



## Document 9

### Report on Implementation of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership 2017-2018

Submitted by EAAFP Secretariat

Partners at MoP10 are requested to consider the summary from the Secretariat of the Reports on Implementation submitted by 31 Partners

#### 1. Introduction

The Report on Implementation is an important mechanism for EAAFP Partners, Working Groups and Task Forces to record and monitor their implementation of the EAAFP and as a result, Partners, WG and TF are encouraged to respond to all questions in the report which is sent out several months prior to the Meeting of the Partners. Previously, a Word or Excel file template was sent to Partners, WGs and TFs to complete but for MoP10, an online format using was produced to help analysis of the information contained in the reports. A Word version of the report was also available for Partners, WGs and TFs to use but submission of the final report would have to be done using the online format. The reports were sent to Partners, WGs and TFs on 10 August with a request for the report to be completed and returned by 16 September 2018. Due to requests from Partners, WGs and TFs for more time to complete the report, the deadline was extended until 1 November 2018.

The results below is from the information provided by Partners, WGs and TFs in their reports submitted by the 1 November 2018. A total of 31 reports were received from the following:

- *National Governments (10)*: Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, RO Korea., Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Thailand, United States of America;
- *Inter-Governmental Organisations (2)*: ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, Convention on Migratory Species;
- *International Non-Governmental Organizations (8)*: BirdLife International, Hanns Seidel Foundation, Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust, Wetlands International, Wild Bird Society of Japan, Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature,
- *Working Groups (6)*: Anatidae, Black-faced Spoonbill, CEPA (Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness), Crane, Seabirds, Shorebirds;
- *Task Forces (5)*: Baer's Pochard, Far Eastern Curlew, Scaly-sided Merganser, Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Yellow Sea Ecoregion.

Generally, the Partners, WGs and TFs were satisfied with the new online reporting system. The main comment was that WGs and TFs should be provided with a different template to that of the Partners so that they could more accurately enter their information.

The MoP10 report format was divided in four sections:

- Section A is to provide information about the Partner, WG and TF, and details about the contact person for implementation of the Partnership.
- Section B allows Partners, WG and TF to provide a summary of their progress with implementation and recommendations for the future.
- Section C provides 33 implementation indicator questions, grouped under each Outcome in the EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2012-2016 (later extended to 2017), and with an optional text section where Partner may add further information if they wish.
- Section D is a voluntary section for Country Partners to provide more information about the Flyway Network Sites in their country

Below is a summary of the responses to the questions in the report. More detailed information can be found in the individual reports submitted which have all been uploaded on the MoP10 webpage <https://www.eaaflyway.net/about-us/the-partnership/partners/meetings-of-partners/10th-meeting-of-partners-MoP-10/>

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

### 1. What have been the most successful aspects of your implementation of the Partnership?

- 22 (67%) responses: Being involved in international collaboration, including workshops and symposia;
- 17 (57%): Receiving updates on the status of research, monitoring and conservation activities on migratory waterbirds and their habitats;
- 12 (40%): Being able to raise greater awareness internationally of the conservation of the EAAF by using the EAAFP website, newsletter and WMBD;
- 9 (30%): Designating and management of Flyway Network Sites;
- 9 (30%): Understanding the conservation status (population) of waterbird species, especially around the Yellow/West Sea;
- 8 (27%): Engaging with local communities and governments to conserve migratory waterbirds and their habitats;
- 6 (20%): Raising national awareness of the importance of migratory waterbirds and their habitats;
- Other responses include being able to encourage new Partners to join the EAAFP, conducting CEPA activities on migratory waterbirds, and being able to implement plans on specific migratory waterbird species.

### 2. What have been the main challenges in your implementation of the Partnership?

- 19 (63%) responses: Lack of financial support for implementing the objectives of the Partnership;

- 10 (33%): The nature of the EAAFP itself, being an informal and voluntary Partnership. This means that there is no obligation on government to implement the objectives of the Partnership, or that the government is not actively engaged. Despite this however, this nature of the Partnership can be viewed as being helpful in encouraging new Partners, offering inclusion to a wide range of organisations, not only national governments;
- 9 (30%): Lack of awareness for the conservation of migratory waterbirds;
- 9 (30%): Lack of ecological knowledge related to the conservation of migratory waterbirds;
- 7 (23%): Staff capacity, in terms of number and their knowledge;
- 6 (20%): Lack of transparency and communication about the decision-making process of the EAAFP;
- Other issues mentioned included an apparent lack of on the governance and basic administration by the EAAFP Secretariat, and transparency surrounding Management Committee discussions. These problems makes assessing progress a challenge.

