



East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership

Sixth Meeting of Partners, Palembang, Indonesia

19-22 March 2012

FINAL (AS ADOPTED)

Report (Minutes) of the Sixth Meeting of Partners

It may be helpful to read this Report in conjunction with the Agenda Documents for MoP6.

A summary table of actions arising from MoP6 starts on page 23.



Participants

Partners represented at the Meeting:

- Australasian Wader Studies Group (AWSG)** – Ken Gosbell, Phil Straw.
- Australia** – Paul O'Neill.
- Bangladesh** – Azam Mohammad Shamsul, Hassan Mahmudul.
- BirdLife International** – Cristi Nozawa, Noritaka Ichida, Nobuhiko Kishimoto, Simba Chan, Jonathan Stacey, Mayumi Sato.
- Cambodia** – H.E. Dr. Kim Sean Yin, Sunleang Srey, Hem Bonarin.
- China** – Lei Guangchun, Yan Zhou.
- Convention on Migratory Species Secretariat (CMS)** – Douglas Hykle.
- FAO** – Boripat Siriaroonrat.
- Indonesia** – Agus Sriyadi Budi Sutito, Dewi Malia Prawiradilaga, Dadang Suganda, Novianto Bambang Wawandono, Tatang.
- International Crane Foundation (ICF)** – Jim Harris.
- IUCN** – Yvonne Ingje Verkuil, John Mackinnon.
- Japan** – Makiko Yanagiya.
- Miranda Naturalists' Trust (MNT)** – Keith Woodley.

Mongolia – Batbold Dorjgurkhem.
New Zealand – Colin O'Donnell.
Republic of Korea (ROK) – Oh Soo-Mi, Jang Jeong-Ik, Kim Jin-han.
Rio Tinto – Denise Goldsworthy, Rick Humphries.
Russian Federation – Evgeny Syroechkovskiy.
Singapore – Sharon Chan, How Choon Beng, Grace Yap.
Thailand – Aree Wattana Tummkird, Sunate Karapan.
Philippines – Anson Tagtag.
United States of America (USA) – Douglas Alcorn.
Wetlands International – Doug Watkins, Taej Mundkur, Roger Jaensch, Yus Roosila Noor, Ferry Hasudungan.
Wild Bird Society of Japan (WBSJ) – Minoru Kashiwagi.
Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT) – Baz Hughes.
WWF – Bena Smith.

Potential Partners represented at the Meeting:

Viet Nam – Nguyen Thi Luong Duyen.
Malaysia – Lily Anak Sir.
Myanmar – San San New.

Technical advisors:

ArcCona Ecological Consulting – Christoph Zöckler.
Audubon Alaska – Nils David Warnock.
BANCA – Htin Hla, Karin Eberhard.
Bangladesh Bird Club – Sayam Uddin Chowdhury.
BirdLife International: national partners – Yeap Chin Aik (Malaysian Nature Society), Vivian Fu (HKBWS), Yu Yat-tung (HKBWS), Don Geoff Eya Tabaraza (Haribon Foundation), Wicha Narungsri (BCST), Wichyanan Limparungpatthanakij (BCST), Menxiu Tong (Rudong SBS Survey Group), Jing Li (Rudong SBS Survey Group), Gao Chuan (Fujian Birdwatching Society), Chen Shuihua (Zhejiang Museum of Natural History).
Birds Korea – Nial Moores.
Birds Russia – Morozov Vladmir.
Bombay Natural History Society – Sivananthaperumal Balachandran.
British Trust for Ornithology – Nigel Clark.
Japanese Association for Wild Goose Protection – Masayuki Kurechi.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) – Nicola Crockford, Robert Sheldon.
University of Ho Chi Minh City – Nguyen Thang.
University of Queensland – Richard Fuller, Nicholas Murray.

Domestic observers:

Burung Indonesia – Dwi Mulyawati, Yoppy Hidayanto.
RAIN (Raptor Indonesia) – Asman A. Purwanto
WWF Indonesia – Chairul Saleh
Burung Nusantara – Fransisca Noni Tirtaningtyas & Iwan Febrianto

Secretariat:

Deputy – Min Kyoung-seog.
Communication Officer – Choi Yuna.
Public Information Officer – Kim Min-seon.
Finance Officer – Hyun Seung-joo.

Opening Ceremony

Speech by Governor of Sumatra (Mr. H Alex Noerdin): The Governor welcomed all visitors to Palembang for EAAFP MoP6, noting this was the second EAAFP MoP in Indonesia, following MoP1 in Bogor. He highlighted the newly designated Flyway Network Site, Sembilang National Park, indicating its importance and connection to other parts of the Flyway (New Zealand, Australia, the Arctic). Sembilang supports over 100,000 waterbirds and also is important for local communities.

Speech by Chair of Partnership (H.E. Dr Yin Kimsean, Cambodia): Dr Yin expressed the Partnership's gratitude to the national, provincial and local governments of Indonesia for hosting this sixth MoP and acknowledged the preparation work of the hosting team and Secretariat. He referred to the significant achievements of EAAFP (now 27 Partners) over recent years and urged further cooperation to address habitat loss. An important aspect of MoP6 will be consideration of a new Implementation Strategy for EAAFP

Certificate ceremony: new Partners received their Certificates for joining EAAFP: Mongolia, New Zealand and Rio Tinto.

Certificate ceremony: for the new Network site, Sembilang National Park

Speech by Minister of Forestry of Indonesia (Mr. Zulkifli Hasan): The Minister thanked the Banyuasin District for its role in the Sembilang site nomination and for supporting the field trip planned for Day 4 of MoP6. He encouraged potential Partners who were attending MoP6, to join EAAFP. The minister emphasized the rich biodiversity of Indonesia and socio-economic forces underlying the various threats to biodiversity and indicated that strong actions are being undertaken by the Ministry to protect migratory waterbirds. The Minister officially opened MoP6 and hoped participants would enjoy the visit to the new Network site, Sembilang.

Agenda Item 1. Introductory session

Agenda Item 1.1 Appointment of Meeting chairperson and rapporteurs

1. Introducing the partnership Chairperson, Dr Srey (for the EAAFP Chair, Cambodia) as well as the partnership Rapporteurs: Choi Yuna, Roger Jaensch, and Taej Mundkur. Unfortunately Dr Srey had to return to Cambodia for personal reasons so the Vice-Chair (represented by Prof Lei Guangchun, China) stood in as Chair of MoP6 on Day 3

Agenda Item 1.2 Approval of Minutes of the 5th Meeting of Partners

3. The 5th Meeting of Partners Minutes were adopted by the Partners without change.

Agenda Item 1.3 Approval of the Provisional Agenda for the 6th Meeting of Partners

4. Russia requested an additional discussion on CAFF which had already been included as 4.5.4.

5. CMS asked for inclusion under 3.3 on day 2 of the review of previous Implementation Strategy as well as presentation of the proposed new strategy.

6. Birdlife requested a brief report on Black-faced Spoonbills and Chinese Crested Terns to be held on day 3, after 4.5.1.

7. ICF requested a side meeting of Amur-Heilong Task Force in Session C.

8. BirdLife: side event Session B, Seabird WG meeting will include Chinese Crested Tern (potential range countries please attend). Another session on Tuesday will cover the Seabird WG formation.

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

9. All Partner heads briefly introduced themselves. Apologies were received from Ramsar (via Lew Young). All other Partners were represented at MoP6.

