

East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership

Fifth Meeting of Partners, Siem Reap, Cambodia
6-10 December 2010



AGENDA DOCUMENTS

Version 2

NOTES ON STATUS OF DOCUMENTS

This is the first version of the Agenda Documents, circulated to Partners and to registered participants for the 5th Meeting of Partners (MoP5), several weeks before the Meeting date. It is also available on the MoP5 web page at <http://www.eaaflyway.net/5th-meeting.php>

If substantial additional material comes to the Secretariat before the Meeting, circulation of a second (revised, updated) version may be conducted. Otherwise, the new documents will be provided at the start of the Meeting.

Please note that some changes have been made to the draft Agenda & Program. In particular, the meeting will start at 09:00 on Monday 6 December.

Other changes since Version 1:

- Addition of Agenda item 3.5.4 (Implementation of other CMS species action plans (2)).
- Addition to the Agenda: Presentation on Waterbird Conservation in Tonle Sap (Day 1 after lunch).
- Addition of extra side meetings to the Agenda (eg. Day 3, task force on colour marking).
- Additional document 3.5.2—B on the Spoon-billed Sandpiper (pages 56-57).
- Additional document 3.3.2—B on the Colour-marking task force (pages 57-59).
- Changes to the 2011 Secretariat budget breakdown (Agenda 6.7, page 40, Columns C & D).
- New information in document 2.1 of (page 8; funds received, under negotiation).

INSTRUCTIONS

In order to save paper and reduce impacts on our environment, please consider using this lengthy document only in digital form.

If users need or prefer to work with a printed version, please note that printing in colour will retain the **coloured highlights** that help show the division between documents.

A limited number of printed copies may be available during the Meeting.

1.3 Provisional Agenda for the 5th Meeting of PartnersExplanatory notes:

Some changes have been made since earlier versions were circulated to Partners. This document remains as draft status until adopted by the 5th Meeting (Agenda item 1.3). A version without the program/schedule can be provided by the EAAFP Secretariat on request. This document also is downloadable at <http://www.eaaflyway.net/5th-meeting.php>

Action required by Partners:

To adopt the Agenda (items 1 to 10 and not including the other activities and time schedule) *as shown below* and after any final modifications permitted by the Meeting and its chairperson.

Version 6

Day One: Monday 6 December

1. Introductory session (9:00 – 10:30am)		
1.1	Opening speeches: Chair, Host Country and Host Province.	
1.2	Appointment of Meeting chairperson and rapporteurs.	
1.3	Approval of the Provisional Agenda for the 5 th Meeting of Partners.	Document 1.3
1.4	Welcome to Partners (existing and new) and Admittance of Observers.	Document 1.4
	Very brief introduction by each Partner/Observer (if time permits).	
1.5	Presentation of Certificates to new Partners	Document 1.5
1.6	Approval of Minutes of the 4 th Meeting of Partners.	Document 1.6
	Photo of participants and VIPs.	
Morning Tea (10:30 – 11:00am) : served outside the meeting room		
2. Overview reporting (11:00am – 12:30pm)		
2.1	Brief report from the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of 2010 activities since MoP4 including financial matters. ▪ Matters arising from MoP4 (or refer to other MoP5Agenda items). 	Document 2.1
2.2	Summary of Partner reports for 2010 submitted to the Secretariat (using the reporting template).	Document 2.2
Lunch (12:30 – 1:30pm): Buffet served in the hotel restaurant on the ground floor		
Side Events Session A (1:30pm – 3:30pm)		
Separate smaller meetings to be held in parallel; may be continued in Session B. Final scheduling will aim to minimise overlap of interests. Other sessions on Wednesday afternoon.		
	Presentation on Waterbird Conservation in Tonle Sap	
	Management Committee (MC members only).	
Afternoon Tea (3:30 – 4:00pm)		
Side Events Session B (4:00pm – 5:30pm)		
	Briefing about EAAFP to potential Partners	
	Shorebird Working Group meeting	
	Seabird Working Group meeting	
Dinner (6:30 – 8:30pm): Welcome Reception hosted by Cambodia in the hotel grounds		

Continued on next page...

Day Two: Tuesday 7 December

2. Overview reporting (9:00 – 10:00am) continued		
2.3	Brief update from EAAFP Working Groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avian Influenza, Seabird, Shorebird, Anatidae, Crane. 	Documents 2.3.1 to 2.3.5
3. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities (10:00am – 10:30pm) Brief reports on achievement since MoP4 and focus on plans for 2011		
3.1 Objective 1: Develop the Flyway Site Network		
3.1.1	Current status of Flyway Site Network and recent or proposed nominations	Doc. 3.1.1
3.1.2	Status of Network site documentation and maps (show website if possible)	Doc. 3.1.2
Morning Tea (10:30 – 11:00am) : served outside the meeting room		
3. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities (11:00am – 12:30pm) continued		
3.2 Objective 2: Enhance communication, education and public awareness		
3.2.1	Translation of Partnership's key documents and website language issues	Doc. 3.2.1
3.2.2	Update on proposed global workshop on waterbird flyways	Doc. 3.2.2
3.2.3	Report on EAAFP side event held at CBD CoP10, Japan	Doc. 3.2.3
3.2.4	Development of e-newsletter and quarterly publication	Doc. 3.2.4
3.2.5	Wetland Link International	Doc. 3.2.5
3.2.6	EAAFP information and news: domestic dissemination by each Partner	Doc. 3.2.6
Break-out session: Small group discussions on Objectives 1 & 2 – opportunities for 2011 (45 minutes)		
(reporting back will be on Day 3, first session) Or alternative topics.		
Lunch (12:30 – 1:30pm): Buffet served in the hotel restaurant on the ground floor		
3. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities (1:30 – 3:30pm) continued		
3.3 Objective 3: Enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, knowledge and information exchange		
3.3.1	Report by Task Force 1: Monitoring of waterbirds and habitats	Doc. 3.3.1
3.3.2	Report by Task Force 2: Coordination of waterbird colour marking	Doc. 3.3.2
3.3.3	Proposed Focal Regions: Yellow Sea; Yangtze floodplain; Amur-Heilong.	Doc. 3.3.3
3.3.4	Monitoring activities by Partners: opportunity for report and discussion	Doc. 3.3.4
3.4 Objective 4: Build capacity to manage waterbirds and their habitats		
3.4.1	Facilitating development and activities of national partnerships	Doc. 3.4.1
3.4.2	AusAID project "Wetland Management Guidelines" with SFA, China	Doc. 3.4.2
Afternoon Tea (3:30 – 4:00pm)		
3. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities (4:00 – 5:30pm) continued		
3.5 Objective 5: Develop flyway-wide approaches to enhance the conservation status of migratory waterbirds		
3.5.1	Report by Task Force 3: Endorsement of action plans for threatened species	Doc. 3.5.1
3.5.2	International Action Plan for Spoon-billed Sandpiper	Doc. 3.5.2
3.5.3	International Action Plan for Scaly-sided Merganser	Doc. 3.5.3
3.5.4	Implementation of other CMS species action plans (2)	Doc. 3.5.4
Break-out session: Small group discussions on Objectives 3, 4 & 5 – opportunities for 2011 (45 minutes)		
(reporting back will be on Day 3, first session) Or alternative topics.		
Dinner (6:30 – 8:30pm): Reception hosted by EAAFP – venue to be advised		

Continued on next page...

Day Three: Wednesday 8 December

3. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities (9:00 – 10:00am) continued		
Reports from break-out sessions		
3.6	Objective 1 through to Objective 5 (or alternative topics). Identify actions arising from the reports from break-out sessions.	Document 3.6
4. Building the Partnership (10:00 – 10:30am)		
4.1	Review of Implementation Strategy 2007-11 and Communication Strategy and schedule preparation of next version	Document 4.1
5. Potential new collaborative activities of the Partnership		
5.1	Developing engagement of corporates in collaborative activities.	Document 5.1
Morning Tea (10:30 – 11:00am) : served outside the meeting room		
6. Flyway Partnership Administration (11:00am – 12:00pm)		
6.1	Rules of procedure of Meetings of Partners	Document 6.1
6.2	Delegation of authority between Chair & Chief Executive (adopt final version)	Document 6.2
6.3	Guidelines for sponsorship to attend MoPs (adopt final version)	Document 6.3
6.4	Report of Task Force 4: Terms of Reference and appointment of the Management Committee	Document 6.4
6.5	Terms of Reference of the EAAFP Secretariat	Document 6.5
6.6	Secretariat's Work Plan for 2011	Document 6.6
6.7	Secretariat's Budget for 2011	Document 6.7
7. Other Business (12:00 onwards)		
7.1	Matters that have arisen during the Meeting, preferably notified to the chairperson in advance.	
8. Appointments:		
8.1	Next Chair and Vice-Chair of Partnership (from June 2011).	Document 8.1
8.2	Management Committee members.	Document 8.2
9. Next Meeting		
9.1	Hosting Offers that have been received by the Chair/Secretariat	Document 9.1
10. Meeting Close (12:30pm)		
Lunch (12:30 – 1:30pm): Buffet served in the hotel restaurant on the ground floor		
Side Events Session C (1:30pm – 3:30pm)		
Separate smaller meetings to be held in parallel or in the next Session. Final scheduling will aim to minimise overlap of interests.		
	Task Force for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper Action Plan *	
	Anatidae Working Group meeting (if required)	
	Task Force 1 (Monitoring) meeting (if required)	
Afternoon Tea (3:30 – 4:00pm)		
Side Events Session D (4:00pm – 5:30pm)		
	Crane Working Group meeting	
	Task Force for the Scaly-sided Merganser Action Plan *	
	Task Force on coordination of colour marking	
Dinner (6:30 – 8:30pm): own arrangements		

* Preferably to occur after Agenda item 3.5.1 has been concluded.

Continued on next page....

Day Four: Thursday 9 December

A full day field trip to **Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve**, hosted by Cambodia, is proposed. Tonle Sap is South-East Asia's largest freshwater lake; it is only 30 minutes by bus from the MoP5 hotel. This will be a boat trip and is expected to include a visit to the Prek Toal area which is an internationally important site for breeding by colonial-nesting waterbirds including several migratory species. It will also be a chance to visit lake-dwelling human communities.

An information sheet will be provided to participants at registration on 5/6 December.

Day Five: Friday 10 December

A full and/or half day field trip to the **Angkor Wat UNESCO World Heritage Area** will be hosted by Cambodia. The Angkor Wat complex comprises many parts, some only 15 minutes from the hotel.

1.4 Attendance list, record of apologies, admittance of observers

Explanatory notes:

A provisional attendance list may be provided to participants at the start of the Meeting based on those who have registered with the EAAFP Secretariat before the Meeting. It should indicate those who are seeking to be admitted to the Meeting as Observers.

A final attendance list may be provided during the Meeting based on those who confirmed their registration during the Meeting.

This final attendance list will be included in the Report (Minutes) of the 5th Meeting of Partners.

Record of Apologies

Notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat

No specific attendance apologies have been received by the Secretariat from an EAAFP Partner.



Action required by Partners:

- To admit Observers to MoP5.
- To ask the Secretariat to follow-up with any absent Partners by sending them the draft Report of the Meeting and encouraging their involvement in EAAFP.

1.5 Presentation of Certificates to new Partners

Explanatory notes:

One new Partner joined in February 2010 but arrangements to present its Certificate of Participation during 2010 were unsuccessful. Three new Partners have joined EAAFP since MoP4. A Certificate of Participation will be presented to each of these Partners (listed in order of joining EAAFP):

- Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (NGO Partner)
- Miranda Naturalists' Trust (NGO Partner)
- Bangladesh (Government Partner)
- Thailand (Government Partner)



Action required by Partners:

To witness and welcome the new Partners!

1.6 Minutes of the 4th Meeting of Partners

Explanatory notes:

The document *Report of the Fourth Meeting of Partners* as provided on the website of the EAAFP at <http://www.eaaflyway.net/4th-meeting.php> is the official draft record of proceedings (minutes) of the 4th Meeting.

It comprises 22 pages, so to save paper, it is not included here and participants are requested to download and review the draft report separately. A small number of printed copies may be made available at the 5th Meeting of Partners.

The *Report of the Fourth Meeting of Partners* remains as draft status until adopted by the 5th Meeting of Partners (Agenda item 1.6).



Action required by Partners:

To adopt the *Report of the Fourth Meeting of Partners* as the final version of the minutes of the 4th Meeting, incorporating any adjustments permitted by the chairperson of the present (5th) Meeting.

2.1 Overview reporting: Brief report from the Secretariat

Report prepared by Roger Jaensch, Chief Executive.

Explanatory notes:

The report is provided to inform Partners of Secretariat activities in the reporting period 2010, mainly from close of the 4th Meeting of Partners in February until about early November.

Facilities, staffing and professional development

- The Secretariat office was maintained in GetPearl Tower, Songdo, Republic of Korea through ongoing funding from Incheon City Government.
- In October the office sustained temporary water damage due to a fire on upstairs floors.
- Problems with computing occurred and were generally resolved but better technical support is needed. Professional IT support with English speaking technicians is difficult to secure.
- Staff composition and principal roles have not changed since MoP4:

Chief Executive:	Mr Roger Jaensch
Deputy *:	Mr Eui-yeon Lee
Science Officer:	Dr Chang-yong Choi.
Communication and Information Officer:	Ms Aram Lee
Publications Officer:	Ms Min-seon Kim
Administration Officer *:	Mrs Mee-hyang Woo
Finance Officer *:	Mr Hyeong-mun Kim

* = seconded from Incheon City Government under the terms of the Hosting MoU.
Mr Lee and Mrs Woo will complete their terms during the first half of 2011.
- Professional development provided to staff or supported during 2010 included training on Flyway Network sites, waterbird families and English communication skills (written, spoken).
- Opportunities were given for all staff to engage with Partners through travel outside of Korea.
- Occupational health and safety issues (eg. fire drill) were overseen by the Chief Executive.

Maintenance and development of the Partnership

- Four new Partners joined EAAFP during 2010 (see Agenda 1.5).
- Significant progress occurred in discussions with two potential Partners (Mongolia, Malaysia).
- Secretariat staff represented EAAFP at 10 international and 4 domestic (Korean) meetings/workshops in 2010, eg. AEWA symposium (Europe), cranes meeting (Russian F.E.).
- Secretariat staff made face-to-face contact with representatives of 17 of the 24 EAAFP Partners, and 4 potential Partners, between MoP4 and mid November 2010.
- Ten of the Flyway countries and 15 Flyway Network Sites were visited.