### **3. What are the future priorities for your implementation of the Partnership?**

- 30 (97%) responses: Improving communication and coordination among the relevant stakeholder groups, e.g. INGOs and local communities;
- 17 (57%): Improving efforts on the conservation of threatened species and sites. This includes expanding engagement with stakeholders, locating the key sites for migratory waterbirds and to gain a better understanding of ecological needs of these waterbirds;
- 14 (47%): To raise greater awareness of the importance of implementing conservation projects on migratory waterbirds and to attract more specialists;
- 12 (40%): Conduct monitoring to have updates on bird usage of sites;
- 11 (37%): Developing and implement programme and projects on migratory waterbirds;
- 11 (37%): Supporting staff capacity building at the site and national levels through regular training and meetings;
- 10 (33%): Designating additional FNS and develop appropriate management of those Sites;
- Other issues included fund-raising and developing a standardized methodology for monitoring.

### **4. Do you have any recommendations on the support needed from the EAAFP Secretariat?**

- 6 (20%) responses: To put more focus on the work of the WGs and TFs such as by providing dedicated time at MoP10 for their meetings, having a separate reporting template for WGs and TFs to future MoPs, improve communication etc;
- 5 (17%): To strengthen networking and communication;
- 4 (13%): To provide support on technical issues as well as to provide training;
- 4 (13%): To provide funding support;
- Other recommendations include supporting awareness to site managers and local stakeholders, updating the website and reconsidering the species group approach. It was also recommended that the Secretariat should spend less time undertaking on-ground management and bird surveys but to adhere to the work given to them by the governance documents and MoP decisions. The Secretariat should consider taking a greater role in coordination of the work in the Flyway, such as for migratory waterbird colour-marking.

### **5. Do you have any recommendations on the support needed from other Partners, Working Groups or Task Forces?**

- 13 (43%) responses: There should be improved communication and coordination among Partners, and between researchers and focal persons;
- It was suggested that WGs and TFs:
  - should have a simple plan that outlines their upcoming intersessional work, and priorities attached to those activities. These tasks can be included in the EAAFP's intersessional work plan. Species focused Task Forces could prioritise and report against their Single Species Action Plan (if one has been developed and adopted);
  - need financial and organisational assistance from the Secretariat and Partners to advance their intersessional work.
  - would benefit from the support of the Technical Sub-Committee to advance their intersessional work;
  - would benefit from having a standard reporting template, different to the Partner reporting template that seeks to highlight key achievements/activities undertaken in the previous intersessional period.
- Other recommendations include providing capacity building opportunities, financial support, and helping to designate more FNS. There was a suggestion that workplans should be eliminated.

#### **6. Do you have any other general comments on implementation of the Partnership?**

Four Reports provided suggestions under this question. They suggestions included:

- There should be more communication within the Partnership, such as between the Secretariat and the WGs and TFs;
- There should be more focus on supporting FNSs, such as by using the sister site network to encourage FNSs from countries with resources to support FNSs in countries where resources are limited;
- Continue to build the capacity of Partners and to provide funding support, especially to WGs and TFs;
- Develop a group of "EAAFP Ambassadors" who can lobby at a higher level for the needs of the EAAFP in countries through personal connections and diplomatic channels;
- The EAAFP should take on the role to coordinate colour marking in the EAAF through the Technical Sub-Committee;
- The Secretariat should adopt a clearer template for financial reporting at future MoPs that will assist Partners in understanding the details of the budget and program of work;
- The internal and external audit review and reports are made available in the lead up to MoP10;
- The EAAFP Secretariat should produce appropriate templates for meeting agenda items (MoP, Management Committee, Finance and Technical Sub-Committees) to help ensure consistency across the meeting documents and demonstrates a professional style of communication;
- The template for Reports on Implementation could be revised so that it more closely follows that used by CMS (<http://www.cms.int/en/cop12docs>).

### **3. Indicator questions on implementation of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy**

**Objective 1: Develop the Flyway Network of sites of international importance for the conservation of migratory waterbirds.**

**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.**

**1.1.1 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
18 (64%)	7 (25%)	3 (11%)

Some 64% of the Partners, WGs and TFs reporting have been active in developing a list of internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds through organizing and participating in activities such as the annual Asian Waterbird Census (AWC) and on a smaller scale, the annual waterbird count along the Yangtze floodplain in China (Tao *et al* 2017). At the project level, such as the ASEAN Flyway Network project funded by the government of Japan, aims to surveys sites where counts have not been conducted for some years and to conduct counts at new sites that have the potential of being key sites for migratory waterbirds. In the DPR Korea, a National Wetland Directory has been recently published that identifies more than 50 key wetlands and conservation priorities are presented.