1.5 Presentation of new Partners' plans and activities:

Mongolia

10. Dr Batbold provided a background to conservation challenges and international commitments in Mongolia. He noted Mongolia's rich diversity of waterbird sites including the present Network sites of Ogii Lake and the Khurkh Khuiten Valley. Mongolia has published a guidebook on KK Valley for CEPA purposes with local communities (an EAAFP small grant supported this project). Dr Batbold vocalised concerns regarding threats to wetlands, including climate change, the challenge of managing expansion of mining (huge projects developing), changes in agriculture and livestock, increasing interest in tourism and infrastructure development. There has been a recent slow down in protected area designations and this may impact the desired future situation. There is also potential for developing sister sites: for example, an Australia-flagged Red-necked Stint was recorded in Buir Lake. However the challenge is to show that protection can generate social, recreational and economic benefits, and achieve integration with other sectors. The science needs to support this.

New Zealand

11. The Department of Conservation oversees 32% of public land in NZ. NZ people see the benefits of conservation for tourism and local economy. Migratory shorebirds of NZ include both long-distance (species breeding in the Arctic) and short-distance migrants. The Ornithological Society of NZ has a programme of monitoring shorebirds; this work is showing long term declines in Bar-tailed Godwits, Red Knots and Ruddy Turnstones. NZ has a program for safeguarding the ecological and natural character of significant ecosystems. It is now prioritising its work as a result of Partnership membership and developing an inventory of candidate sites for the Site Network.

Rio Tinto

12. Rio Tinto hopes that activities planned will set some precedents for EAAFP and ensure that biodiversity and its conservation will benefit from Rio Tinto's presence in a region. Rio Tinto has a commitment to Net Positive Impact on biodiversity and biodiversity action plans are required for each mining site. Dampier Salt (DSL) is part of Rio Tinto, operating in north-west Australia: it manages three salt fields and natural saline ponds that support shorebirds – each is an IBA. DSL has identified a suite of priority shorebird species. What can Rio Tinto bring to EAAFP? It has resources and project management skills and long-term business relationships. Rio Tinto wishes to build collaborative relationships with EAAFP Partners and be part of developing an integrated strategy for the Flyway. Three linked initiatives in an integrated flyway project are: research on shorebirds at its saltfields (Edith Cowan University); pre-feasibility study for a Wetland Centre at Bohai Wan, China; and considering plans for the IBAs that are crucial to the DSL priority species in the Flyway.

2. Overview reporting

2.1 Brief report from the Secretariat

Detailed paper provided in Agenda Document 2.1.

13. The EAAFP Secretariat introduced new staff and provided an update on recruitment of the new Chief Executive (negotiating with a candidate now). Plans are to relocate the Secretariat office to a new building (in 2013?) along with other international organisations hosted by Incheon City. The office will be smaller but savings will be directed to Partnership Activities. The Secretariat summarised the visits by Secretariat to Partners, and meetings and workshops.

14. BirdLife International requested a correction to Document 2.1, noting that the monitoring workshop and the AI workshop were hosted by MoE Japan, not BirdLife International.

15. Wetlands International commended the contributions by Partners Republic of Korea and Japan over several years and encouraged other Partners to contribute. It reminded all that the audit of accounts by BDO has been completed for year 2011.

16. Mongolia sought clarification on conversion of KRW to USD for the contribution by Japan.

17. ICF expressed thanks to the Secretariat staff for the preparation for MoP6, especially Choi Chang-yong (who unfortunately was unable to attend).

18. CMS noted the proposed move to the new building and the anticipated saving, asking it saved funds will it be directed to program activities? The secretariat responded that it would be used to further the goals of the partnership.

19. The Republic of Korea thanked and acknowledged the Host City (Incheon) support for hosting the Secretariat.

20. Wetlands International remarked that page 11 of Document 2.1 had an unknown status item (2) that will be further discussed during the meeting. Also, Action 28 (ToR for CEPA WG) *has* been prepared for MoP6.

2.2 Summary of Partner reports submitted to the Secretariat

21. The Secretariat introduced the reports summarised by seven Partners, and summarised them into Agenda Document 2.2.

22. The WWF-HK consisted of mostly information concerning WWF HK activities. For future reporting, an effort will be made to encourage better coordination and reporting from all WWF offices in the EAAF.

23. The WWT suggested that we need to do better than just 8-10 Partner Reports per year.

24. The Chair announced the need for input from partners on the new Implementation Strategy as well as for the CEPA strategy, which will be discussed on subsequent days.

2.3 Brief update from EAAFP Working Groups:

Avian Influenza Working Group (by Chair, Taej Mundkur)

25. This WG also reported to the Central Asian range states and the Scientific Task Force on AI. The WG compiled knowledge on AI surveillance of migratory waterbirds and promoted sharing of knowledge with the idea of communicating through a Yahoo e-group.

The Fourth OIE Regional Expert Meeting was held in Japan. Another Expert Meeting for the far eastern region was also held in Japan with support from MoE Japan. The role of wild birds in AI outbreaks is still unclear. It was stated that there was a need to strengthen field monitoring of viruses in wild birds. The main goals to work on are; stronger communication networks with regular updating and dissemination of migration and conservation info in local languages; stronger management of important sites due to potential implication in outbreaks; greater recognition of integration of wildlife and human health. A long list of research needs has been identified. Also an e-group with broad representation was established for East Asia.

Eight Partners met during MoP6 on 19 March where the Draft EAAFP Implementation Strategy of EAAFP was reviewed. They agreed on the need to focus more on conservation outcomes and also identified needs for guidance on what action to take at sites to reduce risk to wild bird populations of AI. It was stated that it may be helpful if Partners could send experts to countries with outbreaks to advise on wild birds.

A new tool for informal reporting, Wildlife Health Event Reporter was introduced which can be enabled via smart phones.

Partners undertaking AI surveillance on wild waterbirds should provide info updates to the AI WG in order to maintain an overview and report to EAAFP annually. In undertaking AI surveillance, Partners are encouraged to focus on Network sites and other important sites to link to identifying migration work through marking of birds (links to other EAAFP WGs). The group is trying to identify additional reps for joining the WG and the partners are invited to express interest in a 5-year regional project to understand migration routes through stable isotope analysis. This will be led by FAO-IAEA starting late 2012.

Seabird Working Group (Simba Chan)

26. Birdlife International had a more in-depth discussion to follow yesterday's discussion specifically on Chinese Crested Tern.

Shorebird Working Group (Chair, Ken Gosbell)

27. The WG met yesterday with substantial attendance and discussed Red Listing by IUCN of EAAF shorebird populations. Richard Fuller will anchor this from Australia. The IUCN situation analysis was presented (by consultants) of threats to intertidal habitat of migratory waterbirds in flyway and aims to report at World Conservation Congress of IUCN in Korea later in 2012. Threats in the EAAFP flyway are among the most serious in the world. WWF Hong Kong presented WWF's Shorebird Conservation Plan that was originally introduced at MoP5. A desk study with workshop later in 2012 will lead to an action plan that links to IUCN study is encouraged. There is an urgent need to identify early actions where possible due to rapid ongoing loss of habitat. From the Waterbird Population Estimates 5th edition, Partners were asked to provide population data to Wetlands International. Miranda NT introduced a five year plan to survey sites in DPRK, building on past efforts, and sought contributions of resources (around \$50,000 over 5 years) to enable this. This will help fill knowledge gaps on key species under threat such as Bar-tailed Godwit. Overall the underlying message was the need to take action urgently at high levels due to rapid declines in shorebird numbers.

