

**REVIEW OF THE
EAST ASIAN – AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY 2007-2011**



FOR:

**The East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership
Incheon, Republic of Korea**

NMS *Nature Management Services*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful thanks to the members of the EAAFP Task Force on the Implementation Strategy for their input to the review during the workshop at the EAAFP Secretariat on 12-14 October 2011, to Douglas Hykle and Roger Jaensch for their guidance and input, and to Choi Chang-Yong, Aram Lee and Minseon Kim of the Secretariat for their assistance during the assignment.

The assistance of the EAAFP CEPA Working Group in providing draft results of the WG meeting on 19-21 September 2011 in Singapore is also acknowledged, relating to the CEPA Objective of the Implementation Strategy.

This report was prepared by:

Crawford Prentice
Director & Consulting Ecologist
Nature Management Services
Tel: +60 3 7725 9546
Cell: +60 12 209 5794
Fax: +60 3 7726 0987
Email: crawford.prentice@gmail.com

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AEWA	Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds
AI	Avian Influenza
AWC	Asian Waterbird Census
CEPA	Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (sometimes used as Communication, Education and Public Awareness)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
CSN	Critical Site Network
EAAF	East Asian – Australasian Flyway
EAAFP	East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FSN	Flyway Site Network (under EAAFP)
IBA	Important Bird Area
INGO	International Non Governmental Organization
IOSEA	Indian Ocean – South-East Asian Marine Turtle Memorandum of Understanding
IS	Implementation Strategy
KRA	Key Result Area
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MoP	Meeting of the Parties
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
Ramsar Convention	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SP	Strategic Plan
SCWP	UNEP/GEF Siberian Crane Wetland Project
TF	Task Force
WG	Working Group
WHSRN	Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network
WSSD Type II Partnership	An informal non-binding mechanism for cooperation recognised by the World Summit on Sustainable Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 1

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 2

INTRODUCTION 4

 Context for the review of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2007-2011 4

SYNTHESIS: OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES ARISING FROM THE REVIEW 6

 Reporting Performance..... 6

 Progress against Implementation Strategy Outcomes & Issues Arising 6

 Cross-cutting Issues 16

 New Subject Areas for Consideration in the Next Implementation Strategy 18

 Observations from review of similar initiatives 20

 Recommendations for the next Implementation Strategy..... 22

 Structure of the Implementation Strategy 22

 Impact Indicators 23

 Core and Shared Outcomes 23

 Other Issues raised by the Workshop..... 23

 Post-workshop Process 24

ANNEXES 25

 Annex 1: Description of Process 25

 Annex 2: Methodology and Expected Outcomes 26

 Annex 3: Coverage and Constraints 27

 Annex 4: Structure of the Review 28

 Annex 5: References 29

INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT FOR THE REVIEW OF THE EAAFP IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY 2007-2011

The Implementation Strategy of the EAAFP was adopted at the First Meeting of Partners in November 2006 and refers to the period 2007-2011. Linked to the Partnership's constitution (The Partnership Document), it outlines the EAAFP objectives and 14 expected outcomes, with considerable detail under each. It is publicly available on the EAAFP website at <http://www.eaaflyway.net/implementation.php>. The Implementation Strategy is the Partnership's most important guiding document and has influence across all of its activity. It is also the basis for the annual work plan of the EAAFP Secretariat. Furthermore, it provides the structure for the reports provided by Partners to the Secretariat for analysis and summary, in the lead up to each Meeting of Partners.

Recognising that its Implementation Strategy would be due for review with a new version to be considered by Partners before the end of 2011, the Fifth Meeting of Partners discussed a process for review and any necessary update. Partners requested that the process place less emphasis on revision and more on how to achieve the Partnership objectives and implement actions. They also reminded the Meeting that the EAAF Partnership is a WSSD Type II partnership which should consider socio-economic perspectives and requested these be incorporated in the review process. It was further acknowledged that review and update may not necessarily be large tasks if the scope and content of the documents remained largely suitable for EAAFP.