The results of such census and projects are valuable to governments so that they can highlight the importance of the key sites, such as by designating them as FNSs. In Sarawak (Malaysia), three more FNSs have now been proposed, i.e. Kuala Baram, Terusan and Pulau Bruit-Patok National Park where large numbers of migratory waterbirds have been recorded.

**1.1.2 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
8 (32%)	12 (48%)	5 (20%)

Despite many (64%) Partners, WGs and TFs reporting being involved in developing lists of internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds, nearly half (48%) of the reports said that they have not used the lists in the prioritization of the sites for designation as FNSs.

**1.1.3a How many new Flyway Network Sites have you been involved in designating since the last reporting period and 1.1.3b, how many do you intend to designate between MoP10 and MoP11? (National Government Partners)**

Since the last reporting period, Partners, WGs and TFs were involved in the designation of new FNS in Bangladesh (1), Cambodia (1), DPR Korea (2), RO Korea (1), Myanmar (2), and New Zealand (2). Then between MoP10 and MoP11, Thailand intends to designate 3 FNS and the RO Korea will make a list of the candidate FNS before consulting with local governments about their designation by December 2019.

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

**1.2.1 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
22 (76%)	4 (14%)	3 (10%)

Partners use a variety of methods to make management guidelines and case studies available to enhance the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats. These include: through

- Drafting articles and reports (e.g. Blackham, G.V. and T. Avent 2018) and making them available through newsletters and on the EAAF website;
- Organization of stakeholder consultations, training courses and workshops to share the guidelines and case studies;
- Direct management projects at the FNS.

**1.2.2a 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	No	Not applicable
10 (34%)	8 (28%)	11 (38%)

Both government (e.g. Australia, Bangladesh, China, Malaysia etc) and other Partners (e.g. Hanns Seidel Foundation, Pukorokoro Miranda, Wetlands International etc) reported being involved in developing, implementing, review or updating of FNS management plans. The RO Korea commented that it was difficult to answer this question as the Ministry would need to compile the information from local governments but the RO Korea also recognized that the Ministry has a role to engage with local government to review progress with the FNS's.

**1.2.2b 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	No	Not applicable
12 (41%)	5 (17%)	12 (41%)

Management plans that Partners intend to develop, implement, review or update included:

- *Australia*: at their 24 FNS;
- *Bangladesh*: will develop 10 management plans and one action plan;
- *Cambodia*: at the Anlung Pring and Boeung Prek Lapouv Protected Landscapes (WWT);
- *China*: at Hengshui Lake supported by the Baer's Pochard TF;
- *Myanmar*: at Pyu Lake supported by the Baer's Pochard TF;
- *Thailand*: will develop a masterplan for biodiversity management;

- *USA*: the WCS will work with the Shorebird WG and US federal agencies plan to conduct studies at the Qupaluk FNS (Alaska) that will help in the development of management plans;
- *ASEAN region*: the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity will prepare a draft management plan for the conservation and management of the migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the ASEAN region to inform capacity-building and CEPA strategies both at the regional (ASEAN) and national levels.

**1.2.3 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
20 (71%)	4 (14%)	4 (14%)

Partners have developed collaboration with other international initiatives to promote the management of migratory waterbird habitat particularly in the:

- *Indo-Burma region* through the Indo-Burma Ramsar Regional Initiative;
- *Yellow/West Sea region* through the Yellow/West Sea Working Group that involves all three Yellow/West Sea countries and other Partners and stakeholders. Partners have also been actively involved in supporting the World Heritage nomination process for the tidal flats along the Yellow/West Sea coast of China and the RO Korea;
- *ASEAN region* through the ASEAN Flyway Project facilitated by ACB with a generous financial donation from the government of Japan. This project has strengthened collaboration between the 10 ASEAN Member States and the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, with other INGOs, i.e. Wetlands International and the EAAFP Secretariat.

**1.2.4 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
8 (28%)	7 (24%)	14 (48%)

Examples of such model projects provided in the reports include:

- *Cambodia*: A model project is being developed alongside Birdlife International's Cambodia Programme at Anlung Pring Protected Landscape, currently being designated as a FNS Site;
- *China*: A model project is being developed at Hengshui Hu FNS;
- *DPRK Korea*: A project to address threats at the Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve, both in biological and social terms, is currently developed. It also necessarily intends to improve the livelihood of local populations;
- *RO Korea*: The government has initiated various programs to protect the ecosystem and to benefit local communities, e.g. Ecosystem Conservation Fund, Cooperation Charge on Conservation of Marine Ecosystem, and Biodiversity Management Contract system. The Biodiversity Management Contract system is a project compensating local farmers who contribute to conserving biodiversity in their farmland;
- *Myanmar*: The Norwegian Government is supporting the development of a number of model projects at sites around the country.