Anatidae Working Group (Chair, Masayuki Kurechi)

28. A discussion took place yesterday on the 2011 earthquake and nuclear accident as well as the potential impact on waterfowl populations. While there was damage to river banks, the greatest damage in N Japan was to coastal habitats, affecting numbers and behaviour of Brent Geese and others. Also discussed was the recent de-gazetting of protected areas (zakaznik) in Kamchatka. These included key staging sites for at least four populations of geese/swans (and other waterbirds). Many protected areas were de-gazetted in 1990s due to poor economic situation in Kamchatka and lack of funds for management and scientific expertise. Poaching became a major issue and seven were de-gazetted in 2007 including Moroshechnaya, a Ramsar site. Authorities are ignoring this status. For the recovery project of Aleutian Cackling Goose, migration and breeding in Asia had been lost, in part caused by release of foxes for economic harvest. Breeding was established in Kamchatka in 1992 and releases in Kurile Islands were made in 1995 - over 200 now visit Japan. This should now be listed in WPE5 as a new population in Asia.

29. Wetlands International sought some clarification of change of the status of reserves in Kamchatka.

30. Russia advised that protection status is at a regional level so is a decision of provincial government. Some sites have potential for development for oil extraction. Moroshechnaya still has Ramsar site status and thus should have some protected status - this is being discussed between federal and regional authorities.

31. China asked for some information on activities in other countries and a brief reply was given.

Crane Working Group (Coordinator, Simba Chan)

32. Insufficient members were present at MoP6 so WG will meet later (China, probably Yancheng, late 2012). Project at Ambyong in DPRK is going well and the wintering population in Korea is now higher than in China, but high concentration in one area (DMZ) so is vulnerable there. WCS Mongolia and others held meeting in Dauria International Protected Area in 2011, focussed on White-naped Crane. Problems of drought and long-term loss of habitat are to be discussed at the upcoming China meeting. A meeting in India for the Black-necked Crane population wintering in Bhutan and India indicated an interest to communicate with China, where the species breeds. In South Korea, on 24 February a celebration of Hooded Crane Day (now a National Monument) at Suncheon Bay was held and local people are positive about conservation and its benefits partly due to CEPA work on cranes.

CEPA Working Group (Sharon Chan, on behalf of Chair)

33. The focus of the Working Group has been on the review of the CEPA Strategy.

3. Building the Partnership

3.1 Introduction to new Implementation Strategy and CEPA Strategy

Implementation Strategy (report by CMS as Task Force chair)

34. Work commissioned at MoP5 has been completed by the Task Force which met in Incheon in October 2011. Three documents were produced and circulated in order to advance MP6.

A Review of Strategy for 2007-2011 was produced by consultant Nature Management Services (Crawford Prentice) based on analysis of Partner Reports and other information. It also investigated other organisations' strategies. Needs identified included: i) to better develop national partnerships; ii) need for guidelines on addressing threats and impacts at sites; iii) sustaining CEPA. Some new concepts were discussed at the workshop and partly incorporated in the draft Strategy for 2012-16. Key Result Areas were incorporated in the draft Strategy. The Secretariat should permanently post the Review report on the EAAFP website.

Proposed Outcomes and Key Result Areas were introduced as the focus for discussion and adoption at MoP6. No changes were made to the objectives of EAAFP. Some changes were proposed to the Outcomes (reduced from 14 outcomes to 11) especially to establish measurable targets. Key Result Areas (definable targets) have been added and explanatory text introduced.

The consultant also prepared a requested preamble to the new Strategy to explain the roles and functions of various bodies of the Partnership. This emphasises the importance and desired roles of national partnerships. The Task Force chair proposed that it be adopted as a stand-alone document [to be referenced by the new Strategy] and that an alternative introduction be developed for the Strategy. This was prepared during the meeting and incorporated in the revised Strategy.

The Secretariat needs to revise the Reporting Template for Partners, post-session, based on changes to the Strategy to be adopted at MoP6.

Also see item 3.3 below.

CEPA Strategy (report by Singapore, on behalf of Working Group leader)

35. A review was commissioned at MoP5 and the CEPA WG was assigned to undertake this. A workshop was held at Sg Buloh in September 2011 and nine key CEPA tasks were identified at Flyway, national and site levels (table provided). The review identified specific interventions to realise the tasks and developed tools, linkages and activities (refer to Objective 3 of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy). Linkages to CBD, CMS and Ramsar need to be strengthened.

MoP6 is asked to finalise the formation of the CEPA WG by endorsing the draft Terms of Reference of the WG (included at the end of the Agenda Documents) and to provide comments leading to endorsement of the EAAFP CEPA Strategy.

3.2 Developing engagement of new Partners (potential partners)

36. The Secretariat wished to clarify the official titles of the Government Partners.

CMS announced that the official long and short versions of country titles are available online, in accordance with accepted United Nations terminology. EAAFP should adopt one or the other format, and be consistent in their usage. CMS said it would assist in directing the secretariat to the relevant guidance documents, as necessary.

Wetlands International requested guidance from the Management Committee on when the Secretariat should use the short title and when to use the long one.

37. Wetlands International said their three potential Partners are present as observers (Malaysia, Myanmar, Vietnam) and invited them to explain their interest in the Partnership and their process.

Malaysia and BirdLife partner (MNS) Ministry is finalising a Cabinet paper on joining EAAFP and have had a positive consultation meeting for the nomination of Bako Buntal Bay, Sarawak, as a new Network Site.

Wetlands International announced under previous arrangements that there is a Network site at Kapar in Peninsular Malaysia.

Myanmar representatives said that the Government of Myanmar has proposed a Ramsar site used by large numbers of shorebirds, the Gulf of Martaban.

Vietnam supports conservation of migratory species and has joined Ramsar with four Ramsar sites designated. They also showed interest in further discussion about EAAFP.

38. Wetlands International mentioned other countries (PNG, Lao, Brunei) in the EAAF and explained their situation. For PNG this mainly consisted of a lack of resources. Some WI staff are presently in Brunei and will report back on situation. Lao has important habitat for Sarus Crane however there has been no recent communication. WI Oceania offered to follow-up re PNG.

Wetlands International: suggested that Secretariat sends info to these remaining countries including about this discussion at MoP6.

39. Wetlands International: An April 2012 workshop on Black-necked Crane confirmed migration from China to Bhutan and NE India. CMS meeting in Norway raised awareness of this species and discussed developing a single species action plan that would involve the range states. This raised the issue of involving India in EAAFP with respect to NE India. Other species migrate through NE India to Bangladesh (already a Partner). Indian Ministry has an interest in EAAFP but there has been a recent change in officials. WWF-India, WI-South Asia and Birdlife International (through BNHS) will explore this further.

3.3 New Implementation Strategy 2012-2016: Wrap-up session

40. Systematic discussion on Document 3.1.2 (Outcomes and Key Result Areas) was led by CMS as the chair of the Task Force. This occurred initially on Day 2 in one of two sub-groups of the MoP participants but on Day 3 the plenary reviewed those initial discussions and concluded the process.

41. CMS reminded Partners that the overall Goal and five Objectives had not been changed, since they were derived from the Partnership text. Many changes had been proposed to Outcomes and Key Result Areas (KRAs) had been added. Explanations, responsible actors and potential implementation mechanisms had also been included. Colour coding in the draft was explained.

42. The following notes record interventions by Partners. Requested additions to the lists of implementing bodies in the document text are not necessarily recorded, to save space in this report. Actual changes to the text of the Implementation Strategy 2012-2016 are not shown here but may be seen in the final text as adopted by MoP6. Where no comments or very minor changes were proposed to KRAs, these are not included in the following comments.

43. Rio Tinto complimented the process and documents and suggested that the present document is largely satisfactory and needs few and only minor changes.

Outcome 1

Key Result Area (KRA) 1.1

Australia had concerns that sites of less importance were more easily nominated (e.g. top two sites are not yet included) and that the number of sites not increasing fast enough, emphasizing that we don't want a Network of mainly lesser sites. Hence the need to identify the top priority sites to promote a network of truly critical sites (through the EAAFP website), and encourage these to be nominated in addition to any others.