Subsequently the Partners agreed that a Task Force be established to conduct a review of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2007-2011 and that the Secretariat facilitate a workshop during 2011 for this purpose, with emphasis on progress of the Partnership towards implementing the five objectives. The Partners asked the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) to initiate the Task Force and CMS arranged to hold a meeting of interested Partners at the close of MoP5 (Draft Report of MoP5, Agenda 4.1, item 111). Representatives of Australia, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, CMS, Ramsar and Wetlands International offered to join the Task Force (Draft Report of MoP5, Agenda 4.1, item 118).

The main responsibilities of the Task Force were:

1. To review implementation progress to date, based in part on information contained in Partner and Secretariat reports;
2. To conduct a gap analysis – identifying strengths and weaknesses in implementation, measured against desired Strategy outcomes that have already been identified;
3. To consider new elements for inclusion in the Strategy, which are not already adequately reflected (e.g. due to oversight or changed circumstances);
4. To make recommendations regarding priority actions to be undertaken to address identified weaknesses in implementation;
5. To elaborate in more detail the steps or mechanisms needed to achieve the desired outcomes; and

6. To prepare a draft EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2012-2016 based on the results of the above, for consideration and adoption by the Partners. It is understood that the new document will be a refinement, as necessary, of the 2007-2011 Strategy – and not a major transformation of content or structure.

Subsequently the Secretariat, in consultation with the Task Force, appointed a consultant, *Nature Management Services*, to give substantial impetus to meeting these responsibilities through preparation of a report and facilitation of a workshop. The report “*Review of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership Implementation Strategy 2007-2011*” was distributed to the Task Force, and presented and discussed at a *Workshop on the Review of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy* on 12-14 October 2011 at the EAAFP Secretariat in Incheon, Republic of Korea. The report provided material for the review of the Task Force, including proposals for consideration in the preparation of the Implementation Strategy 2012-2016.

The present document is an abridged version of the above-mentioned report, consisting of its Introduction and Synthesis sections, incorporating feedback from the workshop and subsequent comments from the Task Force. This revised, stand-alone document is intended as the main background paper for the consideration by all Partners at the MoP6 session on revision of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy.

The following sections cover reporting performance, progress against the Implementation Strategy outcomes and issues arising, cross-cutting issues, new subject areas for consideration in the next Implementation Strategy, observations from a review of similar initiatives, and recommendations for the next Implementation Strategy.

Introductory material is available in the annexes at the end of this document, including the methodology and expected outcomes of the review, coverage and constraints, and the structure of the review.

SYNTHESIS: OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES ARISING FROM THE REVIEW

REPORTING PERFORMANCE

1. There was a relatively poor response in reporting on implementation progress, with only half (13) of the current number of Partners responding overall and a maximum of 9 reports received in any one year (2009). In addition, the EAAFP Working Groups (Anatidae, Cranes, Seabirds, Shorebirds, Avian Influenza and CEPA) have not been reporting against the IS framework (with the exception of one report from the Anatidae WG), instead providing updates at the MoPs.
2. The information provided in the reports received did not reflect the overall level of activity or status of conditions across the flyway because of limited participation and limited text information in the forms. However, the consolidated reports have been used as a **general indication** of progress and to identify some achievements against the Implementation Strategy.
3. The Partner reports had to be supplemented with information drawn from the EAAFP MoP reports, EAAFP website and other sources to obtain a fuller picture of actual progress during the reporting period. This may still contain gaps, especially relating to activities conducted unilaterally by individual partners that were not reported through the EAAFP, but that contributed in reality to the Implementation Strategy outcomes. Some of the WG activities may also be under-represented.
4. The reporting template requests partners to indicate areas of interest for future collaboration under each outcome, but lacks emphasis on showing what collaborative actions have been taken during the reporting period, versus unilateral actions by individual partners.
5. The reporting template, while well designed and user-friendly, should be reviewed during the development of the next Implementation Strategy, especially if significant structural changes are made in the IS (see below). Consideration should be given to reducing the number of questions.