Achievement against the EAAFP Implementation Strategy and 2010 Work Plan

- A high level of completion/progress on specific tasks set by MoP4 was achieved (see below); drafting and consultation on documents requested by MoP4 was time consuming.
- Modest progress was achieved on general work against the five EAAFP objectives.
- Network Sites. Two sites (Japan) were designated in 2010 but progress elsewhere has been slow due to consultations/negotiation on candidate sites and boundaries. (See Agenda 3.1.1.)
- CEPA. Significant restructuring and expansion of the EAAFP website was achieved.
- Research & monitoring. Technical support was given (Chief, Science Officer) to the EAAFP colour marking, species action plan and monitoring task forces.
- Capacity building. Equipment for monitoring was delivered to 3 sites (DIPA: Agenda 3.3.3). Development of sister site arrangements within the Flyway Site Network was promoted.
- Action planning. Chief & Science Officer participated in the first action planning workshop for the Scaly-sided Merganser (Vladivostok).
- If possible and deemed worthwhile by Partners, an Annual Report may be prepared for circulation to Partners and potential Partners/supporters early in 2011.

Matters arising from the Fourth Meeting of Partners

- An explanation of specific items may be given verbally by the Chief Executive during MoP5 by referring to the table.
- Significant progress or completion was achieved on all but 4 of the 47 Actions arising from MoP4 (summary table at end of Report of MoP4): Actions 2, 16, 18 (?), and 43.
- In regard to Action 43 (GEF funding), discussions were held with Partner Wetlands International about opportunities and prospects in regard to previous proposals for support to implementation of EAAFP activities, but conclusions were not favourable at this time. Securing co-funding is a major obstacle.
- Many aspects of the matters arising have been captured in the Agenda for MoP5.
- Most of the writing tasks commissioned by MoP4 and assigned to task forces or the Secretariat were completed or greatly advanced. Guidelines on EIA and sensitive issues were not developed.

Financial situation:

- The Secretariat maintains accurate and detailed financial records that have been inspected by an international auditor (BDO). But accrual accounting and computer accounting programs have not been adopted as yet – English language versions are not readily available or used.
- The Korean financial year ends 31 December 2009. An audited financial report of 2009 income and expenditure by BDO was tabled at MoP4. The Secretariat is required to return the balance of 2009 funds (KRW 203 million, ca. USD 183,000) to the Host City.
- Funds received by the Secretariat in 2010 were:
 - From the Host City as per the hosting MoU: KRW 509.0 million (ca. USD 460,000).
 - From Partner Japan as a 2009-10 contribution: JPY 2.0 million (ca. USD 22,000).
 - From Partner Japan as a 2010-11 contribution: JPY 2.0 million (transfer pending).
 - From Partner R-o-Korea, a voluntary contribution (under negotiation).
 - From Partner Australia for printing of shorebird ID guide: KRW 5.8 million.
 - Interest from short-term investments: KRW 1.3 million to 30 September.
- The Host City funds are held in separate bank accounts to funds from the Partners.
- Balance of 2010 Host City funds at 30 September 2010: KRW 198.1 million (USD 178,000).
- Anticipated expenditure of 2010 host City funds on operating the Secretariat and conducting Partnership Activities during the last quarter of 2010, is expected to consume all but about KRW 17.0 million (contingency items and allocation for postponed workshop) if MoP5 costs match projections. The Host City has advised that any unspent 2010 balance may be retained for use in the next year.
- Funds from Japan in 2009-10 were consumed for document translation (Khmer) and Secretariat travel; funds for 2010-11 are earmarked for poster production, CBD side event costs, and additional Secretariat travel including to meet with potential Partners. The Shorebird ID guide (Russian) is not ready for publication.
- Liabilities: compulsory payments to staff 'retirement funds' for hired staff (4) have been established as quarterly transfers. No provision for unused leave has been made as yet.
- Assets: equipment purchased by the Secretariat during 2010 included: Nikon telescope (1), binoculars (3), DSLR camera and lenses (1), high luminance data projector (1).



Action required by Partners:

To review the report and decide and schedule any action arising.

Document 2.2

2.2 Summary of Partner Reports submitted to the Secretariat

Explanatory notes:

If preparation time is available and sufficient responses are received, an overview will be provided to Partners at MoP5 summarising the various reports submitted to the Secretariat by Partners using the Reporting Template. The template was circulated to Partners and posted on the EAAFP website on 15 October 2010. Reporting typically covers the 10 month period from January to October 2010.



Action required by Partners:

To review the summary and decide and schedule any action arising, such as commonly supported points raised by the Partners in their reports.

Document 2.3

2.3 Brief update from EAAFP Working Groups

Explanatory notes:

The following report is provided to inform Partners of the activity of the EAAFP Working Groups in the reporting period. It mainly refers to the period from the close of the 4th Meeting of Partners in February 2010 until about the end of October 2010.

List of component papers (see following pages):

- 2.3.1 Avian Influenza Working Group
- 2.3.2 Seabird Working Group
- 2.3.3 Shorebird Working Group
- 2.3.4 Anatidae Working Group
- 2.3.5 Crane Working Group

Document 2.3.1

2.3.1 Avian Influenza Working Group

Report provided by... (no report received)



Action required by Partners:

To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

2.3.2 Seabird Working Group

Report provided by... (no report received)



Action required by Partners:

To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

2.3.3 Shorebird Working Group

Report provided by Australasian Wader Studies Group (Ken Gosbell, Interim Chair)

Introduction

In my report to MoP4 several issues were raised in regard to the role and effectiveness of 'working groups'. In particular, the Shorebird working group sought feedback from Partners on the role they required of this group. While this was not fully addressed at the meeting there was an informal indication of the need for an 'expert group' to which the Partners could refer relevant issues for advice. As a result I have suggested that a meeting of those shorebird specialists attending MoP5, together with any local experts, be held at a convenient time within the agenda to discuss a constructive path for supporting the Partnership and to identify any specific issues.

Informal Collaboration

Shorebird experts around the EAA Flyway have a loose network based on their common interest of shorebird science and conservation. This network has enabled informal collaboration in a number of important activities such as:

- Training programs,
- Participating in workshops and conferences in China, Korea, Australia etc
- Participating in banding expeditions in North-west Australia
- Providing information and advice related to population monitoring based on Shorebirds 2020 experience (Australia), Monitoring 1000 (Japan) and AWC etc
- Encouraging ongoing collaboration at important shorebird areas such as Yalu Jiang, Bohai etc.
- Supporting management strategies for critically endangered species.
- Sharing information on new developments such as geolocators (Australia).

Recommendations

- I. That Partners endorse the proposal for a meeting of shorebird specialists in conjunction with MoP5,
- II. That Partners consider the role of the SWG in action plans arising from agenda items at MoP5.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.
- To consider the two recommendations in the report.

2.3.4 Anatidae Working Group

Report provided by... (no report received)



Action required by Partners:

To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

2.3.5 Crane Working Group

Report provided by BirdLife International (Simba Chan, Asia office)

Main achievement in the first half of 2010:

Regional:

- The International Red-crowned Crane Network conducted a coordinated count for the species on 9 January 2010 (China, Republic of Korea and Japan)
- From 26 April to 1 May and During 12-17 May 2010, staff of the Daursky Reserve (Russia) and Mongol-Daguur Reserve (Mongolia) conducted joint research work on study and monitor cranes and wetlands in the Mongolian of the Dauria International Reserve and neighboring Daurian steppes.
- The workshop, “Cranes – Climates – People” was convened at Muraviovka Park (Russia) from May 29 to June 3, 2010. This workshop was attended by 30 participants from 14 countries. A practical manual or guide will be developed in the next couple years to help Crane Specialist Group members respond effectively to these issues. Abstracts is available at <http://muraviovkapark.ru/doc/actionsCCPabstracts.pdf>
- Daursky Reserve (Russia) held an International seminar "Crane-Farmer Conflicts and Conservation Response to Climate Change for Cranes and the Wetlands They Inhabit" from 4-9 June 2010. Four American specialists, four Russian specialists and local farmers participated to discuss problems on crop damage and climate changes. Daursky has also monitored the crane population and habitats in the first half of 2010.
- Khingansky State Nature Reserve (Russia) has Cooperation Agreement with Honghe Nature Reserve (China) with special emphasis on ecological education and Oriental stork studies. A meeting and probably exchange the delegations is planned for late 2010..
- Dr Oleg Goroshko, Russian representative of Crane Working Group, has written an article on the BirdLife Asia News on the climate change of the Dauria Region, which covers three Crane network sites and an international protected area at the borders of Russia, Mongolia and China. He has raised the international awareness on the situation on the problem of drying up of this region. The article can be downloaded at <http://birdlife-asia.org/newsletter/documents/nl30.pdf>

National:

- Staff of the Daursky Reserve (Russia), during spring and the first half of 2010, made nine presentations, lectures and festivals about birds and cranes and conservation of them for 574 local children in different schools.
- Khingansky State Nature Reserve Reintroduction Center (Russia) released nine captive bred Red-crowned cranes of one year old in the wild.
- Bolonsky State Nature Reserve (Russia) together with National Institute for Environmental Studies (Japan), Khingansky State Nature Reserve (Russia) and Amur province agency for protected territories conducted ground survey and taking blood and tissue samples for Oriental Storks in some protected territories of Amur province for genetic and disease study

...and project for cryo-conservation.

- ICF worked with National Bird Banding Center (China) and several network sites in organizing a Siberian Crane Count on 17 April 2010, involving 57 observers who counted all species of cranes and other migratory waterbirds at 67 locations in northeast China.

Schedule for the second half of 2010:

- A crane meeting is planned in China in late 2010, which would cover the issue on the recovery of a Red Crowned Crane wintering site at Ambyon, DPR Korea, and we may also raise the issue of climate change at the inland steppe in NE Asia that raised by Dr. Goroshko. Unfortunately because of recent politic developments the meeting has to be postponed.
- The crane working group plans to meet in Siem Reap, in conjunction with the meeting of the EAAFP.

National: Russia:

- During the second half of 2010 the research and monitoring of crane populations and habitats in Daurisky Reserve and neighboring Daurian steppes will be continued, including census on cranes on the migratory gathering sites. During September of 2010 Daurisky Reserve will organize Crane Festival for local people living around the reserve and in neighboring Daurian steppes.
- During 26-29 July of 2010 Daurisky Nature Reserve plan to do Workshop of the Dauria International Reserve (Daurisky, Mongol-daguur and Dalainor) in Mongolia for reporting about joint international work during 2009 and first half of 2010, discussing of cooperation and planning of joint international activities during second half of 2010 and 2011. Status and conservation of cranes and wetlands, and global climate change will be special topics for the Workshop.
- During 19-27 July of 2010 staff of the Daurisky Reserve, Sokhondo Reserve (Russia) and Mongol-daguur Reserve (Mongolia) will organize international Russian-Mongolian children summer ecological camp in the Daurisky Reserve and in Sokhondo Reserve. Status and conservation of waterbirds and wetlands, and global climate change will be important topics for the camp.

National: China:

- ICF is cooperating with Yunnan Forestry Bureau and Dashanbao Nature Reserve to hold a Black-necked Crane Workshop at Dashanbao from November 30 to December 3, 2010.



Action required by Partners:

To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

3.1 Objective 1: Develop the Flyway Site Network

Explanatory note:

Separate explanatory notes and action points have been inserted in each component paper.

List of component papers (see following pages):

- 3.1.1 Current status of Flyway Site Network and recent or proposed nominations
- 3.1.2 Status of Network site documentation and maps.

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

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat.

Present situation

The present number of sites in the Flyway Site Network is 99 (<http://www.eaaflyway.net/list-of-sites.php>). At least 700 sites are known to be internationally important for migratory waterbirds in the Flyway.

The list of sites by country is as follows:

* indicates categories transfer under consideration, and status to be resolved

Russian Federation *	10	The Philippines	2
Mongolia *	5	Malaysia *	1
China	19	Indonesia	1
DPR of Korea	2	Papua New Guinea	1
Rep of Korea	8	Singapore	1
Japan	29	Australia	17
Thailand	1	New Zealand	2

Sites to be transferred from previous networks

Written advice was received from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 12 July 2010 that it agreed to transfer its two sites to the present Flyway Site Network.

During 2010, the Chief Executive under advice from Evgeny Syroechkovskiy wrote to the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources requesting transfer of Russia's 10 sites. Despite follow-up, to date no reply has been received.

During visits by the Science Officer and Chief Executive to Mongolia in 2010, the transfer of Mongolia's five sites was discussed with waterbird scientists and government officers. Mongolia is closely considering if it will become a Partner of EAAFP and, should it go ahead, it will address the transfer and/or designation of sites to the Network at that time. Significant changes have occurred to some sites including some as the result of changes in climate.

The Chief Executive has been in contact with Malaysia, assisted by BirdLife International's affiliate (Malaysian Nature Society), about transfer of the site Kapar Power Station. Unfortunately, the fly ash ponds used by up to 20,000 migratory waterbirds (mainly shorebirds, at high tide) are likely to become less suitable for shorebirds in the near future. This issue has influenced discussions about transfer of this site. However, other new Network site nominations (eg. Selangor and Sarawak coastal sites) are being considered in the context of discussions between the Secretariat and the Government about Malaysia becoming a Partner of EAAFP.

New sites since MoP4

The following sites have been designated to the Flyway Site Network since the previous MoP:

- Furen-ko and Shunkuni-tai, JAPAN (supports 12 migratory waterbird populations, mainly Anatidae, at 1% levels; also supports threatened waterbird species)

Site nominations under development

- REPUBLIC OF KOREA has made substantial progress with three potential nominations.
- INDONESIA conducted consultations in November regarding a potential nomination.
- BANGLADESH has sought advice on a list of potential candidate sites for nomination.
- CAMBODIA has proposed a program for consultations about site nominations.

Document 3.1.1

- THAILAND, in its application to become a Partner, indicated it would pursue a nomination.
- AUSTRALIA has formally discussed new nominations with the provincial agencies.

To successfully and properly establish a new site in the Flyway Site Network requires considerable lead time for consultations and technical review.

A flowchart illustrating the process for new nominations to the Network, to assist Partners, was developed by the Secretariat and is available on the EAAFP website at <http://www.eaaflyway.net/nominating-a-site.php>



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any new action arising.

Document 3.1.2

3.1.2 Status of Network site documentation and maps

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat.

Information added to the Partnership website

During 2010 the Secretariat added a page “Information on sites, and Maps” to the EAAFP website <http://www.eaaflyway.net/information-sites-maps.php> . This enables users to view a map of the location of each Network site for each country where Network sites exist and also to open a Google Earth placemark positioned over a composite satellite image of the site and its surrounds. The Secretariat attempts to update these tools as new sites are designated.

In relation to the Google Earth placemarks, Partners are asked to check the position of each placemark and advise the Publications Officer (Ms Min-seon Kim min-seon.kim@eaaflyway.net) if any adjustments are required. Ideally please email her a replacement placemark.