Wetlands International commended the three documents and greatly appreciated the need for prioritisation and noted the absence of some critical sites.

ICF suggested it would be difficult to meet the target of KRA 1.1 by December 2012 without a Science Officer in the Secretariat. Australia suggested hiring a consultant to assist on this work and will prepare ToR for that; Wetlands International added that the consultant should report to a Task Force and do this work in conjunction with KRA 1.2.

KRA 1.2

Rio Tinto asked if the prioritisation be based on species or groups. Wetlands International responded by saying the lack of knowledge is a key issue. Prioritization may include habitats but is probably best done at species level. Principles for this need to be identified. Some simple guidance can be provided based on existing knowledge.

Australia said that they should purposely try to keep the process unqualified and simple. However CMS said they might not reach the proposed target by December 2013.

Wetlands International announced that the emerging project with Rio Tinto will hopefully provide guidance to MoP7 for a set of priority species. In which Rio Tinto suggested additional words regarding an initial network of sites and communication.

China said that many of China's important sites are not formally recognised, and suggested adding words about first establishing national-level prioritisations (as is starting in China). CMS informed EAAFP that it cannot be very prescriptive for the national level and instead EAAFP must focus at the Flyway level.

CMS said it has not described the process for getting to the initial Network. A task force could assist. Wetlands International stated the explanatory notes could say that the process should be led at the national level based on the information developed for the Flyway level while the Critical Site Network Tool developed for AEWA is a readymade tool that could be applied to the task. The Task Force on Monitoring could explore this.

It was agreed that the existing Task Force on Monitoring would initially lead on development of actions under KRAs 1.1 and 1.2

KRA 1.3

CMS asked if a target of 7-10 nominations per year at Flyway level would be reasonable. Wetlands International replied that the greatest constraint is probably at

national level in terms of the time and cost for the consultation process for each nomination. The target was recommended to the Monitoring Task Force to discuss and report back during MoP6 for finalising the KRA text.

Outcome 2

CMS mentioned that the Task Force proposes some changes to the previous Strategy.

KRA 2.1: no comments or changes to the draft.

KRA 2.2

New Zealand sought indication of the size of the task while two-thirds of Wetlands International sites have some type of plan.

CMS asked if the target is specific enough and do we need guidance on process. We are not getting enough information in reporting to the MoP through use of the Reporting Template.

Wetlands International said that we ultimately want effective reporting, so we need good plans and ability to report well. It was suggested that experience of Government Partners with Ramsar reporting may guide the process. Australia responded by recommending the EAAFP document be kept simple since much of this (regarding KRA 2.2) is determined at national level. Wetlands International replied by saying the EAAFP could take a different tack by promoting model plans and give guidance in this way. CMS ended by suggesting leaving the words as is, and make the interim target as 5 plans (of a good standard) per year and indicating the need for better reporting.

Outcome 4

CMS announced changes suggested earlier by the CEPA WG to Objective 2 were declined by the Task Force in order not to alter the five founding objectives in the Partnership Document at this time. However, the suggestions of the WG have been incorporated in the Outcomes and KRAs in the present draft.

KRA 4.2

Singapore mentioned some suggestions raised by the CEPA WG in regard to a mechanism for translation and for recognition of translators. There is a need for a pool of translation experts and we want them to be more forthcoming. ICF supported recognition of the many types of contributors.

Outcome 5

KRA 5.1: a minor change (ICF) but no other comments or changes to the draft.

KRA 5.2

Wetlands International said that this is a very important KRA and national partnerships need to include other Partners in addition to the National Government.

ICF requested that case studies be put on the EAAFP website. Indonesia, China, Japan and others have national partnerships.

Singapore/Chair said that sub-regional partnerships should be included.

Outcome 6

KRA 6.2

BirdLife International asked if there could be clarification on which regions. Wetlands International stated that since we have focal region Task Forces (Yellow Sea, Amur Heilong) this KRA presumably applies to those regions. The IUCN situation analysis will input for the Yellow Sea. CMS responded by saying that perhaps there will be new regions in due course.

KRA 6.3

Wetlands International said a rapid assessment should be revisited every five years in line with EAAFP Strategy updates and the present project will recommend a method.

KRA 6.4

CMS inquired about which Task Force would assist. BirdLife International and ICF responded by saying the KRA is applicable to several existing Task Forces and Working Groups. Wetlands International added that relevant materials are available through other Conventions and AEWA.

Outcome 7

KRA 7.1

Wetlands International said there that there are major knowledge gaps for many groups of waterbirds.

CMS asked about what would be realistic, noting the cross reference to KRA 1.1 with a deadline of December 2013. Wetlands International responded by saying this KRA is part of a more comprehensive exercise and requires more time than KRA 1.1.

Outcome 8

CMS stated that the original Outcome 8 was deleted and contents were merged into Outcomes 3 and 6.

Outcome 9

Text on the three KRAs was provided by the Avian Influenza Working Group.

KRA 9.1

Japan wanted clarification as to which zoonotic diseases are referred to in the KRA. Wetlands International's answer was that other viruses such as West Nile Virus and Japanese Encephalitis can be carried by birds but this has not been a priority for the AI WG so far but it is worth considering. BirdLife International then requested that relevance to waterbirds be maintained.

KRA 9.3: a note on practical application to be provided by ICF.

Outcome 10

CMS informed everyone that the original outcome was deleted and incorporated in the next outcome and the proposed new Outcome 10 incorporates previous Outcomes 12 and 13.

Outcome 11

KRA 11.1

Indonesia asked what are the priority species and CMS replied to this by saying other actions in the strategy will help define this, but that there is currently no list. Wetlands International said the provided explanatory text does guide us.

KRA 11.2

This additional KRA (11.2) was proposed by WWT during MoP6.

WWT reported that a strategic approach has been taken by EAAFP since MoP4 with some discussion on single species action plans but, this has been missing in Outcome 11. CMS said the rationale in the explanation is very clear, with examples of action plans and their status/progress.

WWT said however there is a need to clarify roles of Secretariat, WGs and Task Forces because currently that is unclear.

44. CMS informed everyone that the finalisation of the new Implementation Strategy requires some cleaning up and inclusion of an Introduction. CMS as chair of the Task Force recommended that Document 3.1.3 on roles of groups in the EAAFP be retained by EAAFP in full detail as a standalone document, as it is too large for the Strategy (ICF: agreed). CMS presented a one-page introduction for inclusion in the Strategy.

45. ICF said in regard to Document 3.1.3, the explanation of the Secretariat needs more elaboration as it will be a standalone document. It can later be expanded. Wetlands International said the ToR of the various WGs could be cross-referenced. CMS said that the Secretariat should adjust then recirculate Document 3.1.3 to Partners as soon as possible (within one month), with request for comments.

46. Japan requested more information about KRA 1.1 regarding the Flyway Site Network and Wetlands International offered to work with Japan to identify issues to bring back to plenary.

47. CMS requested that hard copies of the cleaned-up final draft of the new Implementation Strategy, including the proposed Introduction, be provided to Partners early enough in Day 3 to enable the plenary to adopt it.

A separate session of plenary considered the hard copy version late on Day 3.

48. CMS said that the Secretariat should put formatting into the final document to make the explanations and 'suggested implementation mechanisms' easier to read and use other tools to enhance the online version.

No objections/changes were raised with respect to the proposed Introduction.

49. Wetlands International reported on discussions with Japan and BirdLife International in regard to KRA 1.1. It was considered premature to mention a tool (CSNT) that may not be well known to the Partners. CMS/Partners adjustments to KRA 1.1 were discussed with further remarks by Japan, CMS and ICF resulting in minor changes to the text.

