



East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership

Third Meeting of Partners, Incheon, Republic of Korea 6 and 7 November 2008

FINAL (AS ADOPTED)

Report (Minutes) of the Third Meeting of Partners

Please note that the text of this document has not changed whereas the layout has changed to accommodate new headers.

Partners

- Australia** – Andrew McNee, Vicki Cronan, Bianca Priest
- China** – WANG Weisheng, LEI Guangchun
- Indonesia** – Agus Sriyadi Budi Sutito
- Japan** – Kazuaki Hoshino, Naoki Amako
- Philippines** – Anson Tagtag
- Republic of Korea** – KIM Ji-Tae, KIM Nak-Bin, KWON Gun-Sang, KIM Jee-Young, CHO Yong-Jae, HA Soo-Ho, PARK Hyeon-Jin Annabelle, CHIN Duck-Whan, PARK Chong-Wook, HAN Sang-Hoon, KIM Jin-Han, HUR Wee-Haeng, KIM Hwa-Jung, KIM BoRah, YI Jeong-Yeon, PARK Jin-Young, KIM Jung-Hyun, SHIN Jeong-Hwa, CHAE Hee-Young, CHOI Chang-Yong, PARK Jong-Gil, LEE Woo-Shin
- Singapore** – James Gan
- United States of America** – Kimberly Trust
- Convention on Migratory Species Secretariat** – Doug Hykle
- FAO** – Boripat Siriaroonrat
- Ramsar** – Lew Young
- Australasian Wader Studies Group** – Ken Gosbell
- BirdLife International** – Noritaka Ichida, Simba Chan, Kanitha Krishnasamy (Malaysian Nature Society), Fion Cheung (Hong Kong Birdwatching Society), Kritsana Kaewplang (Bird Conservation Society of Thailand)
- International Crane Foundation** – Claire Mirande, George Archibald, Elena Ilyashenko
- IUCN** – Hyun Kim
- Wetlands International** – Ward Hagemeyer (Netherlands), Taej Mundkur (Netherlands), Nobuhiko Kishimoto (Japan), Doug Watkins (Oceania), Warren Lee Long (Oceania)
- Wild Bird Society of Japan** – Yutaka Kanai
- WWF** – Viet Hoang (Vietnam), Averil Bones (Australia)

Observers

- Bangladesh** – Rezal Sikder
- Mongolia** – Ayush Namkhai
- Myanmar** – Sein Tun
- Thailand** – Nirawan Pipitsombat
- Vietnam** – Cuong Tran
- African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement** – Bert Lenten,
- Birds Korea** – Tiffany Inglis
- Japan Wetlands Action Network** – Minoru Kashiwagi

Japanese Association for Wild Goose Protection – Masayuki Kurechi
PGA Wetland Institute – HAN Dong-Uk
Korea Wild Birds Society – PARK Heon-Wook
Gyeongnam Ramsar Environmental Foundation – SUH Seung-Oh
Saemangeum Life-Peace Chonbuk Union – JU Yung-Ki
Shell International – Steven de Bie

DAY 1

Agenda Item 1.1 Introduction by the Chair

1. The Chair of the Partnership, Mr Andrew McNee, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. The Chair expressed gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Korea and City Government of Incheon for hosting the third Meeting of Partners.
2. The Chair extended a warm welcome to the People's Republic of China and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (of the United Nations) as new Partners to the Partnership.
3. Mr Kim Ji Tae, Director General, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of Environment, the Republic of Korea, as host of the third Meeting of Partners, welcomed the participants and commented that the Partnership will be the most effective mechanism for the conservation of migratory birds.

Agenda Item 1.2 Appointment of Rapporteur

4. Bianca Priest (Australia), Maki Koyama (interim Secretariat) and Warren Lee Long (Wetlands International – Oceania) were appointed as rapporteurs for the meeting.

Agenda Item 1.3 Approval of the provisional agenda for the third Meeting of Partners

5. The meeting agreed to the provisional agenda (refer to Attachment 1) subject to one amendment proposed by the Chair, to bring forward Agenda Item 6 in relation to the Secretariat Arrangements.

Agenda Item 1.4 Admittance of Observers

6. The Chair welcomed the observers to the meeting, including the Governments of Bangladesh, Mongolia, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam, as well as the Secretariat for the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement, Birds Korea, Japan Wetlands Action Network, Japanese Association for Wild Goose Protection, PGA Wetland Institute, Korea Wild Birds Society, Gyeongnam Ramsar Environmental Foundation, Saemangeum Life-Peace Chonbuk Union and Shell International.

