounts in US dollars.

168. Australia advocated that the Chief Executive could determine adjustments to budget within the overall total allocation.
169. Partners agreed to the budget adjustments (within the existing total) as presented by the Chief.

Agenda Item 7. Other Business

170. Korean Wetland NGO Network, with agreement of the Korean Government representative, presented a short video and a statement (read by Dr. Han Dong-Uk of PGAI Korea) on the threats to cranes at Nakdong River (a Network Site) due to the Four Rivers Project. KWNN asked the Partnership to write to the Korean Government demanding protection of the site.
171. Wetlands International reported recent discussion with BirdLife International and their agreement to organize a technical meeting to bring together governments and NGOs to enhance/strengthen Flyway Network Sites, to enhance monitoring and develop regional projects. A short concept proposal should be prepared now to seek the interest of GEF Council and to approach potential co-funders. Ramsar Secretariat and CMS/AEWA expressed their interest in supporting Wetlands International's lead on this. Russia obtained clarification that relevant GEF fields included Climate Change and Marine Ecosystems.
172. AEWA invited the Chief Executive to represent EAAFP at the 15th anniversary meeting of AEWA on 14-15 June, 2010, The Hague, The Netherlands. AEWA also informed Partners of its other activities including development of the Central Asian Flyway and development of guidelines to manage electricity powerlines near waterbird habitat. It commended participation in World Migratory Birds Day (8-9 May 2010).
173. Chief Executive sought approval of presenters for their PowerPoint presentations to be made available to registered participants of MoP4 if requested. BirdLife International consented on the basis that the files be for personal use only – there may be copyright issues on some photographs.
174. Bangladesh suggested making a Declaration from MoP4. AEWA countered that a press release may be more appropriate and Chief Executive advised that Ministry of Environment, Korea, had indicated that it would make a press release shortly.
175. AWSG briefed interested Partners on data loggers and migration after the close of meeting.

Agenda Item 8. Next Meeting

176. Vice-Chair advised that no offers to host the next Meeting of Partners had been received. Chief Executive explained that any Partner, including NGOs, could offer to host.
177. Cambodia offered to be host of MoP5, subject to Ministerial approval after the delegation's return from MoP4. A date in November or December would be most suitable. The Partners expressed their appreciation of this generous offer and Chief Executive noted that it would be very strategic to have a meeting in South-East Asia to promote the Partnership there.
178. USA expressed its hope to host a future Meeting of Partners in Alaska, but advised that summer was the preferred time. If June or July was appropriate, then USA would be willing to host MoP6.
179. Chief Executive advised that the Management Committee had confirmed (as per the Partnership Document) that there was no prescribed date (month) for Meetings of Partners and that in principle there would be sufficient Secretariat budget to hold MoP5 in 2010. He would liaise with Cambodia to confirm its offer to host MoP5, possibly in November-December 2010.
180. BirdLife International proposed that meetings of the various EAAFP Working Groups be held on the day/s before the start of MoP5.

Agenda Item 9. Meeting Close

181. Vice-Chair and Chief Executive thanked all Partners for their attendance and hard work during MoP4 and committed to providing a draft Meeting Report within a few weeks.
182. Indonesia, on behalf of the Partners, expressed sincere thanks to Incheon City, the Republic of Korea and EAAFP Secretariat for hosting of MoP4 and also thanked the other Meeting supporters (Japan; national governments), the volunteers and other assistants.
183. Vice-Chair declared the Meeting closed at 17:15.

A summary table of actions arising from the 4th Meeting of Partners starts on the next page.