50. CMS stated that the adaptation and uptake of the CSN Tool should be revisited by EAAFP if funding becomes available.

51. China (Vice-Chair) said they have adopted the Implementation Strategy 2012-16 with these late changes. Thanks to the consultant and the Task Force and its Chair, CMS.

3.4 New CEPA Strategy 2012-2016: Wrap-up session

52. Points have been covered under item 3.3.

4. Moving forward on Flyway Partnership activities

4.1 Objective 1: Develop the Flyway Site Network

4.1.1 Current status of Flyway Site Network and recent nominations

53. The secretariat presented an overview. Three sites in Mongolia and one in Malaysia have not yet been transferred to the present Network and the background to the situation was explained (see Agenda Doc. 4.1.1). Eight new sites have been designated since MoP5, two in South Korea, five in Bangladesh, one in Indonesia.

54. South Korea introduced the two new Korean sites. Both include threatened species. Yubu-do is exceptionally important for shorebirds. Chilbal-do is the first site nominated for seabirds under EAAFP. One site has Ramsar status (Yubu-do) and the other is a protected area (Chilbal-do).

55. Bangladesh introduced its five new sites, three are freshwater sites important for Anatidae and shorebirds and two are intertidal sites important for shorebirds. Both types support large numbers (tens of thousands) as well as threatened species. Complex multiple threats exist at these sites, related to the huge human population, including within some of the sites. One site is a national park and some others have management regimes.

56. Indonesia introduced Sembilang as a new Network site (200,000 ha). Designation was part-supported by an EAAFP small grant. It contains important mangrove and intertidal ecosystems. Up to 100,000 migratory waterbirds use the site. Surveys from 1980s were replicated recently and confirmed the ongoing importance, supporting at least 3 populations at 1% level. A national park and also now a Ramsar Site (2011), Sembilang hopes to share experience and knowledge within the Network.

57. Cambodia announced it is in process of nominating Prek Toal (Tonle Sap) having finished local consultation (part-funded by EAAFP small grant) with good support from stakeholders.

4.1.2 Report on the assessment of EAAF Flyway Network Sites

58. To be reported under item 4.3.1.

4.2 Objective 2: Enhance communication, education and public awareness

4.2.1 Report on the Global Waterbird Flyways Workshop, Korea

59. Wetlands International said that the workshop was successfully conducted in Seosan county, South Korea, in October 2011. A full set of recommendations is in Agenda Document 4.2.1. An open and inclusive network of networks “Global Inter-flyway Network” was proposed. A report was made to CMS Conference in late 2012 and a full report of the workshop is in preparation.

4.2.2 E-newsletter and publications

60. The secretariat reported on new publications since MoP5 with a PowerPoint that complemented the detailed Agenda Document 4.2.2. New products have been produced (flyway posters, brochures) and some Partners have been supported by EAAFP to produce products in local languages (e.g. for a Network site in Mongolia). The information brochure on EAAFP has been updated. The Russian Shorebird ID booklet, with funding support from Australia, is close to completion. Partners were encouraged to provide materials and requests for new website pages. Certain publication design files can be requested from the Secretariat to enable Partners to produce local language versions. Facebook-linked tools are now being developed.

61. AWSG congratulated Public Information Officer, Kim Minseon, on her excellent work.

62. Nial Moores (observer) said that there is a need to recognise translators and to find translators. Can Facebook be used to facilitate establishing a ‘translators community’?

63. Singapore said that the WG on CEPA welcomes comments on the draft CEPA Strategy for EAAFP (2012-16) and seeks input from Partners by end of April.

4.2.3 Award system of the EAAF Partnership

64. Wetlands International recognised the work of Mark Barter in leading development of knowledge, research and capacity building in the Flyway. WI, AWSG and other Partners jointly wish to recognise Mark’s contribution through an award system under EAAFP that will encourage similar work. WI requested Secretariat to develop a proposal for an awards system that can be brought to MoP7.

65. The Chair recounted his personal encounters with Mark Barter and his work and how his protégés have gone on to become local leaders.

66. WWT noted that in AEWA there is an award for lifetime achievement but in EAAF we might focus on up and coming students and young conservationists.

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

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

Assessment of Flyway Network Sites (report by Wetlands International)

67. The major task set by MoP5 was to assess the existing (100 at the time) Network sites. The project is being implemented jointly by WI and BirdLife using a proforma based on the IBA monitoring mechanism. For some sites we have not had information for 15 years! Preliminary results are available for about 70 of the sites:

- Sites designated as protected areas: for more than 90% of sites there is some protected area status: we have very few sites that are not PAs – should we try more to extend the Network to non-PA sites?
- Management plans exist at 67% of sites.
- Number of counts of waterbirds in past 5 years: 57% of sites have more than 10 counts; but sharing of info could be better.
- Extent of inclusion of species in the Network: of 201 selected species, 40% are included in the Network site as key species (meeting 1% levels): thus 60% of our species are not captured in this way so the Network is not yet comprehensive. (Note: for species that do not congregate in large numbers, we need to find another way to address them.)
- Threats to FNS in Australia and China (very different countries and sites/management) were analysed using the IUCN categories and revealed some key differences. There are some limitations in using these categories and using the reporting of threats by volunteers. WI is seeking more objective ways to assess threats to sites.

The report to Secretariat by WI and BirdLife is anticipated by end of April 2012 with full analysis. The report should then go to Partners for comments and will inform follow-up work by Partners.

Other activities on monitoring (report by Wetlands International)

68. A brief report was given on work by Queensland University on changes to intertidal habitat in NE Asia using satellite imagery. WI commends this type of approach to monitoring habitat loss and noted its potential application to other types of habitat. Waterbird Population Estimates 5th edition: WI leading on this work which affects the 1% thresholds for identifying Network sites in EAAFP and is seeking input of data for this work by end of April 2012. We should bring the outcomes of WPE5 into the EAAFP list of 1% levels later in 2012. WI and BirdLife are seeking greater collaboration with Partners on monitoring of habitats and populations and looking to mechanisms outside the EAAFP such as bilateral agreements.

69. Japan: requested further discussion on methods for monitoring of waterbirds.

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

70. Australia reflected on tasks set at MoP5 and progress achieved – see Agenda Document 4.3.2. The protocol for shorebirds is on the website and information on most other waterbird groups has also been compiled and posted on the website; thanks to Dr Choi-Chang-yong of the Secretariat. A key question is who should decide on marking protocols for flyway? Task Force through Australia as Chair will manage queries on new projects for the time being. The process would be to check the EAAFP website and then contact your national banding/marking office. The last 4-5 colour combinations remaining available for shorebirds in the Flyway were identified yesterday by the Task Force. Managing resightings info: WI informed the task force on reporting mechanisms used in Europe and WI (Taej Mundkur) will aim to try this in EAAF for Bar-headed Goose; examples from the website were shown 'live' to Partners.

71. Wetlands International wished Partners to acknowledge the considerable work done by Choi Chang-yong for this task force.

72. The Chair said that this is critically important work and asked if all banding offices are included (they are, through email groups, at least).

73. AWSG stressed the importance of coordination on resightings and the AWSG coordinator is assisting Flyway-wide in collaboration with national coordinators. AWSG requested that any new initiatives be integrated with the existing ones.

74. Wetlands International is not intending to replace or duplicate existing mechanisms; instead looking at other species groups such as migratory geese and swans in the northern part of the flyway. The aim is to help colour marking groups to encourage quick reporting and better feedback.

75. Australia illustrated the web-based tool mentioned above.

76. WWF stated that there are currently two 'live' reporting websites for Black-faced Spoonbill resighting's that serve as successful examples from within the EAAF.

77. China asked if there is a coordinated way to obtain marking materials.

78. Australia/AWS said there is a central source for shorebird flags in Europe and AWSG is in touch with most banding offices informally.