Agenda Item 1.5 Approval of minutes of the second Meeting of Partners

7. The meeting adopted the record of the second Meeting of Partners.

Agenda Item 6. Arrangements for the Secretariat

8. The Chair informed the meeting that both China and the Republic of Korea had expressed an interest in hosting the Secretariat and proposed the following options i) initiate consideration of proposals by forming a committee to explore the proposals and make a decision on behalf of the Partnership, or ii) if the information in the proposals is sufficient, undertake to make a decision.

The Chair invited China and the Republic of Korea to present their proposals to the meeting.

9. The Ministry of Environment and City Government of Incheon outlined the Republic of Korea proposal to host the Secretariat in relation to i) the City of Incheon – geography, transport hub and environmental considerations, ii) why it is appropriate for Incheon to host the Secretariat and iii)

financial support for the operation of the Secretariat (\$500,000 USD for staff, office, an operating budget, partnership support and lease of an apartment for seconded staff).

10. China outlined its proposal to host the Secretariat in relation to i) China's 20 year history of involvement in migratory waterbird conservation – Migratory Waterbird Conservation Committee, development of the WSSD Type II Partnership and host of the second Meeting of Partners, ii) China's interest as an important breeding and stopover site for migratory waterbirds iii) functions and staffing of the Secretariat Office, v) governance and vi) support for the operation of the Secretariat (diplomatic, office facilities, financial).

11. The Chair thanked both the Republic of Korea and China for their serious and significant offers and opened the floor for discussion on i) a process to reach an outcome by consensus and ii) the for Partners to indicate their willingness to participate in this process.

12. Japan supported the proposal of a method to consider the issue and a small group to assess the proposals and expressed its interest to participate in the group. The same view was expressed by Australia, CMS, Wetlands International, BirdLife International, International Crane Foundation, Ramsar Secretariat and Singapore, all indicating their willingness to participate in the task group.

Agenda Item 2.6 Report of the interim Secretariat

13. The interim Secretariat provided a brief report on the key activities of the Secretariat over the past six months.

Agenda Item 2.7 Update from Working Groups

14. Representatives of the Crane, Shorebird, Anatidae and Avian Influenza Working Groups provided updates on progress since the second Meeting of Partners, including providing revisions of their Terms of Reference to the Chair for review.

15. The former Chair of the Crane Working Group, (Yutaka Kanai), advised the meeting that WANG Wei from China would be the new Chair of the Crane Working Group. The coordinator for the Working Group (Simba Chan) noted the change in structure and membership, and the establishment of an advisory board. The next meeting will be in October 2009 in China to coincide with the Siberian Crane Project meeting.

16. The representative of the Shorebird Working Group (Ken Gosbell) invited Partners to nominate representatives to the Shorebird Working Group and noted the group was looking for opportunities to provide assistance to Partners through agreed programs under the Partnership.

17. The coordinator for Anatidae Working Group (Nobuhiko Kishimoto), on behalf of the Chair of WG, noted the inclusion of two new sites in the Republic of Korea important for Anatidae – Upo and Junam wetlands – in the Flyway Site Network.

18. The US (Kimberley Trust) advised the meeting that Kent Wohl's position would be filled shortly and that the replacement will be in contact with Partners regarding the Seabird Working Group.

19. The Chair of the Avian Influenza Working Group (Taej Mundkur) noted the previous Working Group meeting and activities including i) input to a CBD side event and resolutions for Ramsar and CMS CoPs and ii) development of a proposal on Flyway AI Monitoring and Surveillance which the meeting was invited to progress. The publication of a 'Wild Birds and Avian Influenza Manual' was also noted.

20. The Chair noted the revision of the draft Terms of Reference provided by Working Groups and sought feedback on the revised ToRs and the endorsement of the ToRs. The Shorebird Working Group endorsed the ToR subject to two minor amendments while the Anatidae Working Group endorsed the ToRs subject to the inclusion of additional background information. No comments were received from the Seabird and Avian Infuenza Working Groups.

Agenda Item 3.1: Objective 1 - Develop the Flyway Site Network

21. The interim Secretariat provided an update on the current status of the Flyway Site Network and noted i) the nomination of three new sites by the Republic of Korea – two of which (Upo and Junam wetlands), have since been included in the Network and with the third (Nakdong Estuary) still under review and, ii) the need to confirm the status of sites in Mongolia, DPR Korea and Malaysia.