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

*1.3.1 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
11 (38%)	4 (14%)	14 (48%)

Examples of Partners, WGs and TFs working to mainstream migratory waterbird conservation into national policies, plans and programmes include:

- Completing the National Bird Red List assessment by December 2018. The Red List category in Mongolian Fauna Law was amendment in 2019;
- waterbird conservation is included under the National Policy on Biological Diversity 2016-2025 (Goal 2, Target 3) where by 2025, the target is to mainstream biodiversity conservation into national development planning and sectoral policies and plans (Malaysia);
- supporting the upgrading of Baer's Pochard to Class 1 protection status in China (Baer's Pochard TF).

*1.3.2 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
12 (41%)	10 (34%)	7 (24%)

Examples provided by Partners include:

- *Cambodia:* At the Boeung Prek Lapouv Protected Landscape as part of the Indo-Burma Ramsar Regional Initiative's Mekong Wet Project (Sophanna and Avent 2018).
- *DPR Korea:* The Hanns Seidel Foundation is supporting wetland assessment in the country, e.g. at Mundok and Rason Migratory Bird Reserves, as well as at other, not yet protected sites, along the East and West Coast. There are already discussions underway how to create guidelines and policies to conserve these sites better;
- *New Zealand:* There is a project to develop a case for future protection of the Manukau Harbour as a site of importance in close proximity to a major human population.

**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.**

*2.4.1 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
14 (48%)	6 (21%)	6 (21%)	3 (10%)

Partners reported that awareness and communication activities were an important part of their work at the national, site and project levels and in particular, using the World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) and the Knot painting competition to do so.

**2.4.2 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
13 (45%)	13 (45%)	3 (10%)

Partners, WGs and TFs said that they translated the WMBD and other materials in local language as well as producing their own materials, e.g. videos, leaflets and teacher's guides about migratory waterbirds and the FNSs, as well as providing material for the EAAFP website. The Baer's Pochard TF even produced special Baer's Pochard pin badges in collaboration with the EAAFP Secretariat.

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

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

Yes	No	Partly	Not applicable
16 (53%)	1 (3%)	9 (30%)	4 (13%)

The responses were generally positive with a range of activities being implemented by Partners, WGs and TFs in line with the CEPA Strategy to improve knowledge on migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

**2.5.2a Are you working to support the development and strengthening of national and sub-regional partnerships as mechanisms for delivery of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy?**

Yes	No	Partly	Not applicable
17 (57%)	7 (3%)	7 (23%)	4 (13%)

More than half of the Partners who responded said that they have been involved in developing and strengthening national and sub-regional partnerships, such as through organizing and attending meetings and workshop of the national partnership, wetland committee etc. New initiatives for developing partnerships include that for the China Coastal Wetland Centre Network and WLI Asia, and the ASEAN Flyway Network.

**2.5.2b If there are national and/or sub-regional partnerships, please indicate the number of meetings that have been held since the last reporting period**

Number of national or sub-regional meetings held	Not applicable
17	13

Country Partners (e.g. Cambodia, New Zealand, Russia, Thailand, USA) reported having held meetings which were under their National Wetland Committee or as part of a Wetland Manager Workshop. A number of WGs (e.g. Black-faced Spoonbill, Seabird) and TFs (e.g. Scaly-sided Merganser, Spoon-billed Sandpiper) also reported having held meetings. Inaugural meetings were held by the ASEAN Flyway Network and the China Coastal Wetland Centre Network.

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

#### ***3.6.1 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
22 (76%)	0 (0%)	6 (20%)	2 (7%)

At the country level, examples of such collaboration and integration activities include:

- *China*: Yangtze Waterbird Monitoring Network with WWF China (e.g. Tao, X., J. Lei, R.D. Hearn & G. Lei. 2017). (WWF China and WWT);
- *Korean Peninsula*: HSF has supported research activities, especially in the DPR Korea, that contributed to the publication of the Wetland Directory of the DPRK (2018), and to the designation of Ramsar Sites and FNS;
- *Malaysia*: the government is working with the MNS Kuching chapter for migratory waterbird counts at key areas of the Bako Buntal Bay FNS;
- *Thailand*: Supporting Bird Conservation Society of Thailand to survey and collect data;
- *New Zealand*: Birds New Zealand continued to conduct biannual national counts of migratory waterbirds to contribute to EAAFP population estimates, while the Pukorokoro Miranda continue their biannual shorebird counts and regular catching of birds for banding to enable tracking of migrations and longevity studies.