79. AWSG requested that AWSG be kept fully informed on new reporting mechanisms especially with respect to impacts on shorebird work.

4.3.3 Report by Task Force 3: Yellow Sea; Yangtze floodplain; Amur-Heilong; DIPA (Dauria International Protected Area in Russia, Mongolia, China)

Amur-Heilong Task Force (river basin shared by three Partner Governments: China, Mongolia, Russia): **report by ICF**

80. See detailed report in Agenda Document 4.3.3. EAAFP established the TF at MoP5 and the first task was to obtain views of governments on this initiative. There was uncertainty on how to move forward given some desire for an MoU, but others preferring an informal mechanism. A side meeting was held during MoP6 with reps from the three countries. An existing DIPA trans-boundary initiative exists and the small group recommends that EAAFP initially focus through the MoU for DIPA to support DIPA activities and its identified needs. The next step after that may be to focus on two further transboundary sites, including Khanka Lake. China and Russia will soon sign a bilateral agreement on bird conservation and EAAFP could eventually link in with this too.

81. Russia is positive about this development and indicated the importance of taking the next steps

Yellow Sea Task Force (report by Wetlands International)

82. The Task Force has been working to engage Government Partners to identify a way forward. Meanwhile, IUCN has undertaken a situation analysis on loss of tidal flats in East Asia, leading to a motion for the IUCN World Conservation Congress in South Korea in September 2012. (This has been a present focus for the Task Force.) Consultants will circulate the report to all Partners in about April for comment; then will meet with China and South Korea to discuss how to frame a resolution for WCC to produce an effective resolution. (Issues for tidal habitats are also applicable in South-east Asia.) One possible additional response is to identify and promote the full range of ecosystem services of tidal flats as a means to better conservation outcomes. Partners are encouraged to read and respond to the desk study report when they receive it.

(4.3.3b) Additional matter: Seabird Working Group

83. Australia reported that the WG met during MoP6 and Australia agreed to chair this WG and reported that Yu Yat-tung of Hong Kong Birdwatching Society would be the coordinator with support from BirdLife International (Asia office) and that a plan for action will be developed by MoP7. There is a need to identify the boundary of what the WG would do and the first step should be to make a list of which populations would be included. WG is open to whoever is interested and interested Partners and experts are invited to give their email addresses to Australia (Paul O'Neill) to be included in the discussion group.

4.3.4 Monitoring activities by Partners: opportunity for report and discussion

84. China said that State Forestry Administration has just started an inventory of wildlife resources involving research institutions.

85. Wetlands International announced that some discussions have been held with BirdLife International on how to more strategically report waterbirds monitoring in the region. A meeting was held in South Korea last month with MoE Korea and MoE Japan. Asian Waterbird Census work continues in the region but we still need updated info from several Partners: WI requested that all Partners submit their most recent waterbird information.

86. Wetlands International stated that an interactive website on Waterbird Population Estimates will be launched at Ramsar CoP in July 2012. This will make it easier for Partners to access data. This project was supported by Ramsar.

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

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

87. Wetlands International said that together with Prof. Lei Guangchun and other experts, WI has been engaged on this project for two years. The project is due to be concluded next month. Five guidelines on wetland management have been produced, which can be discussed further on request.

88. China stated that the guidelines are important for implementing a compensation fund scheme (from central to local government and other stakeholders) for wetland management actions that need to be undertaken. Beijing Forestry University is resourced to follow-up.

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

4.5.1 Report by Task Force 4: Activities of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF

89. Report by Coordinator (Christoph Zockler). See detailed report in Agenda Document 4.5.1. A new breeding area was found in North Kamchatka. Heritage Expeditions has been a champion of the work of the Task Force. A message was conveyed from the children of the major breeding area in NE Russia to children of other flyway countries in the species' range, asking to protect the birds. A small grant from EAAFP assisted survey work in China over the past year. A flock of over 200 birds was seen in China last year in a site highly threatened by reclamation. In Bangladesh, 80-90% of hunters have ceased hunting. More than 40 hunters signed agreements in the community to switch to other (supported) livelihoods. Good progress also in Myanmar; entire Bay of Martaban is proposed for a new Ramsar site. Captive breeding program has proceeded and at least 12 adult surviving birds have been raised so far. EAAFP made a small contribution to the budget for this program. A

separate workshop of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force will be held after MoP6 in Palembang.

90. Work on the threatened Nordmann's Greenshank has developed during the SBS project; it uses similar wintering areas as SBS. Breeding populations have declined 10-fold: possibly only 90-130 pairs left? Urgent action is needed to: i) uplist status under IUCN to Critically Endangered; ii) review trend data from EAAFP Partner range states; iii) set guidance for a task force; and iv) hold a regional workshop. There is scope to work on both SBS and NG at same sites.

4.5.2 Flyway Project of Rio Tinto - BirdLife International - Wetlands International

91. Rio Tinto said that a side event was held on Day 2 to explain the project and explore potential new linkages. There are three major activities within a flyway strategy: i) shorebird research at important sites in Australia (on key shorebird species); ii) management of IBAs that are important for these key species; and iii) feasibility of building a wetland centre at Bohai Bay, China, a critical staging site. Rio Tinto requested the opportunity to describe in more detail on Net Positive Impacts and biodiversity offsets at next MoP.

(4.5.2b) Update on implementation of the CMS action plans on Black-faced Spoonbill and Chinese Crested Tern.

Chinese Crested Tern (report by BirdLife International)

92. The wide range of implementation activities (workshops and CEPA) recently undertaken was explained with illustrations. One site (Min Jiang estuary, Zhejiang) is important for both the Tern and the SB Sandpiper. The major threat is on breeding grounds but awareness is being raised in former range states in SE Asia. There has been a recent sighting in eastern Indonesia.

Black-faced Spoonbill (report by BirdLife partner, HKBWS)

93. Numbers increased in recent years: as of January 2012, a total of 2693 was recoded in recent census after a decline in previous year. There was a new record from Cambodia (inland) so the wintering range may be larger than expected. Substantial CEA activity and resources are in place for this species. Information centres in Korea, Taiwan, Hongkong are active. The main threat is habitat loss (tidal flats).

94. BirdLife International said that it is not appropriate to form a Task Force for these species now because a key area for both species (the island of Taiwan) is not formally included in the Partnership.

4.5.3 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Jeju, Korea

95. South Korea is seeking participation, endorsement and support for a session "International Cooperation for Migratory Waterbird Monitoring to support sound management", at the WCC (World Conservation Forum = 7-10 September). It aims to set up a draft and adoption of a motion/s which reflects the characteristics of South Korea and propose borderless conservation cooperation; to promote public participation at a global scale. There is one month left to finalise the draft resolution. It is proposed to hold a workshop on this during WCC and requested input of Partners to development of the motion; which requires at least 5 co-sponsors. South Korea (Dr Kim Jin-han) will circulate the draft motion.

96. Wetlands International stated that the WCC offers an opportunity to address this long standing issue and commends South Korea for this initiative. WI is keen to support the development of the motion and as a co-sponsor; encourages additional sponsorship, especially from Government Partners.

97. Australia is unable to commit now but will raise this within its own Government.

98. The Chair encouraged others to also contact Dr Kim.

4.5.4 Potential cooperation with Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)

99. Russia (present CAFF Chair, for another 18 months) announced that CAFF is a working group of Arctic Council – the high level inter-governmental forum; (8 Arctic countries, including Russia and USA of EAAFP members as well as indigenous organisations and observers (China, Korea, Japan). CAFF undertakes monitoring, assessment and conservation work in the Arctic areas including a key activity - Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP). Rapid and ongoing change in the Arctic with loss of sea ice allows new sea transport and changes outside of the Arctic, affecting migratory species, which originate in the Arctic, are recognised as a stressor. The serious declines in EAAF have drawn the attention of CAFF. A technical report on migratory birds is under preparation to the Arctic Council and information/review of Partners of EAAFP is requested. CAFF is developing closer cooperation with Ramsar and AEWA/CMS. It was suggested that CAFF and EAAFP could get in closer contact and plan closer cooperation in the future. The Secretariat will follow-up.