22. The International Crane Foundation sought clarification on the process to confirm the transfer of sites in the Russian Federation. Australia clarified that the Russian Federation needs to write to the Chair regarding the timing for the transfer of sites.

24. BirdLife International/Crane Working Group noted there are sites in China that could be nominated because of their importance for cranes and that the Working Group will consult China on the nomination of these sites to the Flyway Site Network.

25. Wetlands International commented on the need to explore ways to make information on the Flyway Site Network accessible to all levels of government, other than relying on the website as a communication mechanism.

◆ Reporting Template

26. The Secretariat noted the Reporting & Planning Template had been circulated to Partners in an e-newsletter and that Partners were invited to provide feedback on the format.

27. Australia commented that the report took approximately two hours to complete and was a useful evaluation form, and encouraged other Partners to complete their reports.

28. Wetlands International noted that national workshops provide a valuable mechanism to complete the template.

29. The US sought clarification on reporting requirements.

30. Ramsar questioned whether countries had nominated a contact to undertake reporting.

31. The Chair deferred further discussion on reporting to the break-out sessions.

Agenda Item 3.2: Objective 2 - Enhance Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA)

32. The interim Secretariat reported on the Partnership CEPA activities including i) translation of Partnership documents, ii) development of the Partnership website and iii) the Asian Wetland Symposium.

33. Australia commented on the usefulness of the website in promoting the Partnership, thanked Japan for its financial contribution to the development of the site, and encouraged Partners to contact the Secretariat with information they wish to have showcased on the website.

◆ Ramsar CoP10 Report

34. Wetlands International reported on the tidal flat workshop held prior to the Ramsar CoP including i) the organising committee, ii) the conclusion produced as part of the workshop and iii) Flyway resolution 22 for the CoP which was adopted to highlight the importance of, and issues in the Yellow Sea.

35. Ramsar noted discussions at the CoP in relation to Resolution X.6 on Regional Initiatives and that current Regional Initiatives should write to the Ramsar Secretariat to request they continue as a Regional Initiative.
36. The Chair invited comments from the floor and following no comment from Partners, endorsed the proposal to write to Ramsar seeking the continuation of the Partnership as a Regional Initiative.
37. Japan noted discussion at the CoP in relation to Resolution X.31 on enhancing the biodiversity of rice paddies as wetland systems and indicated the Scientific and Technical Review Panel would prepare a report on this resolution.
38. Australia reported on the Partnership side event and thanked Nobuhiko Kishimoto for organising the side event and Japan for its sponsorship of the event.
39. Wetlands International noted the launch of the book *'Invisible Connections'* during the Partnership side event to highlight the importance of the Yellow Sea and reported that signed copies were presented to China and the Republic of Korea and provided to each delegation attending the Ramsar CoP. The publication was produced by Wetlands International in collaboration with Birds Korea and the Australasian Wader Studies Group, with financial support from Shell International.
40. The International Crane Foundation commented on the Flyway resolution in relation to the Western Central Asian Site Network established for Crane.
41. Wetlands International noted discussion at the CoP in relation to Resolution X.21 on the spread of H5N1 and called for increased surveillance, better communication of surveillance and risk assessments.

◆ African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement

42. Bert Lenten from UNEP/AEWA Secretariat presented information on the AEWA including i) foundation, ii) approach, iii) scope (62 Parties, 118 Range States), iv) overview of activities – World Migratory Bird Day, Single Species Action Plans (SSAP), Wings Over Wetlands (WOW), WetCap, International Scientific Taskforce on AI and v) Outcomes of MoP4.
43. Wetlands International noted that a tool similar to WOW's Critical Site Tool would also be useful to EAA Flyway.
44. In response to IUCN's question on how AEWA shares information with UNEP-WCMC, Mr Lenten explained that AEWA is not a custodian of data but it provides a platform to access different databases. Wetlands International noted that the same approach can be taken by other flyway initiatives.
45. International Crane Foundation noted the UNEP/GEF Siberian Crane Network activities and lessons learnt.

