



## **PARTNER'S REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION**

**Submitted to the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Partners  
Changjiang, P.R. China 9-14 December 2018**

Please submit the completed Report on Implementation to using the online (e.g. Survey monkey) format by 16 September 2018. The reporting period is from December 2016 to 16 September 2018

## Introduction

The Partner's Report on Implementation is an important mechanism for Partners to record and monitor their implementation of the EAAFP. As a result, Parties are encouraged to respond to all questions.

The deadline for submission is **16 September 2018** to allow the EAAFP Secretariat to analyze the results as a summary to be presented to MOP10. It will not be possible to include information from Reports received after that date.

The Report template is available in an online format and as a Word format. Partners are requested to submit their final Report using the online format so as to facilitate analysis by the Secretariat.

The structure of the MOP10 Report Format is in four sections:

- *Section 1* provides the institutional information about the Partner and the Focal Points for implementation of the Partnership.
- *Section 2* allows Partners to provide a summary of their progress with implementation and recommendations for the future.
- *Section 3* provides 33 implementation indicator questions, grouped under each Outcome in the EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2012-2016, and with an optional text section where Partner may add further information if they wish.

After the Report has been completed, Partners are requested to submit it using the online format.

## 1. Institutional Information

### 1.1 Partner

*Name of Partner, Working Group or Task Force:*

*Type of Partner:* **GOVERNMENT**

(e.g. Government, Inter-Governmental, International NGO, Private Sector etc)

*Name, title and contact details of designated Focal Point:*

**Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Senior Advisor of Arctic biodiversity and migratory bird conservation for the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)**

**Akamedimka Anokhina street 64-80, Moscow, Russia**

## 2. General Summary of Implementation: Progress and Challenges

### 2.1 What have been the most successful aspects of implementation of the Partnership (up to five points)

- a. ....
- b. ....
- c. ....
- d. ....
- e. ....

### 2.2 What have been the main challenges in implementation of the Partnership (up to five points)

- a. ....
- b. ....
- c. ....
- d. ....
- e. ....

### 2.3 What are the future priorities for implementation of the Partnership (up to five points)

- a. ....
- b. ....
- c. ....
- d. ....
- e. ....

### 2.4 Do you have any recommendations on implementation assistance from the EAAFP Secretariat?

2.5 Do you have any recommendations on implementation assistance from other Partners, Working Groups or Task Forces?

2.6 Do you have any other general comments on implementation of the Partnership?

### 3. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

**Objective 1: Develop the Flyway Network of sites of international importance for the conservation of migratory waterbirds, building on the achievements of the APMWCS networks.**

**Outcome 1: Internationally important sites are identified for all migratory waterbirds across the Flyway and prioritized for conservation and inclusion in the Flyway Site Network.**

1.1 Have you been involved in developing a list of internationally important sites to support the life cycles of the Flyway's waterbirds? (Secretariat, WGs, INGOs and/or Monitoring Task Force)

Yes  No  Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

1.2 Have you been involved in prioritization of the above sites (1.1) for nomination in the FSN and to review/revise this list at each successive MoP? (Secretariat / Consultant / Monitoring Task Force)

Yes  No  Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

1.3a How many new Flyway Network Sites have you been involved in designating since the last reporting period? (National Government Partners)

Please indicate number  Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

1.3b How many new Flyway Network Sites do you intend to designate between MOP10 and MOP11? (National Government Partners)?

2 ] Please indicate number      ] Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

**Outcome 2: The management of internationally important sites demonstrates sound integration of wetland biodiversity conservation and sustainable development that benefits local communities.**

2.1 Have you helped to make available management guidelines and case studies to enhance the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats, emphasizing participatory management processes and benefits to local communities? (CEPA WG, Secretariat, with support from all Partners)

Yes      [ ] No      [ ] Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

2.2a During the reporting period, how many management plans for FNS and other internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds have you been involved in developing, implementing, review or updating? (National Government Partners; Subnational: Local Government with support from INGOs)

[ ] Yes      [ ] If "Yes", please indicate the number of management plans  
 No      [ ] Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

2.2b Between now and MOP11, how many management plans for FNS and other internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds do you intend to develop, implement, review or update? (National Government Partners; Subnational: Local Government with support from INGOs)

[ ] Yes      [ ] If "Yes", please indicate the number of management plans  
 No      [ ] Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