As site boundaries are polygonal rather than points, this method of mapping is indicative rather than prescribing the boundary so some discretion may be needed in where the placemark is positioned over the site. Some adjustments from the official site coordinates have been necessary (but only for using the Google Earth feature) so that the placemarks do not appear above factories or other surrounds of the actual Network site!

Missing documentation

When sites are nominated to the (present) Flyway Site Network it is required that a complete and adequate Site Information Sheet be provided as well as a map of the site boundary. Due to transformation from a previous system involving three separate networks, for which the documentation requirements were different, the result is that the Secretariat lacks essential documentation for many Network sites that were nominated between 1996 and more recent years. In some cases this may be simply misplacement of copies that do exist and can be retrieved from the relevant Government Partners and/or EAAFP Working Groups.

- Sites for which the Secretariat does not have a Site Information Sheet = 81
- Sites for which the Secretariat does not have a boundary map = 87

Due to other priorities in its work program the Secretariat has been unable to resolve this gap during 2010 but intends to give it greater attention in 2011. It is possible that some information

sheets will be located but likely that many of the Site Information Sheets and boundary maps will need to be fully written as new documents. This will require significant investment in consultation and technical review. Ideally, the relevant Government Partners, assisted by Working Groups and experts, would prepare the documents with support from the Secretariat's Science Officer. It would also be ideal if the maps could be provided as digital shapefiles for eventual incorporation into a GIS operated by the Secretariat but that may be unrealistic at this time.

The Secretariat proposes to secure approval from Government Partners before any information sheets or boundary maps are posted on the EAAFP website.

Development of a GIS system at the Secretariat

The Secretariat wishes to provide a digital information service to the Partners such that they can receive, or access online, appropriate geographic information about the sites of the Flyway Site Network. This requires securing or creating digital maps of each site and setting up in-house GIS capability. Two of the present Secretariat staff have some experience with GIS systems; additional training may be needed and suitable hardware and software must be obtained.

Access to such information may be possible via the EAAFP website. In the longer term, rather than create new systems, it may be possible to extend coverage of the Critical Site Network Tool, established for the African-Eurasian flyways under AEWA, to the EAA Flyway. This comprehensive tool enables users to access site, waterbird and geographic data online.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.
- To consider the proposals that:
 - The Partners review the Google Earth feature for locations of Network sites on the EAAFP website and indicate any adjustments to the Secretariat.
 - The Secretariat work with Partners to secure any existing SISs and maps, which have not reached the Secretariat's files
 - The Secretariat liaises with Partners to create an SIS and boundary map for each site where they do not exist.
 - The Secretariat obtain Partner approval before uploading site data.
 - The Secretariat explore and develop its capability for establishing an in-house GIS of the Network sites and/or secure use of suitable existing tools.

3.2 Objective 2: Enhance communication, education and public awareness

Explanatory notes:

Separate explanatory notes and action points have been inserted in each component paper.

List of component papers (see following pages):

- 3.2.1 Translation of Partnership's key documents and website language issues
- 3.2.2 Update on proposed global workshop on waterbird flyways
- 3.2.3 Report on EAAFP side event held at CBD CoP10, Japan

3.2.4 Development of e-newsletter and quarterly publication

3.2.5 Wetland Link International

3.2.6 EAAFP information and news: domestic dissemination by each Partner

Document 3.2.1

3.2.1 Translation of Partnership's key documents and website language issues

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat.

Progress with language versions

At MoP4 (Agenda 3.2.1), significant gaps in available language versions of key EAAFP documents were identified as Khmer, Korean and Japanese and in some cases English. Key documents are the Partnership Document, Implementation Strategy, Communication Strategy, Site Information Sheet, Network Benefits and Expectations document, and Flyway Species Population Estimates (all downloadable from the EAAFP website.) To produce additional documents in languages of all Partners may be unmanageable for the Secretariat.

Progress on addressing gaps since MoP4 includes:

- Translation of key documents to Khmer language has been contracted to Partner Cambodia with funding support by Japan Ministry of the Environment. Many of the documents have been translated and completion is due by December 2010. The Khmer versions will facilitate consultations for development of Network site nominations.
- Japanese versions of some documents have been provided by Japan and uploaded.
- Some Korean versions have been obtained and others are being translated by the National Institute for Biological Research.

Website language issues

Many people who try to use websites in foreign languages and/or unfamiliar scripts are discouraged by unfamiliar menu labels and text to the extent that the website may not be used at all. A common solution is to provide a translation feature on the website; browser-based translation tools can help to some extent. The Secretariat attempted to install a translate function on the EAAFP website, to take users to the 'site map' page so they could find uploaded documents provided in their first language. Significant challenges arose and prevented completion but are being tackled by the Publications Officer assisted by the consultant who created the website.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.
- To consider the proposal that the Secretariat continue to explore best possible ways to provide a point of entry to the website in all Partner languages.

3.2.2 Update on proposed global workshop on waterbird flyways

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat.

At MoP4 (Agenda 3.2.3), Partners were introduced to a proposal by a consortium (Ramsar, BirdLife International, Wetlands International) to conduct a workshop on global flyways, to collate lessons learned and plan future directions in regard to flyway initiatives, worldwide.

During 2010, the consortium negotiated with the Ramsar Regional Center – East Asia (RRC-EA), which offered to host the workshop in late November 2010 in Changwon, South Korea, with local financial support. Unfortunately, this date proved difficult because many of the essential invited experts were unable to attend due to other commitments (it was a remarkably busy week!). The workshop was postponed to 2011.

The organisers recognise the critical need to secure the availability of sufficient of the regional and global experts, and are working to reschedule the workshop in 2011, probably March or April. Hosting by RRC-EA in Korea is still being discussed.

The EAAFP Secretariat through the Chief Executive has participated in the consortium's planning committee, with a particular role to liaise with RRC-EA on logistics. It has promised to support the workshop by providing travel costs sponsorship for EAAF-based experts, up to Euro 6500.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.
- To consider the proposal that the Secretariat continue its committee role and participate actively in the workshop with a report back to Partners.

3.2.3 Report on EAAFP side event held at CBD CoP10, Japan

Report provided by Japan

Objective

The Side Event promoted better understanding of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership and its importance for biodiversity conservation. It also demonstrated the significant challenges faced in conserving migratory waterbirds and their habitats in this region. It also provided the venue for the official launch of the 'State of the World's Waterbirds 2010'; the book provides a global synthesis of the state of waterbird populations of different species in different parts of the world, and how they changed between the 1970s and the 2000s and demonstrates that some progress has been made towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target.

Date and Venue

21 October, 2010, 13:15 – 14:45

Interactive Fair Tent of Japan, Government Pavilion adjoining Nagoya Congress Center in Nagoya city, Aichi, Japan

Organizer

Secretariat of East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership
Ministry of the Environment, Japan

Participants

More than 100 people participated

Programme

- 13:15 - 13:20 ; Opening remarks (by Mr. Daizaburo Kuroda, Senior Counsel to the Minister, MOEJ)
- 13:20 - 13:35 ; Launch of “State of the World Waterbirds 2010” and introduction to global flyways. (by Dr. Taej Mundkur, Wetlands International)
- 13:35 - 13:40 : Presentation of the publication to MOEJ, Ramsar Secretariat, CMS Secretariat, CBD Secretariat, DEFRA (UK Government)
- 13:40 - 13:45 : Brief statement by the Ramsar Secretariat on state of worlds waterbirds (by Prof. Nick Davidson, Ramsar Secretariat)
- 13:45 - 13:55 ; Outline of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway and other major flyways (by Dr. Kim Jin-Han, NIBR)
- 13:55 - 14:10 ; Outline of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership (by Mr. Roger Jaensch, Chief Executive, EAAFP Secretariat)
- 14:10 - 14: 15 ; Introduction of National Partnership for the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Site Network in Japan (by Mr. Naoki Nakayama, MoEJ)
- 14:15 - 14:20 ; Introduction of Shorebird Site Network in Japan (by Mr. Satoshi Maekawa, WWF Japan)
- 14:20 - 14:25 ; Introduction of Crane Site Network in Japan (by Mr. Fumio Matsumoto, Japan Crane and Stork Network)
- 14:25 - 14:30 ; Introduction of Anatidae Site Network in Japan (by Mr. Kaname Kamiya, Nakaumi Waterbirds International Foundation)
- 14:30 - 14:40 ; Management of Kabukuri–numa and the surrounding rice paddies for migratory waterbirds (by Mr. Masayuki Kurechi, Japanese Association for Wild Geese Protection)
- Moderator : Ms. Aram Lee, EAAFP Secretariat

Materials for promotion

- EAAFP Secretariat produced brochures and following posters funded by MOEJ for the side event
- (1) Challenges to biodiversity (waterbirds) in our Flyway;
 - (2) EAAFP activities;
 - (3) Threatened species – 4



Action required by Partners:

- For information of the Partners.

3.2.4 Development of e-newsletter and quarterly publication

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat.

One of the actions arising from MoP4 (summary action 14, MoP4 Agenda 3.2), backed by the Partnership’s Communication Strategy, related to development of an “e-newsletter” or similar communication tool. During 2010, the Secretariat considered various options and existing models and consulted some Partners including Ramsar and WWF. A decision was made to start a monthly e-newsletter that listed recent news articles on the EAAFP website and provided a few lines of description with a live link to the full article. The first issue was sent to Partners and other contacts in early November 2010 as an email message. The first issue included news from four months; if the volume of news is insufficient then the service may be reduced to two-monthly or quarterly

Partners are asked to provide comments on the format, scope and frequency of the new e-newsletter service, to the Secretariat's Publications Officer (Ms Min-seon Kim min-seon.kim@eaaflyway.net).



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.
- To consider the proposal that the Secretariat continues its e-newsletter service and explore additional efforts to generate and disseminate regular publications that draw attention to the work and achievements of the Partnership.

3.2.5 Wetland Link International

Briefing notes provided by Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (Chris Rostron).

Wetland Link International (WLI) was set up in 1991 and aims to provide a support network for wetland centres globally. We have 300 wetland centre members, as well as links to other networks, individuals and wetland-related organisations. The initiative is hosted by WWT (the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust), a UK-based wetland conservation NGO, with 9 wetland visitor centres, but running many other projects internationally.

WWT is ideally based to use its experience with wetland centres over the past 60 years to promote the approach with partners wherever they are working in the world. There is also a Memorandum of Cooperation with the Ramsar Secretariat, identifying WLI as a key tool to support wetland CEPA (communication, education, participation and awareness) for the convention.

A dedicated website has information and resources, with pages available in English, French, Spanish, Russian and Chinese. Although we do not have as many resources in Russian and Chinese, we hope to develop this, and currently we are creating a new WLI Russia network to facilitate local work and provide better Russian resources.

Also on the website, we have a 'virtual wetland visit' project, using 360 degree pictures, film footage and interviews to help people understand better what is happening at each wetland centre feature. We hope that this will give people support to run better wetland education centres wherever they are, and promote what they are doing to colleagues and the wider world. More traditional resources are available such as a guide to creating a wetland centre, education and engagement resources, and profiles for many of our members. These can now be seen on our regional partners site, which uses a googlemap facility to show where members are, and offer a birds-eye view of the site.

WLI Regions

WLI functions through a set of regional groups, and WLI Asia is one of them. WLI Asia has been running since 2005, with a lead taken by the Hong Kong Wetland Park and the Sungei Buloh wetland centre in Singapore. A third WLI Asia conference will take place at the end of November, based on a programme put together by the WLI Asia core group.

In Europe, WLI is leading on a project to link wetland centres in Ramsar sites, along a flyway running north-south. The project aims to help a set of 12 wetland centres develop linkages with each other, source funding and expertise, and develop projects and materials. The project works closely with Wetlands International and the Dutch Environment Agency.

Our North America network has just published a regional leaflet, which will be distributed across the partners and externally too. A core group of wetland representatives meets regularly to plan and develop work.

WLI Oceania is led on by the Hunter Wetland Centre in Australia, and we organised a WLI Oceania meeting in late 2009, bringing together partners for Australia and New Zealand. WLI Africa and WLI Neotropics are smaller, with some local partners, but we still need resources to strengthen the networks to be properly active.

WLI Asia

A core group of WLI Asia members meets regularly via skype, from across the region. Most recently, we have spent time planning and organising the forthcoming WLI Asia conference, see below for more details. Despite the time difference, we regularly stay in touch, ensuring that the network is kept active even between WLI Asia conferences.

Malaysia Nature Society (MNS), MNRE (Ministry for Natural Resources and the Environment) and WLI Asia are organising the 3rd WLI Asia Conference at Paya Indah wetlands in Kuala Selangor. The conference will have speakers from across the region, and cover themes of wetlands and people, wetland science, and wetland centres. The conference will run from the 22nd to the 25th of November, with an estimated 40-50 delegates attending.

WLI Asia also has its own website, with listings of members, and resources available in Chinese as well as English. The Hong Kong Wetland Park administers the website, and it is closely linked to the WLI Global web pages. Although WLI Asia no longer produces newsletters, it still updates its members with news and events, and posts member newsletter on the website. Student exchange visits have also taken place between centres in Asia.

For more information on WLI Global, contact Chris Rostron, the Head of WLI at chris.rostron@wwt.org.uk; for more on WLI Asia, contact Eric Wong on eric_yh_wong@afcd.gov.hk



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

3.2.6 EAAFP information and news: domestic dissemination by each Partner

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat.

Effective communication to all relevant stakeholders is critical to the success of any initiative. Information about the EAAF Partnership and Flyway Network Sites should be distributed as widely as possible at the domestic or operational level by the Partners. Whereas the Secretariat may communicate such information to several contacts in the Partner organisation, it is not appropriate or practical for the Secretariat to communicate it widely at the domestic level.

At the national level, the EAAFP encourages the creation or enhancement of domestic networks ('national partnerships') of cooperating organisations that support the objectives and activities of the EAAFP. If Partners succeed in operating such domestic networks, they may find communication from the official focal point to other parts of government and the community, at all levels, far more successful.

This issue is particularly important in regard to managers of the Flyway Network Sites, to ensure they are fully aware of their participation in the Network despite changes in personnel that inevitably occur over time.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

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

Explanatory notes:

Separate explanatory notes and action points have been inserted in each component paper.

List of component papers (see following pages):

- 3.3.1 Report by Task Force 1: Monitoring of waterbirds and habitats
- 3.3.2 Report by Task Force 2: Coordination of waterbird colour marking
- 3.3.3 Focal Regions: Yellow Sea; Yangtze floodplain; Amur-Heilong Basin (DIPA)
- 3.3.4 Monitoring activities by Partners: opportunity for report and discussion

3.3.1 Report by Task Force 1: Monitoring of waterbirds and habitats

Briefing notes provided by the Secretariat

Despite several setbacks in scheduling, a workshop was successfully conducted on 28-30 October 2010 at the Secretariat premises in Incheon, Korea, to discuss directions for monitoring of waterbirds and their habitats in the flyway. This arose from the formation of a temporary task force at MoP4 on this subject (summary action 17, MoP4 Agenda 3.3.4). Ten invited experts, based in seven countries, participated and a series of recommendations was crafted. A more detailed report for MoP5 will be provided by the workshop leader, Wetlands International.