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

46. Wetlands International reported on the publication in 2008 of *'Migratory Shorebirds of the EAA Flyway: population estimates and important sites'* and the appointment of a new coordinator for the Asian Waterbird Census (in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway and Central Asian Flyway).
47. The Australasian Wader Studies Group reported on the i) Saemangeum Shorebird Monitoring Program (SSMP) which has prepared three annual papers, and documented declines in the Spoon-billed Sandpiper and Great Knot, ii) Monitoring Yellow Sea Migrants in Australia (MYSMA) program which is designed to detect changes in Australian populations of migratory shorebirds linked to Yellow Sea reclamation activities and has in the past two years documented declines in Great Knot and iii) Shorebirds 2020 program which is a reinvigoration of the national shorebird monitoring program in Australia.

48. Wetlands International reported on Monitoring 1000 in Japan and the Anatidae component which includes 80 sites, while the Japan Wetlands Action Network (JAWAN) noted the shorebird component which includes 119 sites and is coordinated by Bird Research, with JAWAN undertaking CEPA activities and WWF Japan undertaking an advisory role. As part of Monitoring 1000, Japan will host a symposium to share information on waterbird migration on 31 January 2009 in Fukuoka.

Break-out session: Objectives 1 & 2 – priorities/opportunities for 2009

49. Break out groups addressed a series of questions relating to Partnership Objectives one and two and in regard to opportunities and priorities for 2009.

Agenda Item 3.3: Objective 3 - Enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, knowledge and information exchange (cont.)

50. FAO reported on International Wildlife Programs and activities implemented in Asia of relevance to the Partnership including i) AI research and surveillance activity in Asia, ii) the Poyang Lake China Project, iii) Bird capture and sampling training course and iv) the future plan and Partners.

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

51. Wetlands International reported on the National Partnerships workshops held in Indonesia, the Philippines and Cambodia and noted i) in Indonesia there is a need to disseminate information on the importance of the Flyway Partnership, and ii) in the Philippines the workshop was valuable in guiding site managers on wetland management and the development of communication plans and participatory management planning. The Philippines is also in the process of evaluating the nominating of eight new sites to the Flyway Site Network.

52. CMS discussed the use of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (developed by WWF and the World Bank) and the need to consider the use of this tool at site level.

53. Wetlands International noted the use of the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network (WHSRN) site tool at a workshop for Australia New Zealand Site Managers.

54. ICF noted they are using protected area tracking tools on an annual basis and could provide some lessons learnt in their use and application for the Flyway. They commented on the need to have these tools completed by a range of stakeholders.

55. The Chair suggested a discussion at future meetings on the nature of tools available and the type required for the Partnership.

Agenda Item 4: Task groups

56. Participants formed task groups to discuss i) arrangements for the Secretariat, ii) a Yellow Sea Collaboration Program, iii) Avian Influenza Working Group activities and iv) Shorebird Working Group activities.

DAY 2

Break-out session: Objectives 3, 4 & 5 – priorities/opportunities for 2009

57. Break out groups addressed a series of questions relating to Partnership Objectives three, four and five, and in regard to opportunities and priorities for 2009.

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

58. BirdLife International presented information on the development of International Action Plans for Spoonbilled Sandpiper, Black-faced Spoonbill and Chinese Crested Tern.

Reporting for break-out sessions on Partnership objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

59. Representatives from the informal break-out groups reported back on discussions (Refer to Attachment 2).

Agenda Item 5: Building the Partnership

60. Australia provided an overview on National Partnerships, including i) Australia's National Partnership through its Wildlife Conservation Plan Working Group which has annual meetings to identify priorities for national level implementation, ii) Japan's National Partnerships coordinated by a secretariat with support from shorebird, crane and Anatidae groups and iii) Australia's support of National Partnership workshops in Indonesia, the Philippines and Cambodia which have brought together agencies responsible for implementing national-level activities.

61. The Chair questioned the mechanism by which the Partnership could facilitate National Partnerships.

62. Wetlands International suggested that the term "National Partnership" is not well-understood in some countries and suggested that alternative wording, such as "National Meeting", be used in these cases.

63. AWSG reported on the Yellow Sea Partnership meeting around the Ramsar CoP as an example of a strategy to link initiatives into the Partnership.

64. ICF noted the establishment of national and regional level working groups as a good forum to bring together partners, and through projects, identify who is working in a similar area to ensure contact between relevant stakeholders. The Migratory Waterbird (Crane) meeting in Southeast Asia is an opportunity to bring people together and blend specific activities.

65. Wetlands International noted it would be valuable to have a National Meeting in Myanmar which was reinforced by BirdLife International.

66. BirdLife commented on the need to explore opportunities for National Meetings in countries where needs are identified due to a lack of information, knowledge and/or activities.