100. Wetlands International notes EAAFP has been missing representation of relevant global initiatives and should develop a joint program of work. They need to integrate trends on breeding grounds with work being done outside the CAFF area. Hoping for a very positive response from EAAFP to the CAFF Secretariat; WI will undertake some follow-up.

5. Flyway Partnership Administration

5.1 Secretariat's Work Plan for 2012

101. The Secretariat's detailed work plan will be developed by the new Chief Executive.

102. Wetlands International said the new Implementation Strategy and decisions of MoP6 should be considered as the basis of the Work Plan 2012 (and will need to be endorsed out of session).

103. The Chair asked for any recommendations from Partners for inclusion in the Work Plan for 2012

104. Wetlands International informed the audience that a new Science Officer should be appointed as soon as possible. The Chair noted that the Management Committee has made plans to do this.

5.2 Secretariat's Budget for 2012

105. The Secretariat reported the budget in the Agenda Document 5.2, noting the situation in 2011. Unspent funds carried over to 2012 totalled KRW 171 million. Voluntary contributions were provided by South Korea and Japan.

106. The proposed budget for 2012 (6 major categories), with revision from the MoU budget breakdown for 2011 that was adopted at MoP5, was presented. No objections were raised by Partners.

107. The Chair also said they have the auditor BDO's report for 2011.

5.3 Terms of Reference for CEPA Working Group

108. AWSG (for the CEPA WG) Proposed ToR were circulated just before MoP6. AWSG requested membership from each of the EAAFP Working groups, with nominations within one month of MoP6. Any Partner wishing to contribute should be able to participate. A small grammatical adjustment to the ToR was suggested.

109. Wetlands International said on behalf of the CEPA WG, it would like to participate.

110. Chair said will be important to include the Communication Officer and the Public Information Officer of the Secretariat in this CEPA WG.

111. Singapore stated that in the ToR it is proposed that Secretariat is responsible for coordination.

112. The Chair said we have approved the ToR of the CEPA Working Group.

6. Other Business

113. The Chair presented the minutes of the Meeting of the Secretariat's Management Committee held during MoP6 on 19-20 March 2012. Recommendations for consideration by the Partners were put forward (refer to the MC meeting minutes for details).

Chief Executive: ICF reported

114. Introduced Spike Millington as the new Chief Executive, subject to finalisation of some administrative matters. Spike Millington briefly spoke to the Meeting. He acknowledged the excellent organization of the MoP and positive atmosphere of the MoP and acknowledged the good foundations and development of the Secretariat by the former Chief Executive.

115. The Chair thanked ICF (Jim Harris) for his leading assistance with the recruitment process under the Management Committee and welcomed Spike to his role.

Terms of Chair and Vice-Chair

116. Chair said three recommendations are made and the terms for Chair and Vice-Chair of EAAFP should be "two MoPs" rather than two years. The Terms of Management Committee members should parallel this. Any Partner can be nominated as Vice-Chair.

117. CMS said that all are recommendations needing adoption by the Partnership, but the process should be considered re-interpretation of existing documents. The record of the meeting should be sufficient, rather than change the existing documents. The Chair stated that the Partners have adopted these changes.

Review the performance of the Chief Executive:

119. The Chair said Criteria should be developed (by Korea MoE, finalised then by the Management Committee) and secondly should seek a general feedback from all partners, and a detailed review by the MC.

Recruiting a new Science Officer:

121. The Chair stated that they wish to make the Secretariat more international but the budget is a constraint to attract international candidates, so they are hoping to attract a secondment from a Partner.

122. ICF's new Chief will have major role in the recruitment but if there is a secondment then this is an opportunity to secure in-kind contributions from Partners and make the Secretariat more international in character.

123. CMS said that the MC proposed that the funds now marked for Science Officer salary could be used to cover relocation and other costs of attracting an international candidate for this position, which will be subject to MoE Korea approval.

124. Wetlands International was seeking clarification and asked if a secondment is unsuccessful what is the alternative plan and when would this process conclude?

125. ICF stated the internationalisation is the first consideration but the budget is a constraint, so secondment may be an option also top-up funding could be an option. The fall-back is to advertise within Korea.

126. Wetlands International gave an explanation of the duties of the Science Officer thus far (based on the existing duty statement).

127. The Chair's agreement was reached on a way forward.

Audit report

128. The Chair said the Secretariat is to propose use of budget allocations for the unspent 2011 funds and the new Chief Executive will work on this.

ToR of the Secretariat:

129. The Chair Recommended that the role of the Secretariat (described in its Terms of Reference, adopted at MoP5) be modified slightly to encourage Partners' to provide in-kind support, such as secondment of staff, in addition to financial support.

130. CMS said the existing Terms of Reference adopted at MoP5 have three points regarding finance.

131. The Chair announced that the recommendation is adopted.

7. Next Meeting

7.1 Announcement of MoP7 in Alaska, USA

132. USA introduced the location and plans for MoP7. Participants were encouraged to arrive a day early to adjust to time zone and do local birding if they wish (local assistance will be offered). Day 1 opening session will be in a large hotel in Anchorage; then Days 2 and 3 will be in a lodge in Seward. There will be a field trip by boat in the local area. There will be an option for personal (privately funded) post-MoP tours to Barrow, for birding and midnight sun experience at the northernmost part of North America (includes tundra habitat with breeding shorebirds, Inuit culture). A less expensive option is to visit Homer (also some breeding waterbirds in forest wetlands along the way). USA requested a RSVP (indication of interest in attending) by February 2013.

133. The Chair's thanks were extended to USA for its advance planning.

9. Meeting Close

134. The Chair thanked the Host Indonesia (met with great applause) and the ongoing Host Country (Korea) for the Secretariat (also applauded).

135. There was a big thank you too for the Vice-Chair for stepping in to chair this meeting on Day 3.

A summary table of actions arising from the 6th Meeting of Partners starts on the next page.

Summary of actions arising from the Sixth Meeting of Partners (MoP6)

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
1	1.2	Convert 'draft' Minutes of MoP5 to 'adopted' without change; re-post on EAAFP website.	Secretariat.	
2	2.2	All Partners should be strongly encouraged to provide Reports, ahead of MoP7.	All Partners.	Secretariat.
3	2.3	Partners undertaking Avian Influenza (AI) surveillance in wild waterbirds to provide info updates to the AI WG for an annual overview.	All relevant Partners.	AI Working Group.
4	2.3	In undertaking AI surveillance, Partners are encouraged to focus on EAAFP Network sites and other important sites and link to migration studies and other EAAFP WGs through marking of birds.	All relevant Partners.	AI Working Group.
5	2.3	Partners are invited to express interest in a 5 year regional project to understand migration routes through stable isotope analysis (starting late 2012).	FAO.	AI Working Group.
6	2.3	Partners were asked to provide data to WI for update of Waterbird Population Estimates (5 th edition) in March-April 2012.	All relevant Partners.	Wetlands International.
7	2.3	Miranda Naturalists Trust is seeking funds (around \$50,000 over 5 years) for a five year program to survey waterbird sites in DPRK.	All Partners.	Secretariat.
8	2.3	Request from the Anatidae Working Group to include Aleutian Cackling Goose as a wild population in the Flyway.	Wetlands International.	Anatidae Working Group.