Action required by Partners:

- Specifically, to consider recommendations in the report of the task force workshop held in October 2010.

3.3.2 Report by Task Force 2: Coordination of waterbird colour marking

Briefing notes provided by the Secretariat **Additional report is attached at page 57.**

At MoP4, considerable interest was expressed in improving the coordination of colour marking of waterbirds for migration study in the flyway and a short term task force was commissioned to investigate this (summary action 19, MoP4 Agenda 3.3.6). Under leadership of Australia, an email discussion group was formed, with numerous participants representing most of those agencies/groups active in colour marking in the flyway.

During 2010, terms of reference and a basic work plan were agreed and some initial tasks completed. This included a review of the material that illustrates the protocols in use for colour-marking of migratory shorebirds in the flyway. The Secretariat's Science Officer, Dr Choi Chang-yong played a key role. Meanwhile, the Secretariat has provided links to information on colour marking on the EAAFP website (<http://www.eaaflyway.net/coordination-of-marking.php>) and as new material and links are agreed, this page will be updated.

Further reporting on the task force will be provided to Partners by Australia at MoP5.

Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

3.3.3 Proposed Focal Regions: Yellow Sea; Yangtze Floodplain; Amur-Heilong Basin (DIPA)

Briefing notes provided by EAAFP Secretariat

Over recent years, the collective efforts on conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the flyway have revealed several especially important regions. These conclusions acknowledge that there are many important sites and that all are necessary for holistic conservation of migratory waterbirds in the flyway. However, some regions are important for a large number and diversity of species, have very extensive habitat and/or support much higher numbers (or proportions of flyway populations) of waterbirds than other regions. Consequently, it makes sense to give special attention to their protection and wise use. The regions are considered below.

Yellow Sea Ecoregion

The vast intertidal flats and associated coastal wetlands of the Yellow Sea Ecoregion are now known to be vital to the survival of many migratory shorebirds and other waterbirds in the flyway. The importance of sites within this region for staging (refuelling) of shorebirds on both northward and southward migration has been summarised in publications (eg. Barter, M. 2002. *Shorebirds of the Yellow Sea: importance, threats and conservation status*. Wetlands International Global Series 12). Threatened cranes and other waterbirds such as Swinhoe's Egret and Black-faced Spoonbill also depend on this region. Ten sites of the Flyway Site Network lie around the Yellow Sea coast and many more internationally important sites are known.

Because the Yellow Sea Ecoregion also supports a large portion of the world's human population and is experiencing rapid economic development, it is under great threat. Large-scale loss of habitat extent and steeply declining habitat quality have occurred and are continuing at a high

rate. The impacts on populations of migratory waterbirds, demonstrated increasingly for shorebirds, have been severe and have global-scale repercussions. Accordingly, concerted and coordinated efforts to stop loss and declines is urgently needed at the domestic and international levels. Some initiatives have occurred or are ongoing but additional integrated efforts are needed.

Yangtze Floodplain

The floodplain of the middle-lower Yangtze River is renowned for its large river-fed lake systems that support massive numbers of migratory waterbirds. Anatidae and cranes, including threatened species such as Siberian Crane and Lesser White-fronted Goose, and many other species groups depend on these wetlands as their wintering grounds. Several of the wetlands, such as Poyang and Dongting Lakes, are listed under the Ramsar Convention and/or the Flyway Site Network.

Due to large-scale changes to management of water in the river system, the need to limit the negative impacts of floods, and escalating demands for urban and rural water supplies, these floodplain wetlands are changing and may change further. At domestic and international levels, scientists and reserve managers are concerned at loss/change of habitat and declines in populations of waterbirds. New water management structures are under development. The EAAF Partnership has a responsibility to promote international cooperation to ensure that migratory connections between the Yangtze Floodplain and other regions/countries are not lost.

Amur-Heilong Basin (including DIPA)

The basin of the Amur-Heilong River system is shared by Russia, China and Mongolia and internationally important wetlands (including 9 sites of the Flyway Site Network) occur throughout. It supports almost all of the breeding grounds of six populations (three species) of threatened cranes as well as threatened Anatidae such as Swan Goose and Scaly-sided Merganser. Southernmost breeding grounds of many migratory shorebirds such as Far Eastern Curlew lie in the basin's swampy wetlands. And major inland migration routes pass through the basin, notably in the Daurian steppes where the Torey Lakes support 1% levels of 30 shorebird species.

Recent increases in human populations and intensification of agriculture have introduced serious threats to the viability of these breeding and migration sites. Some protected areas once featured as core areas of huge wetland systems are now more or less the last viable remnants of these systems. Remote lakes and swampy floodplains in arid grasslands are being modified by river channelization and extraction of water for mining projects. And steppe wetlands have experienced total loss of habitat due to prolonged drought and apparent climate change. International cooperation for conservation in this basin has been led by Partners such as International Crane Foundation and WWF. The Dauria International Protected Area (DIPA) has been established to enable cooperation on monitoring (the Ecosystem Monitoring Network) and management between Russia, Mongolia and China near where their borders meet. But equipment, training and technical support are needed.

Proposal for action by EAAFP

Deeper discussion of the issues described above is beyond the scope of the main MoP so it is proposed by the Secretariat that:

- the Partners consider establishing (3) task forces to investigate each of these three proposed focal regions
- the task forces identify the best ways in which EAAFP can enhance conservation outcomes in these regions through international cooperation, including integration with and support to appropriate existing initiatives
- the task forces consider possible project proposals for development of funding as and where appropriate.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider the proposal for action by EAAFP in relation to each of the three proposed focal regions of the flyway.

3.3.4 Monitoring activities by Partners: opportunity for report and discussion

Briefing notes provided by EAAFP Secretariat

This agenda item provides an opportunity for Partners to report on their own monitoring activities. Partners are asked to focus on activities that have flyway-wide or regional implications. Time allocated to this item will be at the discretion of the Meeting chairperson.



Action required by Partners:

- To review any reports and define and schedule any action arising.

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

Explanatory notes:

Separate explanatory notes and action points have been inserted in each component paper.

List of component papers (see following pages):

3.4.1 Facilitating development and activities of national partnerships

3.4.2 AusAID project “Wetland Management Guidelines” with SFA, China

3.4.1 Facilitating development and activities of national partnerships

Briefing notes provided by EAAFP Secretariat

Whereas the EAAF Partnership focuses on international cooperation, it encourages the activity/formation of “national partnerships” at the domestic level. Such domestic cooperation can draw together, integrate and enhance the collective efforts of the many and varied organisations that work for waterbird/habitat conservation in each country. Local governments, NGOs, site managers and academics can support the Government Partner that works with the other EAAFP Partners at the international level. (Implementation Strategy: Outcomes 3.2, 4.3, 5.3, 13.2).

National partnerships are active in some flyway countries such as Japan and are being considered in others. As the Secretariat is located in the Republic of Korea, it has a unique opportunity to assist the Government Partner in this regard. During 2010 the Secretariat helped the Ministry of Environment host a workshop for managers of Korean sites in the Flyway Site Network. This enabled valuable briefing to personnel who were new to their positions (not in their roles when the sites were designated) and stimulated interest in new site nominations by observers. It was suggested that similar workshops be held annually, at different sites around the Network in Korea.

Previously, Partners have funded projects to develop national partnerships in some flyway countries (eg. Myanmar, Thailand), which have been well appreciated locally. The Secretariat encourages Partners to increase their efforts to establish and/or strengthen national partnerships.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.

3.4.2 AusAID project “Wetland Management Guidelines” with SFA, China

Briefing notes provided by Wetlands International (Doug Watkins)

In March 2010, a two year collaborative project was initiated to strengthen wetland management in China. The AUD 1.2 million project is funded by AusAID and is a component of the Australia China Environment and Development Partnership.

The project is being implemented by Kiri-ganai Research, in association with Wetlands International, working with the Centre for Wetland Conservation and Management, State Forestry Administration of China. The project has three objectives:

1. To develop guidelines for management planning and monitoring of Internationally Important Wetlands, the construction and assessment of National Wetland Parks, and wetland restoration;
2. To develop related national policy, including national standards/forestry standards; and
3. To improve the institutional coordination mechanism for wetland management through capacity building via training activities and international inputs (national Ramsar Committee).

The wetland management guidelines are being drafted by a team of Chinese wetland experts, primarily from the Academy of Science, with the support of the overseas team. The guidelines will cover:

- Management Planning for Ramsar Sites
- Monitoring of Ramsar Sites
- Development and Assessment of National Wetland Parks
- Wetland Restoration.

These guidelines will be reviewed in workshops at 5 wetlands in China and submitted to the national Ramsar Committee.

The project also involves three training activities in Australia – for the 5 Chinese Wetland Experts, representatives of the National Ramsar Committee and representatives from the review sites.

The link with the National Ramsar Committee is an important component because it enables the project to reach out from State Forestry Administration to other national Government Agencies in China.

In implementing the project the Australian team is making special efforts to increase awareness of the needs of shared migratory waterbirds. As 7 of the 12 Flyway Network Sites are also Ramsar sites, the guidelines for the management of Ramsar sites will directly contribute to improved planning and monitoring of Flyway Network sites in China.



Action required by Partners:

- To read the report – for information only.

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

Explanatory notes:

Separate explanatory notes and action points have been inserted in each component paper.

List of component papers (see following pages):

- 3.5.1 Report by Task Force 3: Endorsement of action plans for threatened species
- 3.5.2 International Action Plan for Spoon-billed Sandpiper: task force report
- 3.5.3 International Action Plan for Scaly-sided Merganser: task force report

3.5.1 Report by Task Force 3: Endorsement of action plans for threatened species

Task force report presented by International Crane Foundation (Jim Harris)

East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership: Single Species Task Forces (Action planning process, terms of reference and types of endorsement by the EAAFP)

1. Background

Outcome 14 under Objective 5 of the East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) Implementation Strategy states that “Collaborative flyway-wide actions for waterbird species and habitats have improved the conservation status of priority species.” Clearly, international action plans for threatened waterbirds are a subject fully consistent with the Implementation Strategy of the Partnership.

Current action plans in the East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership region are at different stages of development. For example:

1. Completed plans (e.g., Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) action plans for Black-faced Spoonbill, Chinese Crested Tern, Spoon-billed Sandpiper).
2. Plans in draft (e.g., Baikal Teal, Swan Goose).
3. Plans under development (e.g., Scaly-sided Merganser, led by Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT)).
4. New plans.

Until recently, no action plans of this type for the Flyway had developed to the point of being put into practice. However:

In December 2009, the EAAFP Secretariat received a request from the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT), which will lead to the development of an international action plan for the globally “endangered” Scaly-sided Merganser. WWT asked the Secretariat if the proposed workshop could be held and action plan published under the framework and branding of the EAAFP.

In February 2010, the Spoon-billed Sandpiper Recovery Team (led by Dr Christoph Zockler), which works to implement the international action plan for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper, raised a request to become an EAAFP Task Force for implementing that action plan.

2. Terminology

The terms, “Working Group” and “Task Force” – both referenced in the Partnership documents – need to be used consistently. The Partnership has five “Working Groups” that address topics or issues of a general and on-going interest such as taxonomic groups of waterbirds, or a specific conservation issue of significance at the flyway scale. In part they arise from groups that existed before EAAFP was formed in 2006. While operation of Working Groups depends upon interest and leadership coming from the Partners as well as on funding, in many cases they might continue for a long period. On the other hand, “Task Forces” under the Partnership have a specific, well defined task that generally is of short-term duration – for example, resolving actions that arise from a Meeting of Partners, or development of an international species action plan. Task Forces may be charged with implementation of an international species action plan; while this task is not short term, it is specific and well defined, and the mandate and continuance of such a Task Force will be reviewed every three years (see Section 3.5 of this document).

3. EAAFP MoP4 agreed that:

In response to the abovementioned requests, the Fourth Meeting of Partners of EAAFP agreed as follows (Agenda 3.5.2, draft report item 115):

1. 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 support from the Anatidae Working Group, as long as it follows the agreed CMS process for action plan production.
2. 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.
3. 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 ToRs for EAAFP Single Species Task Forces (based on the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) model).
4. The Partnership should use the terminology in Section 2 of this document regarding Working Groups and Task Forces
5. The mandate and continuance of Task Forces should be reviewed every three years.

Furthermore Action 27 in the summary of actions arising from EAAFP MOP4 stated that the small group mentioned in bullet point 3.3 should “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”.

The group was chaired by Jim Harris (ICF), and comprised Baz Hughes (WWT), Bert Lenten (AEWA, now also affiliated with CMS), Taej Mundkur (WI), and Evgeny Syroechkovsky (Russia).

This briefing document provides further guidance to EAAFP MOP5 on a suggested EAAFP action planning process and on guidelines for ToRs for EAAFP Single Species Task Forces.

4. EAAFP action planning guidelines

Single Species **Task Forces** should be established to produce and implement international Single Species Action Plans under the framework (and existing structures and terminology) of CMS and the East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership, in consultation with the relevant **Working Group** (Anatidae, Crane, Shorebird, Seabird) if one exists.

The action planning process for the EAAFP, consistent with the agreed CMS process, should be:

- Hold at least one workshop with relevant experts and stakeholders.
- Produce the action plan for the entire range of the population, not just that part of the range within the EAA Flyway.
- Produce the action plan under CMS or both CMS and EAAFP where appropriate, otherwise under EAAFP alone.
- Use the latest iteration of the standard CMS/AEWA action plan format.
- Produce action plans after consultation and if appropriate in close cooperation with CMS and other relevant organizations.

5. Guidelines for Terms of Reference

EAAFP Single Species Task Forces should follow guidelines based on an agreed Terms of Reference, adapted from the AEWA model - see **Annex 1** (page 43 below).

The mandate and continuation of these Task Forces should be reviewed every three years.

The EAAFP should identify an organisation (ideally a Partner but could be another range state, NGO, university or research institute) that is prepared to take the lead in coordinating the development and implementation of Single Species Action Plans. The lead organisation should ideally support or raise funds for plan development and implementation and for a dedicated coordinator’s position.

6. Endorsement by EAAFP

The EAAFP can endorse action plans for any species / population which occurs in the EAA flyway (provided that they have been produced according to the above process and guidelines). Priority should be given to populations of globally threatened species as per the IUCN Red List or populations that are threatened within the EAA flyway (consistent with Outcome 14 sub-items).