67. Wetlands International noted the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) and ASEAN Working Group on Biodiversity and suggested the Partnership write to the Director of the Working Group. Ramsar suggested the Partnership seek an opportunity to participate in an upcoming ACB workshop on wetlands to be held in Singapore in 2009.

◆ International Business Sector Partners

68. Shell International noted the perception that the international business sector may perceive the Partnership as a threat and that Partners need to consider and be specific about i) what the initiative can offer the business sector and ii) what they want the business sector to commit to. From the business sector point of view, they want to i) maintain a licence and ii) secure access to resources. Simple request for funding would be seen as "green-wash".

69. The Chair questioned whether business sector engagement was something the Partnership would pursue through Partners or as the Partnership.

70. The USA questioned what 'hooked' Shell, to which Shell replied it could apply business skills to management planning and management of protected areas, along with the opportunity to work together on shared interests.

71. The Chair noted the need to look at the overlap between business operations and Partnership values. Wetlands International identified port operations and Shell commented on biodiversity offset programs, while the USA noted mining and wind power operations as opportunities.

72. The USA commented on the need for the Partnership website to promote the benefits and opportunities for business and site managers.

73. The Chair asked the meeting whether there is an interest in establishing contact group to develop a strategy on approaching business sectors and more than half a dozen Partners expressed their wish to be in the group. The Chair suggested that these Partners initiate discussion via exchange of emails. The contact group members are: Australia, China, Japan, Korea, USA, FAO, ICF, IUCN and Wetlands International.

Agenda Item 6: Flyway Partnership Administration

◆ Arrangements for the Secretariat

74. The Chair reported back on the formation of a task group to explore the proposals put forward by China and the Republic of Korea and a process for consideration of these proposals and the establishment of a permanent Secretariat. The task group included Australia, Japan, Indonesia, CMS, IUCN, Ramsar, BirdLife International, Wetlands International, ICF, China and the Republic of Korea.

75. The task group agreed there were two possible approaches, i) to take a decision at the meeting, or ii) continue evaluation of the proposals and form a management committee with the authority to explore the proposals and make a decision. The task group, at a meeting where the two proponents did not participate, was of the view that the second option was appropriate.

76. The Chair then outlined criteria and critical elements which would serve as the basis for consideration of proposals (Refer to Attachment 3).

77. The Chair then invited China and the Republic of Korea to respond to the recommendation of the task group.

78. China expressed its appreciation for the work conducted by the task group and considered the criteria and critical elements were helpful.

79. The Republic of Korea expressed their desire for a decision on the Secretariat to be made at the meeting, noting that their proposal was only valid for the duration of the meeting.

80. The Chair suspended the meeting to consult further with the Republic of Korea.

81. The Chair reconvened the meeting and asked Partners if they were in a position to make a decision on the Secretariat Host at the meeting today.

82. Wetlands International questioned how the legal entity would work in relation to the employment of staff and operation of bank accounts and acceptance of funds.

83. USA questioned whether that question would be put to the Chinese and the Chair responded that it would.

84. ICF commented that the question was difficult to answer, but they fully supported both proposals. They noted it would be helpful to have clarification but that a decision needed to be made soon.

85. Australia commented that time was required to assess the proposals against the criteria, including the legal status of the Secretariat.

86. Japan viewed the need for more clarification on the decision, noting it needed to be made as soon as possible, while not losing the spirit of cooperation for the conservation of migratory birds.

87. BirdLife commented that Partners were not able to compare the proposals as funding information was lacking from China.

88. The Republic of Korea stated the difference between today and tomorrow, including i) equity and ii) the relationship between the local and central government. They noted the proposals were made yesterday and that it is fair to make a decision today. If the decision is made tomorrow, then this may provide an opportunity for the other proponent to revise its proposal. It was a new opportunity for Incheon and the central government can guarantee the proposal from Incheon City today but not tomorrow.

89. CMS noted that the Partnership was not seeking a new proposal but clarification of the existing proposals.

90. The Chair summarised the discussion by noting the clear position of the Republic of Korea and the number of Partners that were unable to make a decision as they required clarification. The Chair thanked the Republic of Korea for the proposal.