Summary of actions arising from the Fourth Meeting of Partners

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
1	1.4	Prepare Certificate of Participation for new EAAFP Partner, Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, and set up the presentation.	Secretariat	
2	2.2.2	Actions required by Partners in the report of the Shorebird Working Group need to be reviewed and implemented.	Chief Executive	Ken Gosbell (AWSG)
3	2.2.4	Activity of Seabird Working Group to be revitalised.	BirdLife International	Noritaka Ichida (BI – Asia)
4	3.1.1	Provide assistance to Partners in developing new Flyway Site Network nominations, including direct help with paperwork, information on benefits of participation, examples of case studies, guidelines and on managing sites for waterbirds.	Secretariat	various Partners may be called to assist
5	3.1.1	Assist Russia to formally transfer sites from previous networks to the present Network.	Chief Executive	Evgeny S. (Russia)
6	3.1.1	All Partners to strive to increase the number and diversity of important waterbird sites in the Flyway Site Network.	Government Partners	All other Partners; Secretariat.
7	3.1.3	Increase the information on Flyway Network Sites, which is on the EAAFP website and install more links to other relevant sites such as Ramsar and AEWA.	Secretariat	Ramsar, CMS
8	3.2.1	Obtain key documents that have already been translated in Flyway languages and load on website.	Secretariat	Japan, Korea.
9	3.2.1	Commission more document translation work in other languages of Flyway Partners and upload to EAAFP website.	Secretariat	Cambodia and other Partners (see Doc 3.2.1)
10	3.2.2	Renew present website hosting arrangement with Melbourne IT, due in March 2010.	Chief Executive	
11	3.2.3	Proceed with planning for EAAFP participation in the 2010 global workshop on flyways as proposed by Ramsar and others, including consideration for hosting in Korea.	Chief Executive	Ramsar, Wetlands International, CMS.
12	3.2.4	Plan a side event on EAAF at CBD CoP10, Japan, October 2010.	Japan, Secretariat	Secretariat, Partners
13	3.2.4	Provide information to Partners on how they can promote migratory waterbird conservation at CBD CoP10	Secretariat	Ramsar, CMS
14	3.2	Liaise with Ramsar on synergies and opportunities to present newsletter-type information on the Flyway.	Secretariat	Ramsar
15	3.2.5	Conduct annual search and review of relevant scientific and other publications on migratory waterbirds/Flyway matters and provide links on website and translations if a high priority.	Secretariat (Science Officer)	All Partners

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
16	3.3.2	Actions required by Partners in the report on shorebird monitoring need to be reviewed and implemented.	Chief Executive	Ken Gosbell (AWSG)
17	3.3.4	Discuss further the monitoring and Decision Support Tool proposal (Doc. 3.3.4) and plan for a small workshop in 2010	Doug Watkins (WI), Ken Gosbell (AWSG), Simba Chan (BirdLife). TASK FORCE 1	Other Partners (several names offered); Secretariat
18	3.3.5	Collaborate on inventories of biodiversity (migratory waterbirds).	Japan	Wetlands International, BirdLife Int'l.
19	3.3.6	Conduct an informal EAAFP task force to review colour marking of waterbirds (all groups) in the Flyway and identify a mechanism for better coordination, reporting and information sharing.	Australia, Wetlands Int'l, CMS, Working Groups (Shorebirds, Anatidae & Cranes) TASK FORCE 2	Other Partners (several names offered); Secretariat
20	3.3.6	Maintain the list of contact officers for waterbird marking schemes in the Flyway.	Secretariat	Australia, Wetlands International
21	3.3.6	Prepare a paper for next MoP on coordination issues and options in regard to colour marking of migratory waterbirds.	Australia.	
22	3.3.6	Provide a copy of the present colour-marking protocol (shorebirds) to Partners and potential Partners on request.	Australia	
23	3.3.7	Conduct review and further development of the EAAFP Reporting Template (Partner annual reports to MoP) to accommodate issues raised by users.	Secretariat	Australia
24	3.4.1	Follow-up with potential Partners attending MoP4 especially those where national partnership workshops have been conducted.	Chief Executive	Wetlands International, BirdLife, Japan
25	3.4.2	Further encourage the development of national meetings/partnerships on migratory waterbirds.	Secretariat	Korea, Japan, Wetlands International
26	3.5.1	Consider how more Partners could be part of a larger collaborative program of activities of the Partnership in the Yellow Sea Ecoregion.	Wetlands International	Korea, China, Japan; all Partners.
27	3.5.2	Investigate existing models (AEWA etc) and consider the appropriate levels or types of endorsement by EAAFP of relevant activities such as action planning for threatened species.	Jim Harris (ICF) TASK FORCE 3	Baz Hughes (W&WT), Bert Lenten (AEWA), Taej M. (WI), Evgeny S. (Russia).
28	3.5.3	Secure reference copies of the newly released international action plans for Chinese Crested Tern and Spoon-billed Sandpiper, for the Secretariat.	BirdLife, CMS	