- 2.3 Have you helped to develop collaboration with other international initiatives relating to the management of migratory waterbird habitat? (Secretariat, INGOs, National Government Partners)

Yes     No     Not applicable

AMBI, CMS, RUS-CHINA BILATERAL

- 2.4 Have you helped to develop model projects at Flyway Network Sites to address key threatening processes, social and economic needs, and contributing to sound integration of wetland biodiversity conservation and sustainable development that benefits local communities? (National Government Partners)

Yes     No     Not applicable

Optional text box for further information

**Outcome 3: The ecological, social and economic values of sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds are recognized in development and impact assessment processes.**

- 3.1 Are you working to mainstream migratory waterbird conservation into national policies, plans and programmes, facilitated by National Partnerships? (National Government Partners)

Yes     No     Not applicable

Optional text box for further information

- 3.2 Have you been working to adapt and make available guidelines and case studies on development and impact assessment processes relevant to network sites and their catchments? (Secretariat, INGOs, National Government Partners)

Yes     No     Not applicable

Optional text box for further information

**Objective 2: Enhance communication, education and public awareness of the values of migratory waterbirds and their habitats.**

**Outcome 4: There is a high level of awareness and recognition of the ecological, social and economic values of migratory waterbirds and Network sites.**

4.1 Are you using the flyway-wide CEPA strategy at national and site levels as ongoing guidance for the awareness and communication activities of the Flyway Partnership? (All Partners)

Yes     No     Partly     Not applicable

Optional text box for further information

4.2 Have you been involved in the production of CEPA resources and have made these available to the Secretariat for distribution more widely? (CEPA WG, Secretariat, supported by all Partners)

Yes     No     Not applicable

Optional text box for further information

**Outcome 5: There is a broad level of recognition of the activities and achievements of the Flyway Partnership.**

5.1 Are your Partnership activities being implemented in line with the CEPA Strategy?

Yes     No     Partly     Not applicable

Optional text box for further information

5.2a Are you working to support the development and strengthening of national and sub-regional partnerships as mechanisms for delivery of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy?

*Three national networks of experts (all independent NGOs) are actively implementing EAAFP priorities as well as key Russian birds conservation NGO – BirdsRussia.*

**Geese, swan and Duck Study Group of Northern Eurasia**

**Working Group of waders of Northern Eurasia**

**Crane Working Group of Eurasia**

s  No  Partly  Not applicable

5.2b If there are national and/or sub-regional partnerships, please indicate the number of meetings that have been held since the last reporting period?

5? ] Number of national or sub-regional meetings held  Not applicable

*Two meetings of Russian Nordmans Greenshank TF meeting (under umbrella of BirdsRussia)*

**Objective 3: Enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, build knowledge and promote exchange of information on waterbirds and their habitats.**

**Outcome 6: Scientifically sound information is available on the flyway-wide status and trends of waterbird populations and their habitats.**

6.1 Have you been involved in collaboration and integration activities to increase assessment and monitoring programmes to provide scientifically sound information on the status and trends of migratory waterbird populations?

Yes  No  In progress  Not applicable

*Monitoring counting work on waterbirds and shorebirds during northward migration on West Kamchatka in 2018; and monitoring counting works on waders during southward migration in two points of West Kamchatka in 2017 and 2018.*

6.2 Have you been involved in developing wetland assessment programmes for any of the Task Force priority regions to provide information on the status of migratory waterbird habitats?

Yes  No  In progress  Not applicable

6.3 Have you been involved in gathering updated information on the status and threats to internationally important sites and to Flyway Network sites in particular?



Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

6.4 Have you been involved in identifying the key threatening processes to migratory waterbirds in the EAAF, and compiling technical briefs for the EAAFP website to illustrate examples of best practice mitigation measures?

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

About SBS

**Outcome 7: Information is available on the internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds in all countries of the Flyway.**

7.1 Have you been involved in providing input or analyzing count data to identify internationally important sites and gaps for migratory waterbirds in the Flyway and inform conservation measures. (Wetlands International and BirdLife International, with input from National Government Partners and Working Groups)?

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

7.2 Have you been involved in surveys to prioritize knowledge gaps at internationally important sites and to progressively address those gaps (National government Partners, EAAFP WGs)?

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

7.3 Have you been involved in making data available on internationally important sites and share that data amongst Partners, such as through the EAAFP website (Secretariat, other Partners)?