Examples of the activities of other Partners, Working Groups and Task Forces include:

- *ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity* encouraging collaboration and integration of activities among FSNs in ASEAN through the ASEAN Flyway Project;
- *Baer's Pochard TF* coordinating annual surveys at all known sites for the species;
- *Convention on Migratory Species* published A Review of Migratory Bird Flyways and Priorities for Management (CMS Technical Series Publication No.27; <https://www.cms.int/en/publication/review-migratory-bird-flyways-and-priorities-management-ts-no-27>);
- *Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF* made information available through scientific reports (e.g. Aung et al 2018; Chowdhury and Foyals 2017; Chowdhury et al 2017b; Clark et al. 2018; Kelly et al. 2017; Pain et al 2018; Peng et al. 2017; Zöckler et al 2016; Zöckler et al 2018), their website

[<https://www.saving-spoon-billed-sandpiper.com>], Facebook page [<https://web.facebook.com/sbstf>], news items [<https://blog.conservation.org/2018/07/bird-watchers-spot-illegal-hunting-in-china/>] and others.

**3.6.2 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
8 (26%)	11 (35%)	5 (16%)	7 (23%)

Partners have been particularly active in the Yellow Sea Task Force priority region, supporting the governments of China (WI, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) and the DPR Korea (HSF, Pukorokoro Miranda) to conduct wetland assessments and conducting waterbird counts.

The Convention on Migratory Species reported that in 2018, IPBES published the Regional Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Asia and the Pacific, which developed assessments of available knowledge regarding the importance, status, and trends of biodiversity, including migratory waterbird habitats, to make informed decisions at the local, regional and international levels ([https://www.ipbes.net/system/tdf/spm\\_asia-pacific\\_2018\\_digital.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=28394](https://www.ipbes.net/system/tdf/spm_asia-pacific_2018_digital.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=28394)).

**3.6.3 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
17 (57%)	2 (7%)	7 (23%)	3 (10%)

More than half of the Partners, WGs and TFs reporting said that they have been involved with updating information on the status and threats to internationally important sites and to FNS, especially through conducting field surveys and satellite tracking projects (e.g. Spoon-billed Sandpipers at Meinyopil'gyno, Chukotka, Russia), and the development of national wetland directories (e.g. in the DPR Korea).

**3.6.4 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
7 (23%)	15 (50%)	5 (17%)	3 (10%)

Examples of the work done by Partners include investigating the spread of the Cord grass *Spartina alterniflora* at key sites in the Yellow Sea and undertaking control work. The ASEAN Flyway Project is also identifying key threatening processes to migratory waterbirds.

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

**3.7.1 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
63 (76%)	1 (<1%)	13 (16%)	6 (7%)

The reports show that 76% of Partners, WGs and TFs have been active in conducting waterbird counts at key breeding, staging, and wintering areas to identify internationally important sites and gaps for migratory waterbirds in the Flyway.

**3.7.2 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
16 (53%)	5 (17%)	4 (13%)	5 (17%)

Many Partners, WGs and TFs collaborated to conduct surveys to address information gaps on key species (e.g. Spoon-billed Sandpiper and Baer's Pochard) and to identify internationally important sites for these and other species of waterbirds (e.g. in DPR Korea, Yellow/West Sea, ASEAN region).

**3.7.3 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
16 (55%)	7 (24%)	2 (7%)	4 (14%)

Some 55% of the Partners, WGs and TFs have published their data as technical papers (see 'Reference' section) or online to inform conservation measures, such as the national Red List assessment. Online information include:

- BirdLife Australia's Shorebirds 2020 Monitoring project <http://www.birdlife.org.au/projects/shorebirds-2020>
- International Waterbird Census where information is available on species count totals by country <http://iwc.wetlands.org/index.php/nattotals>, and country count totals by species <http://iwc.wetlands.org/index.php/spectotals>. Visualisation of the data is also possible <http://iwc.wetlands.org/index.php/awcsites>.