PROGRESS AGAINST IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY OUTCOMES & ISSUES ARISING

6. As noted in the introduction to the EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2007-2011, the Partnership builds on the achievements of the Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Committee, the Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy and its Action Plans for Anatidae, Cranes and Shorebirds over the period 1996 – 2006, which enhanced and guided international cooperation, coordination and activities for conservation of migratory waterbirds. These included the identification of more than 700 sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds and the development of site networks for Anatidae, Cranes and Shorebirds.
7. The reporting period under review (2007 – 2011) was only partially covered by the implementation reports from Partners as standardized reporting only really got underway during 2008 and reports for 2011 will only be received before MOP6 in early 2012. This period was very

much a formative period for the Partnership, with major emphasis on putting in place the policy basis, administrative and management arrangements for its operation – which is largely not reflected in the Implementation Strategy, but progress should be seen in this important context. The establishment of the Partnership's Secretariat in July 2009, (fully staffed by February 2010), hosted by the Republic of Korea, was a major advance which gave an important boost to some areas of implementation.

8. Progress against specific Outcomes is discussed in the report's section on Detailed Review of Implementation Progress, and generally only key points arising that are of significance for the next IS are mentioned here.

Partnership Goal:

9. No indicators are provided for the goal (or for the outcomes) so progress towards the goal is difficult to assess objectively. Trends in waterbird populations and their habitats are suggested as indicators. While information on waterbird population trends is available (with substantial data gaps and deficiencies in robustness), information on habitat trends is patchy and incomplete (see comments under Outcome 2).

Outcome 1 (Flyway Site Network development):

10. Although good progress was made in transferring the 95 sites listed before EAAFP was established to the FSN, progress on new site designations was very slow (the total is now 103 sites). Various reasons apply, but fundamentally the perceived lack of real (i.e. to a large degree financial) benefits resulting from site designation, and the complexity of achieving the agreement of all stakeholders are important constraints. There remain significant information gaps in the Site Information Sheets held by the Secretariat that require the proactive support of country Partners to resolve. Secretariat plans to provide a digital information service on FSN sites are on hold pending potential application of the Critical Site Network tool to this region. Communications work by the Secretariat and Partners is important in further developing the FSN. The following measures are recommended going forward: consultation with Partners to identify specific constraints in nominating new sites, preparing a strategic plan for development of the FSN (similar to Ramsar) including prioritization of efforts, and specific targeting of sites recognized as being of outstanding regional importance as well as those where designation can be quickly achieved. See **cross-cutting issues** below for comments on the importance of functional national partnerships. The target for new nominations should be reduced to a more feasible rate (e.g. 10 sites/year).
11. This outcome was extensively discussed during the workshop and much advice was provided towards revising the outcome for the next IS. Most significantly, it was proposed that the title of Outcome 1 should be more holistic, recognizing the need for a basic skeleton of critical sites to conserve species populations, rather than simply a broad total number of sites. This should include the identification and prioritization of sites of international importance for waterbirds in the flyway, and the protection of priority sites through nomination as Flyway Network Sites and/or other mechanisms. While FSN site designation is often complex and time-consuming, it involves a greater degree of recognition by site managers and government (against simply listing sites), leading on to management measures. It is just the first step. It was noted that the

knowledge base for the FSN development needs to be strengthened and that EAAFP needs to articulate priorities for the FSN more clearly. Greater involvement of EAAFP Working Groups (WGs) was proposed in site identification and nomination by listing out sites of importance for different species / groups as a basis for prioritizing nominations. The WGs should set targets in their plans in terms of site nominations, information gaps to fill, etc. This would provide the basis for research efforts linked to the WGs, strengthening the integration of WGs with the Partnership's IS. It was noted that a review of sites of importance for migratory waterbirds in the EAAF was presented at MOP1 (700 sites), but this needs to be polished up and put on the website. The subsequent inclusion of additional bird groups (e.g. seabirds) will increase this number of sites.