9	3.1	Permanently post the consultant-prepared Review report on the Implementation Strategy 2007-11, on the EAAFP website.	Secretariat.	
10	3.1	Revise the Reporting Template used by Partners ahead of each MoP, to match the new Implementation Strategy 2012-16.	Secretariat.	Consultant that designed the template.
11	3.1 (see also 5.3)	Terms of Reference for the CEPA WG as adopted at MoP6 should be posted on the EAAFP website (on the CEPA WG page).	Secretariat.	CEPA Working Group.
12	3.1	Provide comments on the draft CEPA Strategy 2012-16 for EAAFP, once it has been circulated, and secure Partners' approval of the final version.	CEPA Working Group.	Secretariat.
13	3.2	Obtain and use where appropriate, the official long and short names of each Government Partner, in EAAFP publications and materials.	Secretariat.	CMS; and Management Committee.
14	3.2	Follow-up on the interest of Malaysia, Vietnam and Myanmar in joining EAAFP; mention the discussion on this at MoP6.	Secretariat.	Observer delegates; and NGO Partners in-country.
15	3.2	Explore the potential interest of Brunei and Papua New Guinea in joining EAAFP.	Wetlands International.	Secretariat.

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
16	3.2	Explore interest of India in joining EAAFP and identify the relevant waterbird populations.	WWF, Wetlands Int., BirdLife Int.	Secretariat.
17	3.3	Prepare Terms of Reference for a consultant to lead on addressing Key Result Areas 1.1 and 1.2 of the Implementation Strategy 2012-2016, in conjunction with the Task Force on Monitoring.	Australia; Task Force on Monitoring.	Secretariat.
18	3.3	Case studies illustrating successful national partnerships within the Flyway should be posted on the EAAFP website.	Secretariat.	Japan, China, Indonesia, other Partners.
19	3.3	In regard to single species action plans, clarification is needed on the roles of the Secretariat, Working Groups & Task Forces.	Secretariat.	WWT, relevant Working Groups & Task Forces.
20	3.3	Document 3.1.3 on roles of groups in the EAAFP (full detail version) should be adjusted as agreed at	Secretariat.	CMS, All Partners.

		MoP6 (more explanation on the Secretariat; cross-reference to the adopted ToR of the various WGs), before circulation to Partners as soon as possible (within a month of MoP6) with request for comments.		
21	3.3	The new Implementation Strategy 2012-16, derived from Document 3.1.2 but as adopted at MoP6, should be tidied up (formatting to make it easier to read; other tools to enhance the online version), then circulated to Partners and posted on the EAAFP website.	Secretariat.	CMS.
22	4.2.2	Partners are encouraged to provide materials to the Secretariat for EAAFP website pages; also, design files for certain publications can be requested from the Secretariat to enable Partners to create local language versions.	All Partners.	Secretariat.
23	4.2.3	Develop a proposal for an EAAFP awards system that can be brought to MoP7.	Secretariat.	
24	4.3.1	Assessment of Flyway Network Sites to be completed by end of April 2012 with full analysis; report then to go to Partners for comments; final report will inform follow-up work by Partners.	Wetlands International, BirdLife International.	All Partners.
25	4.3.1	The 5 th edition of Waterbird Population Estimates should be used to update the Flyway Population Estimates used by EAAFP to identify candidate Network sites.	Secretariat.	Monitoring Task Force, Wetlands International.
26	4.3.1	Further discussion should be conducted on methods for monitoring of waterbirds.	Japan.	Monitoring Task Force.
27	4.3.2	Colour-marking Task Force and AWSG to be informed of reporting mechanisms used in Europe for resightings of marked waterbirds, via a case study applied to the Bar-headed Goose in the EAA Flyway.	Wetlands International.	Colour-marking Task Force, AWSG.

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
28	4.3.3	Task Force for Amur-Heilong Basin to initially focus its efforts through the MoU for the Dauria International Protected Area (DIPA), by identifying how EAAFP might support the activities and	Task Force for Amur-Heilong Basin.	China, Russia, Mongolia.

		identified needs of DIPA.		
29	4.3.3	Read and provide comments to IUCN on its situation analysis of tidal flat conservation in Asia, due to be circulated in about April.	Yellow Sea Task Force.	All Partners.
30	4.3.3	Interested Partners and experts to give their email addresses to Australia if wanting to be included in the communication network of the Seabird Working Group of EAAFP.	Australia.	Seabird Working Group, BirdLife International.
31	4.3.3	Create a list of which seabird populations would be included in the work of the Seabird Working Group of EAAFP.	Seabird Working Group, Australia.	BirdLife International.
32	4.3.4	Partners are requested to ensure that their most recent waterbird count data have been submitted to the Asian Waterbird Census.	All Partners.	Wetlands International.
33	4.5.2	Rio Tinto requested an opportunity to describe in more detail its Net Positive Impact and biodiversity offsets concepts at MoP7.	Rio Tinto.	Secretariat.
34	4.5.3	Co-sponsors are requested for a draft resolution for IUCN World Conservation Congress on “International Cooperation for Migratory Waterbird Monitoring to support sound management” sponsored by S. Korea.	All Partners.	South Korea.
35	4.5.4	Review is requested on a technical report being prepared for the Arctic Council on changes outside of the Arctic, affecting migratory species that visit the Arctic.	All Partners.	Russia.
36	4.5.4	EAAFP to make closer contact and consider closer cooperation with CAFF (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, Arctic Council).	Secretariat.	Russia, USA, Wetlands International.
37	5.1	A detailed work plan for the Secretariat for 2012 is to be developed by the new Chief Executive after commencement; work plan to be based on the Implementation Strategy 2012-16 and decisions of MoP6; work plan to be endorsed by the Partners out of session.	Secretariat.	Management Committee, All Partners.
38	5.3	Nominations for membership for the CEPA Working Group are requested from each of the other EAAFP Working Groups, within one month of MoP6.	All Working Groups, All Partners.	CEPA Working Group.

39	5.4	Criteria for review of performance of the incoming Chief Executive are to be developed through consultation and agreement between MoE Korea, the Management Committee and All Partners.	Management Committee.	South Korea, All Partners.
----	-----	---	-----------------------	----------------------------

Action No.	Agenda Reference	Description of action required	Lead responsibility	Helpers
40	5.4	Recruitment of a new Science Officer for the Secretariat to be undertaken as a matter of urgency and to include consideration of possible secondment of suitable staff from EAAFP Partners.	Management Committee.	South Korea, All Partners.
41	5.4	Incoming Chief Executive to propose use of unspent funds from 2011, to the Partners.	Secretariat.	Management Committee.
42	7.1	Intending Partners and observers should provide an RSVP (indication of interest in attending) to the Host of MoP7 (USA) and the Secretariat by February 2013.	All Partners.	Secretariat, USA.
Also see:		Actions arising from side meetings of Working Groups and Task Forces, during MoP6 week.	Refer to the chair or leader of the relevant group.	
Also see:		Actions arising from previous MoPs but not completed (see MoP6 Agenda Doc. 2.1).	Refer to Reports/Minutes of previous MoPs (EAAFP website).	

Abbreviations:

AI = Avian Influenza.

CEPA = Communication, Education, Participation & Awareness.

WG = Working Group.

WI = Wetlands International.

LIST OF SIDE EVENT SESSIONS AT MOP6

Management Committee

Shorebird Working Group

Anatidae Working Group

Avian Influenza Working Group

CEPA Working Group

Seabird Working Group (Chinese Crested Tern)

Monitoring Task Force

Colour Marking Task Force

Yellow Sea Task Force

Rio Tinto – BirdLife International – Wetlands International Project