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

**3.8.1 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
18 (55%)	3 (24%)	6 (7%)	5 (14%)

Partners, WGs and TFs in particular, have been active in such international collaborative projects, such as:

- In Mongolia, migration studies on crane, wader, duck, and swan are being conducted with international organizations;
- In the ASEAN region, improved monitoring and the baseline surveys are being conducted to better understanding the situation in the ASEAN part of the Flyway;
- Satellite tracking of Spoon-billed Sandpipers at Meinyopil'gyno, Chukotka, Russia identified new moulting site in DPR Korea and a new staging site on the west coast of the Leizhou peninsula, southern China (Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF);
- Satellite-tracking of juvenile BFS in Korea (Black-faced Spoonbill WG);
- Research on Latham's snipe between Wild Bird Society of Japan and Australian researchers (WBSJ);
- Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust have continued their collaboration with DPR Korea in research and surveys at sites along the Yellow/West Sea. Associate Professor Phil Battley (Massey University) continues to lead research into the biology of migratory waterbirds in the Flyway (see New Zealand's Report on Implementation for full list of references);
- The Hanns Seidel Foundation supported collaborative research in DPR Korea and RO Korea, especially related to the inner-Korean border area as well as along the West Sea and East Sea of the DPR Korea. The results contributed to the publication of the 'Wetland Directory of the DPR Korea' (2018), and the designation of new Ramsar Sites and FNS;
- Members of the Shorebird WG participated in surveys, capturing and marking birds, and tracking studies along the EAAF. The information collected helped to expand the databases on the ecology of a number of focal species. SWG members participated in the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative's EAAF plan and collaborated closely with the Global Flyways Network, the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative and other groups. A Colour Flagging Protocol, resighting database and Facebook site are maintained to document resightings of birds throughout the EAAF. The Alaska Shorebird Group annual report that includes their research studies and papers published can be found at [https://www.fws.gov/alaska/mbsp/mbm/shorebirds/working\\_group.htm](https://www.fws.gov/alaska/mbsp/mbm/shorebirds/working_group.htm)

**3.8.2 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
15 (52%)	5 (17%)	1 (3%)	8 (28%)

A number of Partners, WGs and TFs have been supporting survey work around the Yellow/West Sea to identify the key sites for migratory waterbirds, such as shorebirds, Black-faced Spoonbill and the Spoon-billed Sandpiper. They have also been supporting the work of the EAAFP Yellow Sea TF as well as the Yellow Sea Working Group that was established in 2016 and facilitated by IUCN Asia Regional Office.

**3.8.3 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
9 (32%)	10 (36%)	2 (7%)	7 (25%)

The Colour Marking Task Force has not been operational for several years and Wetlands International stressed that it was of great importance for the Partnership to play a role in encouraging communication between countries and organisations planning colour marking migratory waterbirds to ensure that coordinated schemes are developed and implemented.

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

**3.9.1 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
7 (24%)	13 (45%)	2 (7%)	7 (24%)

A number of Partners reported that they conduct surveillance for avian influenza at the national level (e.g. RO Korea, Mongolia, Thailand) and at the site level (Pūkoro Miramira Shorebird Centre). The RO Korea also said that their National Institute of Environmental Research has international cooperation with neighbouring and Flyway countries to share information and to strengthen coordination.

**3.9.2 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
7 (24%)	11 (38%)	3 (10%)	8 (28%)

The EAAFP's Asia-Pacific Working Group on Migratory Waterbirds and Avian Influenza (APWG-MWAI) shared information on outbreaks of AI in wild birds from countries in the region as well as information relating to the latest research worldwide on AI and migratory habits that have linked AI to wild birds, latest genetic studies on HPAI, etc.

The CMS Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds works as a communication and coordination network and continues to review the role of wild birds in the epidemiology of AI and the impact of the disease on wild birds, promoting a balanced opinion based on currently available evidence. Additionally, in the wake of the spread of the H5N1 Avian Influenza virus via migratory birds, AEWA and CMS initiated World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) as a countermeasure to join hands with major

international organizations for information sharing and awareness raising through international cooperation.

**3.9.3 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
7 (24%)	13 (45%)	2 (7%)	7 (24%)

Examples of action taken by Partners, WGs and TFs include:

- Production and dissemination of publications such as an ‘Avian Influenza in Wild Birds SOP’ for responding to such diseases (RO Korea);
- Development of a web portal (wetlandhealth.org) to promote health in wetlands. This portal also hosts the Ramsar Wetland Disease Manual (currently hosted here: [wwt.org.uk/rwdm](http://wwt.org.uk/rwdm)) which offers specific guidance to wetland managers on reducing disease risks to migratory waterbirds (WWT);
- Providing guidance which have been uploaded on to the EAAFP website (Avian Influenza TF, Wetlands International);
- The Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds providing advice on the root causes of the epidemic as well as on technically sound measures to combat it and to develop early warning systems (CMS).

**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.**

**4.10.1 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	No	In progress	Not applicable
16 training on migratory waterbird monitoring	3	2	5
7 training courses on migratory waterbird conservation			
6 training courses on habitat management			
3 training courses on sustainable development			
6 training courses on CEPA			

Many Partners, WGs and TFs have been involved in delivering a variety of training courses throughout the EAAF, with a focus on migratory waterbird monitoring. In Cambodia, WWT has produced a publication in English and Khmer language on “Wise Use Guidance for Freshwater Wetlands in Cambodia (Blackham, G.V. & Avent, T. 2018) that includes a case study from the Boeung Prek Lapouv Protected Landscape and which

is used in their training. In some countries, e.g. Mongolia, the government Partners stated that more training programmes are needed.