Endorsement could include:

--Official branding of the Single Species Action Planning workshop as a SSAP workshop of the Partnership for the East Asian - Australasian Flyway. This endorsement could include the use of the EAAFP logo in SSAP workshop materials and banners.

- Explicit mention of the EAAFP in the workshop objective. For example, “To produce an International Action Plan for the [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] under the framework of the East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership and CMS (where appropriate), based on input from experts from [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Range States, for submission to the [NTH] Meeting of the Parties of the East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership”.
- Branding the resulting action plan as a SSAP of the Partnership for the East Asian - Australasian Flyway and CMS (where appropriate). This branding could include the use of the EAAFP logo and possibly a foreword by the relevant EAAFP official (e.g., Chair).
- Official recognition of the plan by the EAAFP. A suggested process for this recognition could be: Action plan is drafted by the EAAFP Single Species Task Force, in consultation with the relevant EAAFP Working Group (Anatidae, Crane, Shorebird, Seabird).
- Draft is submitted to principal range states for comment (followed up by face-to-face meetings where feasible), and these comments incorporated into the draft
- Draft is submitted to all EAAFP Partners for comment.
- Final draft is submitted, together with a draft resolution, to the EAAFP Secretariat.
- Final draft, along with a final resolution, is submitted to the next EAAFP MOP.
- The action plan is officially endorsed by the EAAFP MOP agreeing to this resolution.

7. Other issues to consider

The Action Plans should be published by the lead organization according to the design and layout in use by that organization, with inclusion of EAAFP logo and other logos as appropriate. EAAFP should consider developing its own technical publication series, that could include Action Plans produced under its auspices.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider and adopt the proposed guidelines (items 4 to 7 above) and proposed Terms of Reference (Annex 1, page 43) and define and schedule any action arising.

3.5.2 International Action Plan for Spoon-billed Sandpiper

*Briefing notes provided by the Secretariat. **Additional notes are attached at page 56.***

There is no doubt that the Spoon-billed Sandpiper is critically endangered as its global population size may be only a few hundred pairs. Furthermore, significant proportions of this number are lost to subsistence hunting in the south-western part of the flyway annually. The species may be on the verge of extinction!

In recent years, an international action plan for the threatened Spoon-billed Sandpiper was developed using the agreed process of the Convention on Migratory Species. The plan is due to be published. During MoP4, representatives of an independent recovery team for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper made a presentation about its work. Recognising these two important initiatives, the Partners considered a proposal that a species task force for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper be established by EAAFP in consultation with the Convention on Migratory Species and the Shorebird Working Group (MoP4 Report item 115). A task force was commissioned to recommend how this might integrate with the Partnership's overall approach to action planning.

Furthermore, a side meeting of the recovery team was held immediately after MoP4 with participation by Secretariat staff.

During MoP5, the endorsement of international action plans for threatened species and formation of associated EAAFP task forces will be considered (MoP5 Agenda 3.5.1). The outcomes will guide further EAAFP action regarding the Spoon-billed Sandpiper.

Regardless, it is clear that reduction of poverty including development of alternative livelihoods may be a key long-term strategy for reducing hunting pressure on the species. Significant efforts have been made at local level to raise awareness of the plight of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper and other migratory shorebirds.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider formalisation of an EAAFP task force for the Spoon-billed Sandpiper and to designate a Partner or other appropriate organisation to lead the task force.

3.5.3 International Action Plan for Scaly-sided Merganser

Report provided by Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (Baz Hughes)

Background

The Scaly-sided Merganser *Mergus squamatus* is classed as Endangered by IUCN as it has a small population which is suspected to be undergoing a continuing and rapid decline as a result of habitat loss, illegal hunting and disturbance.

The species breeds in southeast Russia, particularly Primorsky and Khabarovskiy Kray (Regions), and in small numbers in northeast China, eg. Jilin and Heilongjiang Provinces. The majority of the population is believed to winter in China, though small numbers also occur in North Korea, South Korea and Russia during winter and on migration. It is a scarce migrant elsewhere in east Asia, eg in Japan. There is, however, considerable uncertainty over its distribution in many regions during both summer and winter.

Developing an action plan

A workshop was held in Vladivostok, Russia, in April 2010 to develop an International Action Plan. It was attended by 21 participants from Russia, China, North Korea, South Korea and the UK. These included the majority of people actively working on the species today, and represented considerable combined expertise on the conservation and study of Scaly-sided Mergansers. The Chief Executive and the Science Officer of EAAFP also attended, and the action planning process was facilitated by the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT). The workshop was organised by the Lazovskiy State Nature Reserve, WWT and the IUCN-SSC/Wetlands International Threatened Waterfowl Specialist Group. Funding was provided by the Forestry Bureau (Council of Agriculture), Taipei, and by WWT. The Scaly-sided Merganser Project organised a two-day field excursion based in the Lazovskiy State Nature Reserve (Zapovednik), providing participants with close-up views of birds caught as part of a nest-box programme.

The action plan was developed using the principles already in use for the preparation of CMS/AEWA action plans. Following an overview of the species' biology and reports from regions,

the workshop identified and prioritised the key threats to the species. Major knowledge gaps were also discussed. These were used to develop a series of objectives and identify key areas of activity to improve the species' conservation status.

Key findings

The main threats were identified as poaching on the breeding grounds, drowning in fishing nets used on breeding rivers, and pollution and habitat loss as a result of extensive dam construction in the wintering areas. Whilst it was thought that many of the threats on the breeding areas could be addressed through targeted action and projects, the underlying causes of the landscape-scale threats on the wintering grounds are driven by development. The significant challenge of addressing this issue is further hampered by poor knowledge of the species' distribution in winter.

Next steps

A draft action plan will be compiled in 2010 for review by stakeholders and endorsement by Partners. This will be the first action plan developed anew under the EAAFP. It will provide the framework for the development of projects to address the key threats. A Task Force will be formally constituted to coordinate international implementation of the plan across the species' Range States.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and define and schedule any action arising.
- To consider formalisation of an EAAFP task force for the Scaly-sided Merganser and to designate a Partner or other appropriate organisation to lead the task force.

3.5.4 Implementation of other CMS species action plans (2)

Briefing will be provided at MoP5 by BirdLife International

1. Black-faced Spoonbill
2. Chinese Crested Tern

3.6 Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities: Reports from break-out sessions Objective 1 through to Objective 5

Explanatory notes:

These reports will be provided to the Meeting after the small group (break-out) sessions have concluded. It is important that digital versions of each report be provided to the Secretariat.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the reports and define and schedule any actions arising.

Document 4.1

4.1 Review of Implementation Strategy 2007-11 and Communication Strategy and preparation of next version

Briefing notes provided by EAAFP Secretariat

The Implementation Strategy of the EAAFP was adopted at the 1st Meeting of Partners in November 2006 and refers to the period 2007-2011. Ordinarily, it would be due for review with a new version to be considered by partners before the end of 2011.

The EAAFP Communication Strategy (undated) also refers to outcomes to be realised by the end of 2011 and therefore could also be reviewed with a new version to be considered by partners before the end of 2011.

Review and update may not necessarily be large tasks if the scope and content of the documents remain largely suitable for EAAFP. The Partners could appoint a task force to conduct these reviews during 2011 and present draft new versions of the strategies to the Secretariat. Drafts could be circulated to Partners for comment and final versions could be adopted by Partners out-of-session if necessary.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider and fully define a process for review and update of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy and Communication Strategy.

Document 5.1

5.1 Developing engagement of corporates in collaborative activities

Discussion item requested by Doug Watkins, Wetlands International.

Information will be presented by one or more speakers on the day. We hope to have at least one international business representative attend MoP5 as an observer.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the discussion and define and schedule any action arising.

Document 6.1

6.1 Rules of procedure for Meetings of Partners

Report provided by the Management Committee

This document was prepared by the Chief Executive, Doug Alcorn (USA), Doug Hykle (CMS) and Doug Watkins (WI) following discussion in the Management Committee prior to MoP4.

Background and context:

Rules of procedure are helpful for the good order and smooth operation of meetings of organisations, especially when unusual or contentious situations arise. Several questions on order/procedure arose in discussions of the Management Committee ahead of MoP4, so the Committee commissioned development of some basic rules for discussion/adoption at MoP5.

Broad principles

The following principles may be considered in preparing rules of order for Meetings of Partners of EAAFP”

- Parliamentary procedure:
 - To allow deliberation upon questions of interest to the organisation and to arrive at the sense or the will of the assembly upon these issues.
 - The rule of the majority with the respect for the minority: allowing the majority to make decisions effectively and efficiently while ensuring fairness to the minority and giving each member or delegate the right to voice an opinion.
- Consensus decision-making:
 - EAAFP makes decision by consensus and thus does not normally require voting (nor rules for voting) nor formal presentation and adoption of motions.
- The Secretariat of the EAAFP (or its Chief Executive) may be equated to an organisation’s secretary.
- Business shall be conducted in English because it is the most widely used language in the Flyway and the most common language of scientific publications. English is recognised as an official national language of 6 countries in the Flyway (The Philippines, Singapore, Papua New Guinea, Australia, New Zealand, USA).

Other background

- The process for appointing the Chair and Vice-Chair is based on precedent set at the First Meeting of Partners in 2006 (see Report items 6 and 7).

The proposed Rules of procedure for Meetings of Partners are included at **Attachment 1** of these Agenda Documents.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider and adopt the proposal (Attachment 1) and define and schedule any action arising.

6.2 Delegation of authority between Chair & Chief Executive

Report provided by the Management Committee

Background

The Memorandum of Understanding between the Partnership for the East Asian - Australasian Flyway and the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea as Host of the Secretariat of the East Asian - Australasian Flyway Partnership provides:

The Chief Executive will be provided with a delegation of authority from the Chair that will permit him/her to exercise the functions of the position (3D.)

Initial discussion on this matter was held at the face-to-face meeting of the Secretariat's Management Committee on 22 February 2010 (item 3.2). Outcomes were brought forward to MoP4.

Report of MoP4, 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.

The proposed Delegation of authority between the Chair and Chief Executive, prepared by the Chief Executive and the Management Committee, is included at **Attachment 2** of these Agenda Documents.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider and adopt the proposal (Attachment 2) and define and schedule any action arising.

6.3 Guidelines for sponsorship to attend MoPs (adopt final version)

Report provided by the EAAFP Secretariat

This is the 3rd draft of a document for consideration by the Partners at the next Meeting of Partners of EAAFP. The document was prepared by the Chief Executive and reviewed by the Management Committee in July-August 2010; then revisions were incorporated.

Sponsorship of participants at previous EAAFP Meetings of Partners.

At previous Meetings of Partners (MoPs) of EAAFP up to and including MoP4, a number of participants received sponsorship to attend the MoP. This support typically comprised reimbursement for the cost of a return economy airfare and direct payment of the hotel room tariff for the days of the MoP. Payments were arranged by EAAFP or directly by a sponsor such as one of the Partners. Normally, participants were asked to indicate on their registration form for the coming MoP, if they required financial assistance to attend. The extent to which such sponsorship could be provided by EAAFP depended on available financial resources (grants from a Partner; core Secretariat budget) at the time, which varied year to year.

The main reasons for providing sponsorship were (1) to enable participation by delegates from countries or organizations that otherwise would not have been able to send a representative, and (2) to encourage participation of potential Partners in the hope that they soon would become a full Partner.

Sponsorship allocated for the 4th Meeting of Partners, February 2010

- Government Partners: Indonesia (2 representatives); Cambodia (2); The Philippines (1); and Russian Federation (1).
- NGO Partners: AWSG (2).
- Potential Partners: Bangladesh (1); Thailand (1); Malaysia (1); BANCA, Myanmar (1); Mongolia (1: offered, not used); Vietnam (1: offered, not used).
- Others: AEWA (1); Spoon-billed Sandpiper recovery team (1).

Previous attendance of potential Partners at MoPs:

Thailand (4 MoPs); Bangladesh (2); Mongolia (2); Vietnam (2); China (1); Lao PDR (1); Malaysia (1); Myanmar (1). China, Bangladesh and Thailand have become Partners. This list does not reflect whether or not these delegations were sponsored.

Future expectations regarding sponsorship

The Partnership expects that all Partners will attend and participate in MoPs since the MoP is the decision-making forum of the Partnership. However, it is understandable that some Partners, both government and non-government, may require sponsorship in order to send delegates, due to insufficient resources for self-payment. In fact, as the number of Partners increases these costs are likely to be an increasing demand on the EAAFP whereas EAAFP funds will always be limited. Consequently, EAAFP needs a rationale to enable allocation of sponsorship to the Partners in a priority order. A proposed rationale, developed by the Secretariat and Management Committee, is given below.

Although the EAAFP encourages the participation of potential Partners in MoPs, it is reasonable to expect that potential Partners will become full Partners as soon as possible – within relatively few years. Accordingly, a limit might be placed on the number of years of sponsorship that will be offered to a potential Partner.

Document 6.3

Note that the number of *potential* Partners to consider for sponsorship (at least among the Flyway countries) should decrease as additional National Governments become full Partners. But it should also be recognized that once a government/organization has become a Partner, it may seek ongoing sponsorship *as a Partner*.

The proposed Guidelines for sponsorship to attend Meetings of Partners are included as **Attachment 3** to these Agenda Documents.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider and adopt the proposal (Attachment 3) and/or define and schedule any other action arising.

Document 6.4

6.4 Report of Task Force 4: Terms of Reference and appointment of the Management Committee

Briefing notes provided by the Secretariat

The Partnership established a Management Committee to oversee the appointment of the Host country and Chief Executive of the Secretariat. Terms of Reference were drafted but not formally adopted by the Partners. With the Secretariat having now moved into the operational phase, the role of the Management Committee has changed significantly.

During the Management Committee meeting associated with MoP4, the Committee resolved to review and update its Terms of Reference for adoption by the Partners at MoP5. Substantial redrafting was undertaken and the Committee produced a completed draft of revised Terms of Reference.

Some issues remain unresolved and so it is not appropriate to include the draft at this stage. Hopefully, a final draft will be circulated to Partners prior to MoP5. Otherwise, further discussion may be required during the face-to-face meeting of the Management Committee in the early stages of MoP5. Hopefully, a final draft will be circulated to Partners prior to MoP5.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and adopt the proposal and/or define and schedule any other action arising.

6.5 Terms of Reference of the EAAFP Secretariat

Briefing notes provided by the Management Committee

Background and context:

The establishment of a Secretariat for the EAAFP is described in the EAAFP Partnership Document (constitution), in paragraph 9, clauses 3-5:

3. *The Partners will establish a Secretariat to facilitate the effective communication and coordination of the Partnership and to coordinate activities across the Flyway. The Partners are encouraged to support and provide resources to the Secretariat.*
4. *The Partners will consider the nature of the Secretariat and develop and adopt Terms of Reference.*
5. *The Partners may engage the services of a Partner or organisation to provide services to the Secretariat.*

Several clauses about the Secretariat and its relationship to the Chair, the EAAFP Management Committee and the Host Government Partner, are captured in the MoU for Hosting of the Secretariat by the Republic of Korea (too lengthy to attach here).