91. The Chair outlined the original decision process proposed by the task group, including: That the Partnership -

- (a) Agree to establish a ‘management committee’¹ (as envisaged by the Partnership text) to undertake the evaluation and selection of a proposal for host of the Secretariat for the Partnership;
- (b) Agree that the decision¹ of the Management Committee be conveyed to Partners for endorsement;
- (c) Agree that the ‘Terms of Reference’ and the ‘Criteria’ provide the primary basis for the assessment but the Chair will, by letter by 14 November, clarify and elaborate as necessary the submission requirements. Should proponents seek any further clarification they should do so in consultation with the Chair;
- (d) Agree that the proponents will provide submissions to the Management Committee through the Chair, to be received no later than 28 November 2008;
- (e) Agree to the following indicative timetable:
 - 7 November: Criteria and TOR provided to proponents
 - 14 November: Letter from Chair to proponents detailing additional information needs
 - 30 Nov – 15 Dec: Management Committee Meeting to determine its recommendation
 - 16 Dec - Chair to write to Partners with Management Committee recommendation
 - 22 Dec - Partners to respond to recommendation.

and invited comments from Partners.

92. CMS proposed that ‘decision’ be replaced with ‘recommendation’ (under point b).

93. The Chair noted the opportunity for other partners to submit proposals.

94. Australia reiterated that Partners need to respond to the Secretariat as soon as possible to allow sufficient time for consideration and advice.

95. CMS reiterated only Partners will have one week to respond.

¹ Replaced by word “recommendation” in the final text. See para. 92.

96. Wetlands International suggested the Chair include the date the decision will be made to the proponents.

97. The Chair accepted the decision process outlined as the forward process.

◆ Funding collaborative activities

98. Australia outlined the history and process in the development of Collaborative Project Concepts and canvassed the decisions required from partners on a forward process.

99. Wetlands International noted that AEWA only considers flyway-wide international proposals and that the proposals are scored on the basis of their relevance and urgency by the Technical Committee.

100. Australia commented that this Partnership is not developed sufficiently to follow AEWA's examples but that it would like to support work in the Yellow Sea.

101. ICF urged Partners to take note of the importance and urgency of the Poyang Lake Project.

102. Wetlands International noted that projects in the current list are mostly individual Partners seeking funding for but that collective and co-ordinated approach is desirable. Further, it questioned whether the meeting will be reviewing the projects funded and pursuing the follow-up.

103. The Chair considered an annual process of review appropriate.

104. Wetlands International suggested it might be useful to consider a sub-committee to look at proposals (and update the list of proposals) on an annual basis. ICF suggested that the initial group engaged in the concept project be the core for such a sub-committee. Wetlands International noted that the composition of such a sub-committee should be flexible so as to prevent originator of projects from being the reviewer. The Chair suggested the discussion on the issue to continue intersessionally while having all information available on the website.

105. Wetlands International asked whether the concept project can extend for further 6 months as the initial period was rather short, while acknowledging that the establishment of a strategy to allocate limited available fund to projects is of higher priority than reviewing and vetting proposals. The Chair noted that the reviewing strategy must be established between the present time and the next year.

◆ Nomination of a new Chair/Vice Chair

106. The Chair reported to the meeting that no nomination of the Chair or Vice Chair was forthcoming during the informal meeting with Government Partners and noted that the nominations have to be sought intersessionally.

107. CMS questioned whether there is a tier of Partners and whether Government Partners are only able to undertake the role of Chair and Vice Chair.

108. Australia commented that the matter had been discussed and noted in the minutes from a previous Meeting of Partners.

109. The Chair agreed to maintain the status quo and noted the appointment of a new Chair and Vice Chair would occur at the end of January/early February once the permanent Secretariat had been established.

◆ Next Meeting of Partners

110. The Chair proposed that the Secretariat canvasses dates for the next Meeting of Partners.

111. ICF suggested not to plan the next MoP at the end of November 2009 as it would coincide with a CMS MoU meeting in Iran.

◆ Meeting Close

112. The Chair thanked the host, Secretariat and the rapporteurs.

113. The meeting Host, the Ministry of Environment, thanked everyone and welcomed them to the Republic of Korea, and wished the participants an enjoyable field trip. The Republic of Korea noted their strong desire to host the Secretariat and indicated they would submit a proposal following an invitation letter from the Chair.

114. Wetlands International thanked the Chair, and the Republic of Korea and China for their offer to host the Secretariat.

ⁱ The members of the Management Committee were initially defined as the Partners who are able to participate in the meeting held in Rome, Italy during the CMS CoP9 (1-5 December 2008). Consequently, the Partners that are initially on the Management Committee are: Australia, Japan, CMS and Wetlands International.