Outcome 2 (Site management reduces biodiversity loss):

12. Significant activity was reported on studies and monitoring of changes in biodiversity at individual sites. However, the overall impact of such changes at a population or flyway level are not clear and this outcome overlaps significantly with both #3 (site management) and #7 (monitoring). To a large degree it also encapsulates the overall goal of the EAAFP and is difficult to interpret. Therefore the workshop proposed that it should be deleted.

Outcome 3 (Integrated management of FSN sites):

13. Significant activity was reported on preparation of management plans, management guidelines and collaboration on international projects involving site management. However there is little information on the status and functionality of participatory site management processes involving local communities. As for Outcome 2, participatory management of key sites is primarily a responsibility of the national Partner governments, and the original intention of this Outcome was that countries should apply their own management planning to FSN sites, with no specific EAAFP format being imposed. Therefore the role of EAAFP in supporting effective site management needs to be reviewed, especially as other initiatives such as Ramsar, CBD and INGOs are also contributing. . EAAFP should be, and. The role of EAAFP should be in promoting local stakeholder committees for FSN sites, facilitating international technical assistance and sharing experience between sites, publicising and disseminating international guidelines and case studies of effective participatory approaches, emphasising the biological connectivity of sites through the flyway approach in site management plans, and supporting and publicizing the results of model projects. All the above should emphasise local benefits. Guidelines for site management planning should include a simplified approach that could be used more easily by countries with limited capacity and resources for site management than existing (eg Ramsar) guidance. Guidelines are also needed on the process for management planning as a basis for participatory site management, as well as on how to integrate waterbird conservation into existing guidelines / planning systems (e.g. Ramsar). The EAAFP CEPA Working Group proposed that CEPA should be incorporated into site management guidelines, and the WG will also develop a template for EAAFP case studies for MOP6. Ideally, progress in improving site management should be assessed annually using a Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) (**see References**) as part of mainstreamed government agency procedures, with initial capacity building assistance.

14. The workshop recommended that the outcome be re-worded to emphasise the focus on management of internationally important sites (not only FSN sites), and proposed restructuring the guidance points (Key Result Areas) for the next IS. The EAAFP assessment of the development of management plans for FSN sites by WI/BLI is underway which will help identify how many FSN sites have management plans, reporting to MOP 6. This will also reflect on the issue of how to treat internationally important sites (e.g. Ramsar sites) outside the FSN with management plans. Finally, EAAFP should encourage the collaboration or use of planning and implementation processes under international conventions like the CBD. As an example, under the Aichi Biodiversity targets 11 and 12, flyway specific indicators and monitoring mechanisms could be incorporated into NBSAPs.

Outcome 4 (Site values recognized in development & EIA processes):

15. 75% of respondents reported significant developments impacting key waterbird sites during 2006-2011. In those cases, with a similar ratio, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) considering the ecological, social, and economic values of the sites were conducted (implying that they were not done for 25%). Mainly unilateral advances on EIA and development planning were reported by various Partners. Looking forward, the identification of important waterbird sites in the early stages of development planning through SEA procedures and improved inter-agency communication and cooperation (perhaps through effective national partnerships) is a proactive approach that should complement improved EIA processes (which are reactive and seek to mitigate damage). Secondly, raising the profile of network sites through publicity and stakeholder involvement can also help increase their security in the face of development proposals. Thirdly, the EAAFP website should be developed to provide access to more resources on the valuation of wetland ecosystems and their services through links to relevant sources. Finally, the role of EAAFP in strengthening such development planning processes (versus purely national concerns) should be kept in mind. This should focus on collaborative actions and provision of information. Good examples should be captured and the EAAFP Secretariat should make case studies available. EAAFP should consider commissioning someone to develop guidance from the case studies. This could include promoting independent review as part of EIA procedures, *inter alia*.
16. The workshop emphasised the importance of National Partnerships for promoting biodiversity mainstreaming, noting that the lead lies with National governments to take this forward by promoting mechanisms within their systems. We currently lack assessments that identify weaknesses in government planning processes as a basis for making improvements. NGOs can help to promote better planning processes. It was noted that EAAFP can have very little influence over EIA processes in comparison with binding agreements like Ramsar and CBD. EAAFP should focus on checking / inserting waterbird concerns into existing Ramsar/CBD guidance, etc. There was discussion about prioritization of attention – all waterbird sites, or FSN sites, and/or Ramsar Sites outside the FSN. For example, Australian law pertaining to development control focuses on sites meeting 1% criteria, rather than whether a site has actually been designated under Ramsar or EAAFP. Migratory species and wetlands are key parts of Australia’s environmental law – see:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/project-assessments-basics.html>