At the face-to-face meeting of the Management Committee in Songdo, Republic of Korea, on 22 February 2010, the Secretariat was requested to review the Terms of Reference of the EAAFP Secretariat established by the First Meeting of Partners in 2006 (see **Attachment 5A**). This request recognised that the purpose and duties of the Secretariat may have changed significantly.

At first, the Secretariat functions were performed by the Australian Government, which was the Chair at that time; then by an Interim Secretariat comprising a person (Ms Maki Koyama) hosted by Wetlands International in Canberra, Australia. Finally, in 2009 a Secretariat of seven staff was established in Incheon, Republic of Korea, with resource support from the national Ministry of Environment and the Incheon Metropolitan City. However, new Terms of Reference were not provided for the Secretariat in its present form and circumstances.

In compiling the following proposed Terms of Reference for the Secretariat, the following documents have been considered:

- Terms of Reference for the Secretariat established by MoP1 (Attachment 5A)
- Interim Secretariat Tasks applied in 2008-9 (Attachment 5B)
- The Duties & Responsibilities of the Chief Executive (Attachment 5C)
- The MoU for Hosting of the Secretariat by the Republic of Korea (lengthy, not attached).

Broad principles:

It is clear that the present Secretariat has several broad roles:

- administrative support to the Partnership especially in regard to Meetings of Partners and the Flyway Site Network;
- facilitation of communication among Partners;
- storage and dissemination of information to Partners; and
- promotion of the Partnership and its foundational activities, especially securing of new Partners and development of the Flyway Site Network.

However, it is much less clear – with some differing views among Partners and some changes occurring since 2006 – as to what role the Secretariat should play in regard to:

- implementation of Flyway-wide or regional projects/activities; and
- raising and management of funding for such projects (note that this element was dropped from the original ToR between MoP1 and MoP2: see Attachment 5A).

Document 6.5

It is helpful to reflect on the reality that, with few exceptions, in the EAA Flyway it is the individual Partner Government that has greatest direct responsibility and opportunity for management of waterbird habitats and threats to habitats and waterbirds in its territory. Accordingly, at the domestic level, procurement or allocation of funding and the implementation of conservation projects should be primarily a matter for Government Partners. The EAAFP and its Secretariat have no obligation or right to involve uninvited in these matters.

However, where international cooperation is required, such as study of migration pathways or coordinated surveys, then the Partnership collectively may be an appropriate mechanism for activity, with lead responsibility being taken by one Partner or by the Secretariat.

In both situations, it is important that Government Partners do not use the Partnership/Secretariat as a means to bypass their inherent domestic responsibilities and financial commitments to conservation. Meanwhile, many of the Partners expect the Partnership/Secretariat to make a great difference to conservation outcomes, to deliver substantial achievement.

Accordingly, it is recommended that a balanced approach be taken in regard to involvement of the Secretariat in implementation and funding of projects.

The proposed Terms of Reference of the Secretariat of the EAAFP are provided at **Attachment 5**.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the report and adopt the proposal and/or define and schedule any other action arising.

Document 6.6

6.6 Secretariat's Work Plan for 2011

Report provided by the EAAFP Secretariat

The Secretariat is sometimes misunderstood as being like an international NGO with its own agenda, funds and direction but this view is incorrect. The Secretariat instead exists to administer the EAAF Partnership and to support and encourage the international cooperation activities of the Partners. In terms of financial resources, unless special funds are contributed by Partners or other donors, the Secretariat in 2011 expects to have only a modest budget (about USD 86,000 per year: see below) for conducting Partnership Activities. This includes the cost of international travel. Partners are encouraged to contribute additional resources for priority EAAFP activities.

The work of the Secretariat is based on the EAAFP Implementation Strategy <http://www.eaaflyway.net/implementation.php> and is further directed by the Meetings of Partners. In 2011, the Secretariat proposes to continue addressing the five Objectives and 14 Outcomes of the Partnership, with particular emphasis on:

1. Addition of new Government Partners in regions where there are remaining gaps (NE Asia) or few Partners (SE Asia).
2. Consolidation of the Flyway Site Network by improving documentation, awareness of participation, and access to information (including via the EAAFP website).
3. Support to delivery of benefits to Network site managers including development of sister site opportunities across the flyway and linkage to potential resources for management.

Document 6.6

4. Support to new nominations to the Network especially in Partner countries where there are many important sites but few designated to the Flyway Site Network.
5. Support to special EAAFP task forces to focus Partnership effort on the proposed focal regions (MoP5 Agenda 3.3.3).
6. Promotion of national partnerships for enhanced communication about EAAFP, about the Flyway Site Network and protection of vital habitats for migratory waterbirds.
7. Support to ongoing and expanded work of the EAAFP task force on monitoring including benchmarking of Network site condition, and its other recommendations.
8. Support to ongoing and expanded work of the EAAFP task force on coordination of colour marking across the flyway, expanding to address other species groups.
9. Enhancing recovery of the flyway's threatened (migratory) waterbird species through participation in action planning activities of commissioned EAAFP task forces.
10. Providing or catalysing capacity building as a cross-cutting element of all work of the Secretariat during 2011.

A spreadsheet with more details of the 2011 work plan may be provided to Partners at MoP5.



Action required by Partners:

- To review the proposed work plan and adopt the plan subject to defining and scheduling any other action arising from MoP5.

Document 6.7

6.7 Secretariat's Budget for 2011

Report provided by the EAAFP Secretariat

Under the Memorandum of Understanding between the EAAF Partnership and the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea, for hosting of the EAAFP Secretariat (signed in May 2009), the host country and host city (Incheon) committed to providing financial support for the Secretariat from May 2009 to May 2014 (5 years). Specifically, Incheon City Government committed to provide KRW 509 million for operational costs and Partnership activities as well as to cover the costs of providing an apartment for the chief executive and securing an office.

During 2009, the Secretariat operated in developmental mode until November-February when the Chief Executive started work and staffing was completed. The audited accounts for calendar/financial year 2009 presented to MoP4 showed Secretariat expenditure of KRW 173 million from the contribution of KRW 377 million and Incheon City requested the un-used funds (203 million) to be returned.

Expenditure for 2010 has been referred to earlier (Agenda 2.1). Essentially, a break-even working budget has been followed for 2010 and subject to the actual final costs of hosting MoP5 in December and reallocation of some contingency items, the closing balance for the year is expected to be relatively small. Note that the host city expects its contribution to be fully used up each year.

The only budgetary details specified in the MoU are totals for six broad categories of expenditure. Based on its early experience and anticipated activities in 2010, and recognising that far less was needed for equipment and related establishment costs after 2009, the Chief Executive presented

a revised breakdown between these six categories to MoP4. This was approved by the Partners including the host country.

A new budget for 2011 calendar/financial year is presented here to the Partners for approval, keeping within the same total of KRW 509 million. It takes into account:

- further operating experience and actual costs during 2010
- possible increases (say 5%) in salaries of hired staff (3) when their two year employment contracts come up for renewal during the last quarter of 2011
- anticipated increases in personnel costs paid to the government, in office rental (15%) and vehicle rental and other operating costs
- purchase of a new laptop computer; and new computer operating systems (Windows 7) and Office 2010 suite for all Secretariat computers
- the likelihood that no Meeting of Partners will occur in 2011
- payments to staff retirement (termination) funds.

<i>MoU category</i>	<i>A</i> <i>Original</i> <i>MoU</i> <i>KRW 1000</i>	<i>B</i> <i>Approved</i> <i>for 2010</i> <i>KRW 1000</i>	<i>C</i> <i>Proposed</i> <i>for 2011</i> <i>KRW 1000</i>	<i>D</i> <i>Proposed</i> <i>for 2011</i> <i>USD</i>
Personnel (including associated costs)	250,000	250,000	259,000	223,300
Office equipment (including 2 rented vehicles)	50,000	44,000	40,000	34,500
Operational expenses of the Secretariat (domestic)	50,000	42,000	34,000	29,300
Partnership Activities (including overseas travel)	100,000	100,000	100,000	86,200
Office Space (rental fee)	42,000	70,000	73,000	63,000
Office Space (overall management costs)	17,000	3000	3000	2600
Totals	509,000	509,000	509,000	438,900

Note that domestic travel costs are included under “Operational expenses for the Secretariat” and international travel costs are included under “Partnership Activities”. Also the proposed 2011 budget assumes that provisions of the MoU are fully met.

Conversion to US Dollars was at the internet (Oanda) rate dated 24 Nov. 2010.



Action required by Partners:

- To consider and adopt the proposed budget for Secretariat operation for the financial year 2011.
- To request the host country to officially communicate this result to the host city.

8.1 Next Chair and Vice-Chair of Partnership (from June 2011).

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat

The Partnership operates with a Chair and a Vice-Chair and their terms are to be two years (Partnership Document, Paragraph 9, clause 2: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/partnership-document.php>). The history of appointments is as follows:

- At the 1st Meeting of Partners in November 2006, Australia was appointed as Chair and Republic of Korea as Vice-Chair (MoP1 report item 7: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/1st-meeting.php>).
- No nominations were received for these positions at the 3rd Meeting of Partners in November 2008 and nominations were to be sought inter-sessionally (MoP3 report items 106-109: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/3rd-meeting.php>).
- Nominations were sought by the Chair in January 2009 and the Interim Secretariat advised the Partners on 11 June 2009 that Republic of Korea had been appointed as Chair and Japan as Vice Chair. This is the present situation.

Two other aspects should be considered:

- Though not specified in the Partnership Document, the Partners agreed at MoP1 (report item 6) that the Partnership should be chaired by a Government Partner.
- It was agreed (in the same item) that replacement of the Vice-Chair would not coincide with replacement of the Chair, presumably to provide some continuity of oversight. However, this has not been achieved to date because replacements and terms have coincided. (Note also that the first pair of appointments lasted 2.5 years.

As it is unlikely that another Meeting of Partners will occur in or before June 2011, the Partners should consider whether to appoint the next Chair and Vice-Chair at MoP5, or inter-sessionally, closer to June 2011.

There seems to be no precedent or rule about reappointment of (the same) Chair or Vice-Chair.



Action required by Partners:

- To acknowledge the contributions to date of the present Chair and Vice-Chair.
- To define the timing of decisions about appointing the next Chair and Vice-Chair and in doing this decide how to manage the replacements so they do not coincide.
- To conduct an election of next Chair and Vice-Chair if that shall occur at MoP5 and clarify the dates and process for handover from the incumbents.

8.2 Management Committee members

Briefing notes provided by the Management Committee

Assuming the Terms of Reference of the Secretariat's Management Committee are adopted by the Partners during MoP5 (see Agenda 6.3), an election of the new members of the Committee should be conducted at this time (unless done as part of Agenda 6.3), in line with the ToR.



Action required by Partners:

- To elect the members of the Secretariat's Management Committee.

9.1 Next Meeting of Partners: Hosting Offers that have been received by the Chair/Secretariat

Briefing notes provided by the EAAFP Secretariat

The EAAFP Partnership Document indicates that:

“Initially, to oversee implementation of the Partnership, a meeting of the Partners will be held annually or as needed at mutually convenient locations”. (Paragraph 9, clause 1: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/partnership-document.php>)

The 1st Meeting of Partners agreed “to hold Meetings annually, at least for the first five years of the Partnership” [2006 to 2010, MoPs 1-5]. (Summary of MoP1: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/1st-meeting.php>)

Accordingly, there seems to be no rule or guideline as to when the next (6th) Meeting of Partners should take place and therefore the Partners might be guided by when a meeting is actually needed. Issues to bear in mind include:

- Meetings of Partners give invigoration to the Partnership’s work and thus should be held relatively often rather than rarely.
- New Partners are being gained and may wish to participate in a Meeting not too long after joining EAAFP.
- Some potential new Partners have expressed concern about their financial and administrative burden if they are requested to attend Meetings near-annually.
- While recognising the impetus given to the Partnership by holding two Meetings in 2010, this has placed a significant burden on the Secretariat. (Note that no meeting was held in 2009.)
- The period October-December in 2010 and generally has been very busy with meetings and conferences, including events timed to coincide with local gathering of migratory waterbirds, which places a heavy travel burden on Partners.
- Due to close of the Korean financial year on 31 December, it is not possible to provide audited financial accounts to Meetings of Partners before about February.

No formal offers have been received by the Secretariat so far but some significant possibilities have been discussed. Item 178 of the report of MoP4 records some of that discussion.



Action required by Partners:

- To determine the optimal date for the next Meeting of Partners of EAAFP.
- To consider offers for hosting the next Meeting and if possible, make a decision.

ANNEXES AND ATTACHMENTS REFERRED TO ABOVE APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES.

Annexes and Attachments

To provide less cluttered reading, some material has been presented at the end of the Agenda Documents. Note carefully the naming and numbering. Cross reference to text under Agenda items is given.

Annex 1

(See Agenda 3.5.1)

Terms of Reference for EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force

Goal (as defined in the International Single Species Action Plan for the [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME])

To restore the [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] to favourable conservation status and to remove it from the threatened categories on the IUCN Red List.

Role

The role of the EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will be to:

- Produce, coordinate and catalyse the implementation of the International [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Single Species Action Plan (SSAP);
- Stimulate and support Range States in the implementation of the SSAP; and
- Monitor and report on the implementation and the effectiveness of the SSAP.

Remit

The EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will:

- Develop an International Single Species Action Plan for the [SPECIES/POPULATION NAME] if not already developed, in accordance with the EAAFP Action Planning Guidelines and consistent with the agreed process;
- Set priorities for action and implement them (this step and later steps can happen while an SSAP is still under development or awaiting formal approval);
- Coordinate the overall international implementation;
- Raise funds for development and implementation;
- Assist Range States in producing national action plans;
- Ensure the Task Force is open to governmental and expert members from all key Range States and other Partners.
- Ensure regular and thorough monitoring of the species populations;
- Stimulate and support scientific research in the species necessary for conservation;
- Promote the protection of the network of critical sites for the species, by assisting Partners to develop new Flyway Site Network nominations, and encourage the designation of new protected areas by Partners;
- Facilitate internal and external communication and exchange of scientific, technical, legal and other required information, including with other specialists and interested parties;
- Assist with information in determination of the IUCN Red List status and population size and trends of the species;
- Regularly monitor the effectiveness of implementation of the SSAP and take appropriate action according to monitoring results;
- Regularly report on the implementation of the SSAP to the EAAFP Meeting of the Partners; and
- Revise the international SSAP by [DATE] and update it in [DATE] or as required.