**4.10.2 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
11 (38%)	3 (10%)	2 (7%)	13 (45%)

WWF has been involved in establishing and operating a training centre at the Chongming Dongtan National Nature Reserve where 100 wetland managers have so far received trained on the 5-day training in migratory waterbird monitoring and habitat management. In the RO Korea, the local government, regional environmental offices, and National Wetlands Center have a range of programs to educate and increase awareness; e.g. workshops for wetlands managers.

**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.**

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

Yes	No	In progress	Not applicable
18 (62%)	3 (10%)	5 (17%)	3 (10%)

Partners, WGs and TFs have been involved in developing new, or ongoing collaborative projects such as:

- The conservation of Black-faced Spoonbills (China, Japan and RO Korea), Saunders' gulls (Japan, RO Korea), restoration of White stork (Japan, RO Korea) and Crested Ibis (China, Japan, RO Korea), as well as on joint research on the migratory route of waterbirds (RO Korea, Mongolia);
- Development of sister-site partnership between Kushiro Wetlands (Japan) and Bako Buntal Bay (Malaysia), and between the Pūkoro Kororo Miranda Shorebird Centre (New Zealand) with Yalu Jiang National Nature Reserve (China);
- Census of the population status and migratory route of key species such as Baer's Pochard, Far-Eastern Curlew, Nordmann's Greenshank, Scaly-sided Merganser, Spoon-billed Sandpiper;
- Identification of key sites along the EAAF used by migratory waterbirds and the protection of those sites, e.g. around the Yellow/West Sea, ASEAN region, and in the DPR Korea.

**5.11.2 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
15 (54%)	8 (29%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)

Partners, WGs and TFs have been involved in the production or implementation of International Single Species Action Plans and other conservation plans for globally threatened migratory waterbirds such as:

- Baer's Pochard (Baer's Pochard TF, CMS, Hanns Seidel Foundation);
- Black-faced Spoonbill (Black-faced Spoonbill WG, RO Korea);
- Dalmatian Pelican (CMS, Wetlands International);
- Far Eastern Curlew (CMS, Far Eastern Curlew TF, Malaysia, Shorebird WG);
- Scaly-sided Merganser (Hanns Seidel Foundation, Scaly-sided Merganser TF);
- Spoonbill-billed Sandpiper (Hanns Seidel Foundation, Myanmar, Shorebird WG, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF).

The Shorebird WG reported that a new effort is being made on the conservation of the Nordmann's Greenshank.

#### 4. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

The voluntary Section D is to allow Country Partners to update the information on the status of their existing Flyway Sites. This section was completed by eight Partners, namely Australia, Bangladesh, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Thailand and the United States of America for 43 FNS's. Information was provided for the Flyway Network Sites in Cambodia and the DPR Korea but these were not considered as the designation process for the Cambodian site has not yet been completed and the data for the DPR Korea was not provided by the country Partner themselves.

Questions	Number (and percentage) of responses	
	Yes (%)	No (%)
Q1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet (SIS)?	34 (79%)	9 (21%)
Q2. FNS should update their Site Information Sheets every six years. Does the Site have an update SIS?	16 (37%)	27 (63%)
Q3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders?	34 (79%)	9 (21%)
Q4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?	30 (70%)	13 (30%)
Q5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)?	36 (88%)	5 (12%)
Q6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)?	39 (91%)	4 (9%)
Q7. Does the Site have a regular monitoring programme to assess the status of the site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.3)?	41 (95%)	2 (5)
Q8. Have the results of the monitoring on trends of the status of the site and its migratory waterbirds been shared with the EAAFP Secretariat and Partners (Key Result Area 7.3)?	37 (86%)	6 (14%)
Q9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4	32 (74%)	11 (26%)

Q10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)?	10 (25%)	30 (75%)
Q11. Have model projects been developed at the Site with the full involvement of related national and site partnerships, to address key threatening processes, social and economic needs. (Key Result Area 2.4)?	6 (15%)	35 (85%)
Q12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)?	10 (24%)	32 (76%)

The results show that most FNS have Site Information Sheets (79%) but a high percentage of these SIS (63%) have not been updated for more than six years. The FNS are generally well managed with site management committees that include local community members and stakeholders (79%), have management plans (70%), CEPA programmes (88%), and where staff have access to capacity development and training programmes (91%). The FNS reporting also have regular monitoring programme to assess the status of the site and its migratory waterbirds (95%) and share the data with the EAAFP Secretariat (86%).