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
29	3.5.4	Indicate an exact form of endorsement or affiliation of the EAAFP with international action planning initiatives for Spoon-billed Sandpiper and Scaly-sided Merganser.	Secretariat	Jim Harris (ICF) and Task Force 3.
30	4.1	Create links on the EAAFP website to websites of each Partner.	Secretariat	
31	4.2	Write an explanation for the status of EAAFP and load on the EAAFP website.	Chief Executive	Management Committee
32	5.1	Make Partners more aware (via EAAFP website?) of small grant funds available for the Flyway regions.	Chief Executive	Bena Smith (WWF), Ramsar, RRCEA.
33	5.1	Allocation of Secretariat budget for 2010 to projects/activities.	Chief Executive	Management Committee
34a	6.3	Existing members of the Management Committee of the Secretariat shall continue to serve.	The 8 MC members.	
34b	6.2	Finalise the list of EAAFP matters needing authorisation (signature) and indicate which should be done by the Chair or by the Chief.	Chief Executive	Management Committee
35	6.3	Review, update and finalise a new draft of the Terms of Reference for the Management Committee of the Secretariat.	Sub-committee (Doug Alcorn, Doug Hykle, Doug Watkins) TASK FORCE 4	Chief Executive, Chair (Korea), Vice-Chair (Japan).
36	6.4	Give more thought to what EAAFP wishes to achieve through sponsoring potential Partners to attend MoPs and revise the sponsorship guidelines accordingly.	Chief Executive	Doug Watkins (WI).
37	6.5	Review the 2010 calendars and work schedules of relevant Partners and international organisations in order to identify opportunities for holding EAAFP events and likely unavailability of key persons.	Secretariat	
38	6.5	Review the draft Secretariat work plan to accommodate relevant actions arising from MoP4; also delete non-Secretariat tasks and add measures (days/other) of effort per task.	Chief Executive	
39	6.6	Inform Incheon City Government of the Partners' approval for reallocation across budget lines for 2010.	Chief Executive	
40	6.6	Modifications to the Secretariat's operational Budget document for 2010	Chief Executive	
41	7	Decide how to respond to the presentation made by Korean Wetland NGO Network regarding threats to the Nakdong Estuary (Network Site).	Chief Executive	Korea; Management Committee
42	7	Promote World Migratory Bird Day in this Flyway.	Secretariat	CMS/AEWA
43	7	Develop a new concept proposal to GEF on waterbirds in the EAAFP, building on a previous submission.	Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International)	Chief Executive

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
44	8	Consider holding meetings of Working Groups (and other relevant groups) in association with next MoP.	Secretariat	Chairs of WGs
45	8	Consider further the offer of Cambodia to host MoP5 once internal approval has been secured by its Ministry represented at MoP4.	Chief Executive	Management Committee
46	8	Liaison with USA about possible future hosting of a MoP in Alaska (2011 or later).	Chief Executive	USA (Doug Alcorn)
47	3.3 / 3.4	Produce an updated version of the Shorebirds Identification Booklet (WWF) for use in selected Flyway countries.	Australia	Secretariat

Note: Action 47 was agreed out-of-session between Australia and Russia.