Membership

The EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will be open to (1) designated representatives of EAAFP Governmental Partners of all principal range states, (2) representatives of the relevant EAAFP Working Group (Anatidae, Crane, Shorebird, Seabird), (3) representatives of national experts and conservation organisations from all principal range states, international organizations, and (4) other experts (not necessarily from the EAA Flyway) as required.

Officers

A Chairperson of the EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will be elected amongst its members. This position should ideally be filled by an EAAFP Governmental Partner from a key range state.

A Coordinator post will be nominated by the Chairperson from among the Task Force members. The Coordinator will be in charge of the day-to-day operations of the Task Force, participate in fund raising, and shall act in close cooperation with the Chairperson, the EAAFP Secretariat and the relevant EAAFP Working Group (Anatidae, Crane, Shorebird, Seabird). The coordinator will be a member of the Task Force and, ideally, represent an EAAFP Partner.

Meetings

The EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force should aim to hold face-to-face meetings at least once every three years. Other face-to-face meetings may be arranged as circumstances allow (e.g., at EAAFP MOPs). Between meetings, business will be conducted electronically such as via an appropriate Task Force website and list server.

Reporting

A report on the implementation of the SSAP will be produced for each EAAFP MOP according to a standard format agreed by the EAAFP Secretariat, with contributions from all major range state Governmental Partners and Task Force members. Reports should be provided to and collated by the EAAFP Science Officer in order to ensure uniform handling of communication and record-keeping. At each EAAFP MOP, the Task Force Chairpersons, Task Force Coordinators, and/or the EAAFP Science Officer, should give an overview report on Single Species Action Plan development and implementation, summarizing progress for each Task Force, lessons learned, challenges common to the Task Forces, and any adjustments needed. Other reports will be produced by Task Forces as required by the EAAFP Secretariat or relevant EAAFP Working Group.

Financing

The operations of the EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force, including the Coordinator post, are to be financed primarily by its members and the organizations they represent. The Lead Organisation should ideally support or raise funds for development and implementation of the SSAP, including the Coordinator post, and associated SSAP activities of the Task Force. Funds may be sought from members and various external sources.

The EAAFP does not derive annual membership dues from its Partners and thus has limited resources. Accordingly the Secretariat cannot commit regular financial support and may only provide such if possible. Funding for SSAP activities of the Task Force or its members is to be sought from various external sources.

(See Agenda 6.1)

Draft Rules of Procedure for Meetings of Partners of EAAFP

1. Definitions

- a. “The Partnership” means The East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership as defined by its constitution: The Partnership Document <http://www.eaaflyway.net/partnership%20document.php>.
- b. “Partner” means a Partner of the Partnership as defined in the Partnership Document; in the context of a Meeting of Partners in progress, ‘Partner’ means those Partners in attendance.
- c. “Chair” means the Chair of the Partnership.
- d. “chairperson” means the person who will act as chair of the Meeting of Partners.
- e. “Secretariat” means the Secretariat of the Partnership.
- f. “Chief Executive” means the Chief Executive of the Partnership.
- g. “Meeting” means a Meeting of Partners. (Other meetings of the Partnership or its groups may use these Rules as a guide or may establish their own rules of order.)

2. General

- a. The Meeting provides general policy, operational and financial direction to the Secretariat concerning the implementation and the expansion of the Partnership. It also provides guidance and advice on any other matters brought to it by the Secretariat in the exercise of its function.
- b. Consistent with the Partnership Document (constitution), the interval of time between Meetings shall be determined case-by-case by the Partners.

3. Notice

- a. The Chief Executive shall issue the notice for a Meeting.
- b. The notice shall include the endorsement of the present Chair.
- c. The minimum period of notice for a Meeting shall be two months.
- d. Notice of a Meeting shall be issued electronically by email or by letter transmitted by post.
- e. Where possible, notice of a Meeting shall be issued to at least two persons who are contacts for a Partner.

4. Agenda

- a. A draft agenda for a Meeting shall be prepared by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair.
- b. A draft agenda shall be included with the notice for a Meeting or presented to Partners no less than one month before the date of the Meeting.
- c. Partners shall have opportunity to review and propose amendments to the draft agenda at the start of the Meeting.
- d. Changes to the draft agenda shall be at the discretion of the chairperson.
- e. The final agenda for a Meeting shall be adopted by the Partners.

5. Quorum

- a. The quorum required for a Meeting shall be the majority (more than half) of the Partners that are recognised in accordance with the records of the Secretariat.
- b. The quorum must be met when any decision of a Meeting is determined.

6. Language

- a. A Meeting shall be conducted in the English language.
- b. Provision of translation into other language/s of Partners is not a requirement for the conduct of a Meeting or for the report of a Meeting.

7. Chairperson

- a. The chairperson for a Meeting shall normally be the Chair of the Partnership.
- b. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair of the Partnership may preside as chairperson of the Meeting.
- c. If neither the Chair nor the Vice-Chair will act as chairperson, the Chair may nominate a suitably qualified representative of a Partner to be the chairperson and such appointment shall be endorsed by the Partners present at the Meeting.
- d. A suitably qualified chairperson will have appropriate capability in conversational English and experience of being a chairperson.
- e. The chairperson shall have the authority commonly bestowed in parliamentary procedure (refer Robert *et al.* 2004).
- f. The chairperson shall manage the discussion times in order to complete the agenda according to schedule.

8. Observers

- a. Observers may be admitted to a Meeting with approval of the chairperson following consultation with the Partners.
- b. Observers may be permitted to contribute to discussion, at the discretion of the chairperson, but may not exercise a right to 'vote' in regard to decisions of the Meeting.

9. Decisions

- a. Decisions of a Meeting shall be made by the Partners and each Partner's view may be put forward by a single representative, who is in attendance.
[Does this contradict point c below?]
- b. The chairperson may represent the opinion of a Partner if s/he is the sole representative of the Partner.
- c. Decisions shall be reached by consensus such that a proposal or matter put to the Meeting shall not be accepted if any dissent is voiced and maintained by a Partner.
- d. Where decision cannot be reached or requires more in-depth discussion, the chairperson may refer a matter to an *ad hoc* committee that s/he appoints, with report back to Partners during the course of the Meeting.
- e. Matters that require more time may be referred by the chairperson to a task force that will report back to the Partners as the chairperson directs, either out-of-session or at the next Meeting.

10. Records

- a. The Secretariat shall record the proceedings of a Meeting, including where possible each particular intervention, and the decisions reached and actions arising shall be summarised separately.
- b. A draft report of a Meeting, including items in (a), shall be circulated by email attachment by the Secretariat to all Partners within one or at most two months of the conclusion of a Meeting.
- c. The Secretariat shall review responses to the circulated draft report and prepare a version that shall be uploaded to the Partnership's website.

- d. The most recent version of the draft report shall be considered at the following Meeting by the Partners and if appropriate, adopted as a true record of the (preceding) Meeting.

11. Dispute

- a. Should a dispute about procedure arise during the course of conducting a Meeting, the chairperson shall first exercise her/his judgement but if necessary refer to Robert's Rules (Robert *et al.* 2004) for guidance on parliamentary procedure.

12. Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

- a. The Chair will be appointed at a Meeting of Partners through simple common process, if necessary presided over by a temporary chairperson: a nomination from a Partner shall be seconded by another Partner and in the case of more than one nomination, an election shall be conducted by the temporary chairperson, by secret ballot.
- b. The term of a Chair will be two calendar years.
- c. The Vice-Chair will be appointed using a similar process as for the Chair.
- d. The term of a Vice-Chair will be two calendar years but, to give continuity of leadership, where possible the conclusion of terms of Chair and Vice-Chair shall be in subsequent years, ie. not ending in the same year.

References:

Robert, HM III, Evans, WJ, Honemann, DN & Balch TJ 2004. Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised In Brief. De Capo Press, 197 pages.

CMS 2009. Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, 36th Meeting of the Standing Committee, Draft Rules of Procedure.

Attachment 2

(See Agenda 6.2)

Delegation of authority between Chair & Chief Executive

Matters at Partnership level – to be signed-off by the Chair:

- Approval of a new Partner (by signature on a letter to the chief executive officer of the national government agency or applicant organisation).
- Issuing the Certificate for a new Partner (by signature on the certificate).
- Approval of new Flyway Site Network site nominations (by signature on a letter to the nominating country's focal point for EAAFP).
- Issuing the Certificate for a new Flyway Site Network site nomination (by signature on the certificate).
- Formal advice of the date, host and place of the next Meeting of Partners (by signature on a letter to each Partner's focal point).

- Response to any letter addressed specifically to the Chair.

Matters at Secretariat level – to be signed off by the Chief Executive:

- Registration of the Secretariat as a business in the Republic of Korea, for employee income tax and other official purposes (signature of Chief).
- Appointment of Secretariat staff (but subject to endorsement first by the Secretariat's Management Committee).
- Staff employment contracts and subsequent changes (signature of Chief).
- Opening of new bank accounts, including credit card accounts, for EAAFP purposes (signature of Chief).
- Appointment of an international financial services company to conduct annual audit of financial records of EAAFP (with endorsement by the Secretariat's Management Committee for any change in appointment).
- New project or funding contracts (signature of Chief, with endorsement of the Secretariat's Management Committee where prudent).
- Allocation of unrestricted funds to projects or activities conducted by Partners or third parties (except where endorsement of the Secretariat's Management Committee seems prudent).
- Commitment to expenditure (except where endorsement of the Management Committee seems prudent).
- Signature of contracts for rental of equipment (including vehicles) or establishment of service provision (eg. mobile phones) (this may be delegated to Secretariat staff such as the deputy director where appropriate, eg. if a Korean resident is required to sign).
- General correspondence with Partners, potential Partners, observers and others in regard to implementation of the Partnership, as well as arrangements for Meetings of Partners and for circulation of agenda, papers, reports, and the like. The Chief will be assisted where appropriate by Secretariat staff, eg. the Communication & Information Officer.
- General correspondence with Convention Secretariats.
- Press releases (but to be copied to relevant Partners).

Note that where the delegation of authority has not been clearly defined the matter should be referred to the Secretariat's Management Committee.

(See Agenda 6.3)

Guidelines for sponsorship of participants for Meetings of Partners of EAAFP:

Guidelines for sponsorship of Partners

1. First priority for sponsorship will be one representative for **Partners** that are **National Governments**, where these are 'developing countries' or where the government has not made funds available for participation in MoPs:
 - sponsorship will cover return economy airfare and hotel room cost
 - on request, a second participant representing the government will be sponsored if sufficient funds are available after considering all other requests.
2. Second priority for sponsorship will be for **Partners** that are **Non-Government Organisations** and where the NGO has indicated funding constraints:
 - sponsorship will cover hotel room cost only
 - only one participant per NGO will be sponsored.

Guidelines for sponsorship of potential Partners

3. First priority will be for **Potential Partners** that are **National Governments**, where these are 'developing countries' or where the government has not made funds available for participation in MoPs:
 - sponsorship will cover return economy airfare and hotel room cost
 - only one participant will be sponsored (see below).
 - Sponsorship normally will be limited to two years, with further requests considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. Second priority will be for **Non-Government Organisations** of countries that are **Potential Partners** and where the government of the country is unable to send a participant to MoP4:
 - sponsorship will cover hotel room cost only
 - only one participant per country will be sponsored
 - each sponsored participant will be asked to provide a briefing to the national government on return to their country
 - Sponsorship will be limited to two years (with the expectation that a government delegation will attend in years following).

Guidelines for sponsorship of other participants

5. Consideration may be given to **other participants** who may contribute significantly to the Meeting's agenda and will be decided at the discretion of the Chief Executive, subject to available funding. The priority of these sponsorships relative to the other categories listed above (1 – 4) may be decided at the discretion of the Chief Executive and in some cases may be higher, or lower, than 5th priority. Possibilities might include, in approximately descending priority order:
 - Chairs of the five EAAFP Working Groups or their alternates (such as experts employed as Coordinators)
 - coordinators of task forces that have been commissioned by EAAFP
 - Other waterbird/wetland experts who will contribute significantly to the business of the meeting
 - Potential Partners that are NGOs and that request funding supportSponsorship in this category will cover hotel room cost only.

Sponsorship provided by donors

In some instances, specific Partners or external donors may offer sponsorship for participants of EAAFP Meetings of Partners. Where the donor indicates particular recipients for sponsorship, that guidance will be followed. But where no preferences have been indicated, the offered funding may be 'pooled' with sponsorship funds of the Secretariat and the above guidelines will be applied.

(See Agenda 6.5)

Proposed new Terms of Reference of the EAAFP Secretariat:

ADMINISTRATION

1. Develop and implement an annual workplan and an annual budget for the Secretariat, based on the EAAFP Implementation Strategy and the outcomes of EAAFP Meetings of Partners.
2. Provide and maintain a staff team to implement the workplan and meet the Secretariat's Terms of Reference, comprising appropriately qualified and skilled administration and technical officers, operating to standards that are appropriate for an international conservation secretariat.
3. Maintain an overview of the activities of the Partnership and prepare an annual activity report and audited financial report for the Partners.
4. Provide administrative support for EAAFP Meetings of Partners, including liaison with the host Partner, input to planning, preparation of documents, support to the Chair during meetings, and preparation of the draft Report of the Meeting.
5. Store copies of key documents of the EAAFP in readily retrievable formats, including registers of Partner representatives/contacts and EAAFP decisions.
6. Allow the Chief Executive discretion to allocate priority to the roles and tasks outlined in this Terms of Reference.

COMMUNICATION

1. Facilitate communication among Partners (which includes the Host country of the Secretariat), among the Flyway Partnership and national partnerships, and with relevant initiatives in other flyways.
2. Support the implementation of the EAAFP Communication Strategy.
3. Provide communication services to EAAFP Working Groups, task forces, advisory bodies and other committees set up to serve the Partnership.
4. As appropriate, develop and maintain electronic communication media for dissemination of news and information about EAAFP.

INFORMATION

1. Develop and maintain the EAAFP website, including updating of key documents, information about the Flyway Site Network and other activities, and provision of links to resources.
2. Collate and disseminate relevant information and resources, such as website links and case studies, to assist Partners in the management and conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats.
3. Maintain a technical overview of developments in relation to migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the Flyway.

PROMOTION

1. Represent the EAAFP in international meetings and events that are most directly relevant and of highest priority to development of the Partnership.
2. Produce and disseminate materials and displays and maintain website pages, which promote the EAAFP and its activities and achievements.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

1. Promote implementation of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy by the Partners and if requested and as appropriate, assist Partners with development of project proposals that address aspects of the Strategy.

[Chief Executive's note: Further discussion is needed as to whether this should apply only at multi-country scale or also at single country level. The latter could include work on Network sites or particular species because the threats and responses can have wider impact than just within country. Regardless, all interventions by the Partnership/Secretariat must occur at the invitation of the Partner Government/s.]