However, 74% of the FNS reported possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds and only 25% of these FNS have reported the threat to the EAAFP Secretariat. Furthermore, only 15% of FNS have developed model projects to address key threatening processes, social and economic needs, and only 10% have assessed the ecological, social and economic values of the FNS.

These initial findings are valuable but a larger dataset from FNS across a larger number of country Partners will be needed to identify longer term trends. This is because more than half of the FNS reporting in this analysis (24, 73%) come just from one country Partner, i.e. Australia, and so may not be representative for the FNS along the Flyway

## 5. References

Aung, P.P. et al (2018). Recent changes in the number of spoon-billed sandpipers *Calidris pygmaea* wintering on the Upper Gulf of Mottama in Myanmar. *Oryx* (accepted).

Blackham, G.V. and T. Avent. (2018). Wise Use Guidance for Freshwater Wetlands in Cambodia. Slimbridge, Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust. (available online via the WWT website in English and Khmer by the end of 2018).

Chowdhury, S. U. and Foysal, M. A five-year study of over-summering shorebirds on Sonadia Island, Cox's Bazar district, Bangladesh. *Forktail* 33 (2017): 120–123.

Chowdhury, S.U., M. Foysal, M.A.A. Diyan & S. Ahmed. (2017). Discovery of an important wintering site of the Critically Endangered Spoon-billed Sandpiper *Calidris pygmaea* in the Meghna Estuary, Bangladesh. *Bird Conservation International* 27: 1–12.

Clark, N.A., Anderson, G.Q.A., Li, J., Syroechkovskiy, E.E., Tomkovich, P.S., Zöckler, C., Lee, R. & Green, R.E. (2018) First formal estimate of the world population of the Critically Endangered spoon-billed sandpiper *Calidris pygmaea*. *Oryx*, 52, 137-146.

Kelly, C., C. Zöckler, B. Scampion & E.E. Syroechkovskiy. (2017). Hammer, filter or microphone: How does the Spoon-billed Sandpiper *Calidris pygmaea* use its bill to feed? *Wader Study* 124(2): 99-111.

Pain, D., Hughes, B., Syroechkovskiy, E., Zöckler, C., Chowdhury S. and Clark, N. Saving the Spoon-billed Sandpiper: a conservation update. (2018) *British Birds* 111 (323 –333).

Peng, He-Bo, Guy Anderson, Qing Chang, Chi-Yeung Choi, Sayam U. Chowdhury, N.A. Clark, X. Gan, R.D. Hearn, J. Li, E.G. Lappo, W. Liu, Z. Ma, D.A. Melville, J.F. Phillips, E.E. Syroechkovskiy, M. Tong, S. Wang, L. Zhang & C. Zöckler. (2017) "The intertidal wetlands of southern Jiangsu Province, China—globally important for Spoon-billed Sandpipers and other threatened waterbirds, but facing multiple serious threats." *Bird Conservation International* 27: 305-322.

Sophanna L, Hour, P, and T. Avent. (2018). Report on Vulnerability Assessment of Boeung Prek Lapouv Protected Landscape. IUCN.

Tao, X., J. Lei, R.D. Hearn and G. Lei. (2017). Report on the coordinated survey for wintering waterbirds of the Central and Lower Yangtze in 2015. WWF China, Wuhan. (Available at <https://monitoring.wwf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Yangtze-census-Jan15-final-report.pdf>)

Yav N., Seng, K., Nhim S., Chea, V., Bou V., & Avent, T. (2017). The impact of shrimp farming on water quality in Anlung Pring, a protected landscape in Cambodia. *Cambodian Journal of Natural History*. 1: 49–54.

Zöckler, C., Beresford, A. E., Bunting, G., Chowdhury, S. U., Clark, N. A., Fu, V. W. K., Htin Hla, T. Morozov, V.V., Syroechkovskiy, E.E, Kashiwagi, M., Lappo, E. G, Tong, M., LeLong, T., Yat-Tung Y., F. Huettmann, F., Akasofu, H. K., Tomida, H. and G. M. Buchanan (2016) The winter distribution of the spoon-billed sandpiper *Calidris pygmaeus*. *Bird Conserv. Internat.* 26: 476–489.

Zöckler, C., D. Li, S.U. Chowdhury, M. Iqbal & C. Yu. (2018). Winter distribution, habitat and feeding behaviour of Nordmann's Greenshank *Tringa guttifer*. *Wader Study* 125(1): 7–14.