

COMMUNICATING THE EAST ASIAN-AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP (EAAFP)
SUMMARY REPORT FROM THE CEPA WORKSHOP, 8TH MEETING OF THE PARTNERS, JANUARY 2015
(Full report on the workshop available [here](#))

The EAAFP includes representatives from Governments, Intergovernmental Organisations, International and National NGOs, as well as scientists/researchers working within research institutions. A Secretariat manages the day-to-day activities of the Partnership. Partners play different roles in implementation and Working Groups and Task Forces are formed to provide technical support to assist in implementation. Representatives of the Partners come together for Meetings of the Partners (MOPs) to assess implementation and plan future work. At MOP 8 in January 2015, the CEPA Working Group ran a two-hour workshop with all participants using individual and group questions to assess how the various implementers viewed communication, information sharing and transfer of knowledge and management skills across the Flyway from international, to national, site and local community level. The aim was to identify strengths and weaknesses and suggest solutions for the future to improve implementation and to create better understanding among the Partners of the diversity of roles and focus areas across the Partnership.

Overall, 43% of the MOP participants have been working with the EAAFP for 5 years or more and will likely have attended several MOPs and have considerable experience of the evolving actions and directions of the Partnership; an almost equal percentage of 42% had only two years or less experience with the Partnership. The Government partners (and the Secretariat) had significantly higher proportion of staff with only two years or less experience than any other group. Most implementers had only 10% of their time available for flyway activities and the Government implementers had the highest proportion of people in this category. These results underline (a) the need to ensure that newcomers can be easily informed online and by other means on key information about implementation needs and priorities and (b) the need for implementing governments to invest time in establishing effective national implementation partnerships involving Government representatives, NGOs, site managers, scientists and local interest groups.

Looking at who the Partners are working with on implementation revealed that the Partners at the MOP do not work much at the local level with communities, ecologists, birdwatchers, or the general public, especially at the flyway site level. This reinforces the important role that national partnerships (including government staff, national and local NGOs, site managers etc.) play in implementation at the local level and the need to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are put in place by the Government representatives.

The two most critical areas of implementation selected were *Improved management of existing Flyway Network Sites* and *Improved monitoring of bird populations across the flyway*. Partners did not select the *Designation of new sites* as most critical. While this does not preclude the designation of new critical sites it emphasizes the need for better management of what is already designated.

Several questions investigated how participants used the e-newsletter. The responses were largely positive on the value of the e-newsletter as a communication tool but also indicated that lack of time, rather than lack of interest prohibited a significant number of participants from always reading it. The results suggest that the Secretariat should consider developing other communication tools such as an interactive email system or promoting further the use of current social media tools.

While all Participants visit the EAAFP website, almost 40% visit the site, at best, several times per year underlining the need to for other effective channels to keep implementers up-to-date with the diverse flyway activities. Participants identified Activities of Working Groups as a key area to be better addressed on the website and this was further highlighted in the group discussion sessions.

Group discussion followed the individual questions looking at the newsletter and its content and on other communication channels both within the Partnership and the wider world that would help maximise EAAF implementation. While the results were not prioritised by participants in several groups the suggestions made form a reservoir of helpful ideas and focus areas for the future.

The CEPA Working Group will continue to work with the Secretariat on making best use of these results to enhance implementation.