2. Encourage Government Partners to nominate internationally important sites to the EAAFP Flyway Site Network and where requested support them in progressing nominations including: provision of data on candidate sites; technical advice on applying the nomination criteria, oversight of expert review; and formalities for endorsement and certification.
3. Where appropriate, support Flyway-wide activities such as coordination of colour-marking for migration research, surveys/monitoring of waterbird population sizes, and monitoring of habitat condition, through provision of administrative, communication and/or technical services.
4. Monitor progress in implementation of the Strategy through securing and analysing annual reports by Partners for discussion at the annual Meeting of Partners.

FUNDING

1. Encourage Partners to provide financial contributions to core activities as outlined in the EAAFP Implementation Strategy and included in the Secretariat's annual work plan, and if required, manage those funds according to terms agreed with the Partner/s.
2. Support Partners in the development of project proposals which balance conservation with the social and economic needs of local communities.

3. As required, seek funding for Partnership-endorsed activities and report to funding bodies on behalf of the Partnership.

[Note: There have been differing views among Partners as to what role the Secretariat should play in fundraising. Fundraising can require substantial time and effort and might place a heavy burden on the Secretariat, potentially affecting the completion of some of its essential tasks. Government Partners should not relinquish their national responsibilities over to the Secretariat. But demonstration projects in one country can have flyway-wide benefits, so, where specifically invited, the Secretariat could consider assisting. Furthermore, situations where one or two Partners persistently seek fundraising assistance from the Secretariat should be avoided; perhaps an annual review of Partner's funding proposals by the Management Committee could be a helpful process.]

GOVERNANCE

1. The [Secretariat's] Management Committee will provide guidance to the operations of the Secretariat including:
 - 1) coordinating with the Chair in managing the recruitment and selection process for the Chief Executive
 - 2) endorsement of the organisational structure and staffing plan
 - 3) endorsement of the appointments of the hired Secretariat staff as proposed by the Chief Executive
 - 4) endorsement of the annual work plan and budget
 - 5) consultation with the Host Government Partner in developing criteria and a mechanism for performance review of the Chief Executive
 - 6) consulting with the Host Government Partner in the event of a proposed renewal of the contract of the Chief Executive
 - 7) consulting with all Partners and the Host Government Partner in terminating the Chief Executive's appointment if so required.

Attachment 5A

MoP1 (2006) Agenda document FP1.4 TOR Secretariat.doc
MoP2 (2007) Agenda document 1.5, Attachment A

Draft Terms of Reference for the Partnership Secretariat.

The Secretariat, comprising staff members of a Partner country or organisation, will support the Partnership through the provision of a central coordination unit for the collection and dissemination of information relevant to the Partnership. The Secretariat is supervised by the Chair of the Partnership.

The Secretariat will have an important role in communication, and will:

- Facilitate communication between Partners, between the Flyway Partnership and National Partnerships and with initiatives in other flyways.
- Support Partnership Advisory Bodies, Working Groups and other committees set up to serve the Partnership.
- Support the development and implementation of the Partnership Communication and Public Awareness Plan.
- Provide administrative support for meetings of the Partnership.
- Maintain an overview of the activities of the Partnership.
- Support Partners in progressing nominations of internationally important sites to the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Site Network.

- Receive and disseminate relevant case studies and information to assist Partners in the management and conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitat.
- Maintain the Partnership website, relevant listservers and bulletin boards.

The Secretariat will also have a role in project development and funding, and will:

- Support Partners in the development of project proposals which balance conservation with the social and economic needs of local communities.
- Seek funding for the Partnership, and report to funding bodies on behalf of the Partnership [included in the MoP1 document but omitted from the MoP2 document]
- Support the Chair and Vice Chair in representing the Partnership in international fora

The Secretariat will also:

- Prepare an annual work plan for the [Secretariat/Partnership]
- Prepare an annual budget for the Secretariat.

Attachment 5B

Interim Secretariat Tasks (April 2008)

1 Provide administrative support to the Chair

2 MoP 2 Follow-up

- Finalize papers
 - ToRs of the Working Groups
 - Future Reporting Processes
 - Reporting Template
 - Technical Experts Panel

3 MoP 3

- Lead in Activities
 - Engagement of Partners on development of Papers
 - Location and venue for MoP3
 - Chair and Vice-chair
 - Locating of Secretariat post MoP3
- Meeting Logistics
- Collating and uploading of Meeting Papers

4 Promote and monitor the implementation of the Partnership Workplan

- Liaison with Partners
- Use of Reporting Template

5 Support Partners with Project Development

- Liaison with Partners

6 Promote the Partnership

- Web site
 - Liaison with Web site developer

- Upload of all Partnership Papers
- Maintain web site
- Bulletin Board / listserver
- Profile at Ramsar CoP10

7 Administration

- Partner and Potential Partner register
 - Establish, maintain and expand
- Flyway Site Network
 - Follow-up with National Governments on sites yet to be transferred to the Partnership
 - Organise review of site Nominations
 - Certificates for sites
- Finance
 - Budgeting
 - Fund raising
 - Reporting
- Liaison with host organisation
- Prepare report to MoP 3

Attachment 5C

Attachment 1

Duties and Responsibilities of the Chief Executive

Leadership

1. Lead and supervise the work of the Secretariat.
2. Foster coordination and collaboration among the Partners, potential Partners, and between the Flyway Partnership and National Partnerships.
3. Support Partners in developing and reporting on the annual work plan of the Flyway Partnership.
4. Provide annual reports to the Meeting of Partners regarding the management of the Secretariat and activities associated with the annual work plan of the Secretariat.
5. Foster communication with initiatives in other flyways and regional/global initiatives.
6. Represent the Partnership in appropriate fora.

Management

Staffing

7. Develop an organizational structure and staffing plan for the Secretariat.
8. Make recommendations to the Partnership Management Committee regarding the Job Description and appointment of new staff members.
9. Select temporary advisers and other non-staff members to meet strategic short-term needs of the Secretariat.
10. Conduct performance review of staff members and take appropriate management actions to ensure a safe and productive work environment.

Finance

11. Develop and implement an annual work plan and budget for the Secretariat.
12. Be responsible for maintaining an overview of finances and monitoring of expenditure.

Communication

13. Communicate regularly with the Partners on issues relating to the implementation of the annual work plan.
14. Coordinate the Meetings of Partners
15. Maintain an overview of developments in relation to migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the Flyway.

Additional documents provided after the first posting

Document 3.5.2—B

3.5.2 International Action Plan for Spoon-billed Sandpiper

ADDITIONAL REPORT provided by Christoph Zockler.

Conservation Activities of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper EAAFP Task Force Report on Activities in 2010

Two major papers have been published that highlighted again the perilous status of the 'Critically Endangered' Spoon-billed Sandpiper and also its prime threats in the wintering areas. The total population is estimated at 120-200 breeding pairs only, with hardly any recruitment into the breeding adult population declines at an average of annually of about 24%. Hunting and trapping has been identified as a major threat in the key wintering areas in Myanmar, but findings in spring after a survey on Sonadia revealed additional pressure by hunting on the remaining key wintering spot on the island of the East coast of Bangladesh. More than 50 hunters have allegedly caught 22 SBS over the past wintering period. In addition plans to develop the area for a Deep Sea port will degrade the critical site severely and threaten further 5-10% of the remaining wintering population!

1) Bay of Martaban, Myanmar

Our efforts focused on the mitigation of the hunting threat. Between March and May 2010 a team of socio-economic experts and zoologists of BANCA visited 14 villages in the target area in eastern Martaban and identified altogether 24 hunters (3 of whom were not known to the team before), signed conservation agreements with 15 hunters and distributed livelihood inputs to them. For those hunters who are 'occasional', raising awareness of the wildlife law and the conservation value of the Spoonbill Sandpiper was deemed sufficient to discourage further hunting. For those who are 'professional' and 'opportunistic', the team asked them to sign conservation agreements and provided a measure of livelihood inputs, dependent on relative needs and percent of income formerly derived by birds. In general, each 'professional' hunter received livelihood inputs with a value of about USD500 (boats and fishing nets), while each 'opportunistic' hunter received goods with a value of approximately USD150 per hunter. The agreements were negotiated with the knowledge of the whole community and most importantly it was agreed with the communities that the former hunter's social status has been raised. For example, in two villages, the village leaders took the initiative to assign the former birdhunters the role of *seheinhmu*, which is the person in charge of ten households according to local administrative systems. This is an honor which shows trust in a person as well as bestowing them with responsibility. By assigning the hunter the responsibility of *seheinhmu*, the village leader makes their behavior more visible to the community as well as making them accountable to the community, increasing the likelihood that they will uphold the law and no longer hunt. This could be suggested to other village heads in the future. All of the above objectives were achieved up to and beyond expectations, including laying the groundwork for future work with the communities.

2) Nan Thar Island, Myanmar, Arakhan region

This small island still hosts 14 wintering SBS, after 35 noted in 2008 and hunting mitigation implemented in 2009 and 2010. Funds have been made available to establish minimal infrastructure for visiting tourists (shelter, toilet) and freshwater wells for the local people. However, those have been destroyed two times! At first, a strong wind on October 7th and 8th destroyed most buildings, they were in the process of reconstruction, but again completely destroyed by the tropical cyclone Giri on October 22nd. There were no losses of lives, but all the infrastructure and buildings have to be rebuilt.

A small local conservation group has been established. This group continues awareness raising and monitoring with available funds.

3) Rudong, Shanghai

A small but very active conservation group established a regular monitoring scheme and found that SBS is regularly passing through the mudflats of Rudong just north of Shanghai where in spring a max 21 and in autumn max. 24 SBS have been recorded. The surveys have been supported by funds from BirdLife's Conservation Leadership Programme. The area is massive and undersurveyed and could well host many more SBS. Its crucial importance for the species is unquestioned, yet the area is threatened by various developing plans which include further reclamations and windparks.

4) Saemangeum, Korea

Only 10% of the SBS return to Saemangeum 3 years after the reclamation. Intertidal mudflats are continued to be reclaimed with very few areas effectively protected, leaving very little habitat for SBS on spring and autumn passage, according to a Blueprint publication of the NGO Birds Korea.

5) Chukotka, Russia

The decline of breeding pairs in the core breeding area of Meinopylgino, South Chukotka seems to have slowed down. With 12 pairs breeding in 2010 it's only 2 pairs less than in the previous year. Another site showed a stable situation over the last three years at a low level.

6) Captive Breeding

With still no recruitment observed and even though the decline of 24% per year might have been reduced it remains uncertain to reverse the declining trend in time before the population has reached a critical low number to sustain. In fact, there are signs for an aging adult population that might vanish suddenly leaving little choice for alternative approaches, like the establishment of a captive breeding population. Throughout the entire period discussions and preparations for the implementation of a breeding programme are under way. A briefing paper on the subject is in preparation and will be distributed.

3.3.2 Report by Task Force 2: Coordination of waterbird colour marking

ADDITIONAL REPORT provided by the waterbird colour-marking Task Force

As far back as the first Meeting of Partners (MoP1) of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) in 2006 it was noted that existing colour marking protocols were due for review, and that increased coordination of colour marking across the Flyway was necessary. Outcome 10 of the 'Implementation Strategy for the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership: 2007 – 2011' identifies the need for marking protocols to be developed for most migratory waterbirds and to maintain a high level of coordination between bird banding/ringing schemes on migratory waterbird marking projects. In response to these identified issues the principal outcome of Agenda Item 3.3.6 at EAAFP MoP4 was to form a temporary Task Force to improve the coordination and management of waterbird marking within the EAAF.

Establishing, maintaining and communicating colour marking protocols across the Flyway are complex tasks. The Task Force has been mindful that sustaining effective communication across a very large e-mail group may not be easy. The issue has been broken into components, and an identified set of tasks approached sequentially. Also, the Task Force was made aware at the start that its role was not to change existing protocols – but to explore ways to better **communicate**, **coordinate** and where necessary **update** protocols across the various waterbird groups in the Flyway.

The Task Force includes a representative from each of the National Banding Schemes in the Flyway, representatives from the non-government (or government) groups in each country involved in colour-marking, and representatives from each of the other waterbird groups involved in colour-marking projects (Anatidae, Cranes, and Seabirds).

The Task Force agreed on its scope of work and the outcomes it is seeking. The colour-marking break-out group at MoP4 identified two broad components to its work: **coordination** and **communication**. After subsequent discussions with Wetlands International (Doug Watkins), these were expanded into a draft list of tasks:

Coordination

- Agree on a consistent way of illustrating the protocols (easily understood by a wide range of users, look good on a website, easily updated);
- Bring colour-marking protocols up-to-date for various waterbird groups and make them consistent (using the format agreed above);
- Identify an approval process for marking schemes proposed by researchers wanting to start new projects.

Communication

- Identify the most appropriate website on which information about colour-marking protocols can be published (much information is currently on the Wetlands International global website, established/maintained by Taej Mundkur). The information could either be updated and maintained where it is with a link from the EAAFP website, or moved wholly on to the EAAFP website (with recognition of previous Wetlands International work).
- Identify the most appropriate ways to manage collation and dissemination of resighting data, for each waterbird group.
- Summarise current knowledge of the migration strategies of waterbird species in the Flyway, i.e. breeding areas, non-breeding areas, staging areas and migration routes, as indicated by banding/colour-marking/tracking projects.

It was decided to focus initially on the shorebird colour-marking protocol because it was the most widely used throughout the Flyway, and the most advanced. The Task Force reviewed the available protocol, and updated it where necessary. Methods of illustrating the protocol were investigated, keeping in mind that the goal was to have the information available on the internet. The Science Officer with the Secretariat, Dr Chang-Yong Choi, took on the task of updating and improving the way the protocol could be presented for use. The resulting illustrations include drawings of birds showing the colour marks allocated to various jurisdictions, a table showing the same information, and maps illustrating where colour marking of shorebirds is occurring in the flyway. The maps were originally prepared by Doug Watkins. These illustrations are attached.

The next tasks for the Task Force are to:

- make a final decision about the shorebird protocol illustrations;
- decide what website(s) the protocols should reside on, and;
- decide who is best placed in the long term to maintain and coordinate the protocols.

It is hoped that the Task Force can progress these tasks at MoP5. The role of the protocol coordinator includes guiding potential users of colour marking to appropriate colour combinations for their geographical area, liaising with national banding offices and maintaining the protocols.

Up until now the shorebird protocol has been maintained in an informal way by David Drynan (Australian Bird and Bat Banding Scheme) and Doug Watkins (Wetlands International-Oceania).

Once the above decisions have been made, similar protocols for the other waterbird groups (Anatidae, Cranes, and Seabirds) could be developed, if desired. Contact will be made with the Working Group chairs for these species groups to progress this work.