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

**Outcome 8: Knowledge of the ecology and migratory strategies of waterbirds is enhanced to support conservation action.**

- 8.1 Have you been involved in implementing international collaborative research projects for migratory waterbirds to better understand the connectivity across the Flyway and inform development of the Flyway Site Network (All Partners)?

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Implementing of international collaborative research projects for migratory waterbirds in Russian part of EAAFP in 2017–2018:*

*In Chukotka region: using JPS-JSM loggers for Bewick's Swans; White-fronted Geese, Lesser White-fronted Geese, Bean Geese, Sandhill Cranes and Glaucous Gulls.*

*Yakutiya region: using JPS-JSM loggers for Bewick's Swans and Bean Geese.*

*Magadan Region: using JPS-JSM loggers for Slaty-backed Gulls*

*Kamchatka region: using geologgers for Dunlins; banding and flagging about 6000 waders.*

*Sakhalin region: using JPS-JSM loggers for Dunlins.*

*Khabarovskiy region: GEOloggers for Common Redshanks.*

*Primorye Region: using JPS-JSM loggers for Mallards, Streaked Shearwater, Great Egrets, Grey Herons, Oriental Storks, Slaty-backed Gulls*

- 8.2 Have you been involved in improving the knowledge base on migratory waterbirds for the three priority subregions, i.e. the Yellow Sea and Amur/Heilong Basin? (Task Forces for these regions, including relevant Government Partners)

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Nature Reserves in Amur basin had been improving their knowledge on migratory waterbirds following their routine work of science departments*

- 8.3 Have you been involved in reviewing and developing the Migratory Waterbird Marking Protocols for migratory waterbirds? (Task Force on Colour Marking)

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

**Outcome 9: Knowledge of the potential role of migratory waterbirds in disease transmission, especially Avian Influenza, is enhanced.**

- 9.1 Have you been involved in international collaborative projects of surveillance programmes at Flyway Network Sites and other important sites to increase the understanding of avian influenza (and other relevant zoonotic diseases) and their impacts on migratory waterbirds? (Partners, APWG-MWAI)

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

In Kamchatka and number of other areas of Siberia and the Far East

- 9.2 Have you been involved in enhancing the network for communication on migratory waterbirds and disease related-issues amongst environment and wildlife agencies and researchers, and other relevant partners? (APWG-MWAI)

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

- 9.3 Have you been involved in the dissemination, review or update of guidelines for improved management planning of wetlands of international importance for waterbirds, aimed at reducing the risk of disease? (Partners, APWG-MWAI)

Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

**Objective 4: Build the habitat and waterbird management capacity of natural resource managers, decision makers and local stakeholders**

**Outcome 10: Natural resource managers, decision makers and local stakeholders at internationally important sites have the skills and support to enable sustainable management of waterbird habitats.**

- 10.1 Have you been involved in capacity development and training programmes that address needs in the areas of migratory waterbird monitoring and conservation, habitat management, sustainable development, and communication, education and public awareness, and participatory (CEPA) methods? (All Partners)

Yes, migratory waterbird monitoring training programme;     number

Yes, migratory waterbird conservation training programme;     number

- Yes, habitat management training programme;  number  
 Yes, sustainable development training programme;  number  
 Yes, CEPA training programme;  number  
 No     In progress     Not applicable

10.2 Have you been involved in establishing site based or national capacity building programmes to facilitate the ongoing management of migratory waterbirds and their habitats? (National Partners)

- Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

**Objective 5: Develop, especially for priority species and habitats, flyway wide approaches to enhance the conservation status of migratory waterbirds.**

***Outcome 11: Collaborative flyway-wide actions for waterbird species and habitats have improved the conservation status of priority species.***

11.1 Have you been involved in developing new, or ongoing collaborative projects across the ranges of priority species of migratory waterbirds? (All Partners)

- Yes     If "Yes", the number of such projects, including sister-site projects  
 No     In progress     Not applicable

*Optional text box for further information*

11.2 Have you been involved in producing or implementing International Single Species Action Plans for globally threatened species and populations of migratory waterbirds to act as a flagship for wetland conservation? (All Partners)

- Yes     No     In progress     Not applicable

*Spoon-billed Sandpiper*

*Far Eastern Curlew*

*Baer's Pochard*