Also, Australia has a draft policy statement for migratory shorebirds which can be accessed at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/migratory-shorebirds.html>

Outcome 5 (Awareness of values of migratory waterbirds and FSN sites):

17. Nearly all responding partners had conducted community awareness and education activities on migratory waterbirds, many had CEPA plans that incorporated elements on migratory waterbirds, and more than half had a list of CEPA resources on migratory waterbirds in the local language. One area of progress is the sister site arrangements and other collaborative activities across the flyway in relation to FSN sites (while noting the need for matching local government bodies with responsibility for the respective sites, and that sister site initiatives tend to equate with sister city initiatives often driven by perceived economic benefits). At the national level, the EAAFP encourages the creation or enhancement of domestic networks that may facilitate communication from the official focal point to other parts of government and the community, including FSN site managers. One example of this approach is in China, which launched a 'secretariat' at Beijing Forestry University in May 2011 with the aim of enhancing communication among the Flyway Network Sites in China.
18. The CEPA WG is leading efforts and has recently developed a draft CEPA strategy, which provides a more detailed framework for the implementation of Objective 2 and its related outcomes on CEPA. The general strategy should be to build on existing CEPA programmes e.g. Ramsar and CBD awareness plans, rather than to establish a new programme under EAAFP. These efforts should be complementary and support the EAAFP strategy – it will be asking too much of countries otherwise. Therefore EAAFP should ensure that waterbird issues are included in these related CEPA programmes. Partners should make CEPA resources available for the Secretariat to compile and put up on the EAAFP website in order to make this material available to a wide range of users throughout the flyway.

Outcome 6 (Recognition of EAAFP's activities and achievements):

19. There was good progress on this outcome, with almost all respondents promoting the activities of the Partnership. Further promotion is necessary, which should focus on priority audiences, such as the key government agencies (including non-environmental agencies, consistent with Ramsar's Changwon Declaration (**see References**)). Such promotion should be integrated into the many relevant projects and activities in the region because of the important role that EAAFP can fulfil for flyway-level awareness and action. In July 2009, the status of the EAAFP as a Ramsar Regional Initiative was endorsed, strengthening recognition for the Partnership. The Secretariat made significant progress in addressing significant gaps in available language versions of key EAAFP documents, is working on translation options for the website, and has been producing a regular e-newsletter. Going forward, it is proposed that Secretariat staff visits to Partner countries to promote EAAFP and follow up on progress on planned outcomes should be maintained and intensified; the Secretariat and CEPA WG should facilitate promotion of the EAAFP at national level and assist in the formation of National Partnerships (with the full support of national government partners); distribution of the EAAFP newsletter should be extended across the region, including through related list-servers; and the CEPA WG and Secretariat should provide guidance and materials to assist Partners in labelling EAAFP activities and outputs.

20. The workshop noted that this outcome seeks to promote successful accomplishments of the EAAFP in order to achieve wider recognition. This includes making more effective use of EAAFP's status as a WSSD Type II Partnership and Ramsar Regional Initiative, and CMS agreement equivalence. This Outcome includes: EAAFP branding; engagement (because EAAFP is recognized, new partners such as corporate bodies and other organizations are attracted to participate); and resourcing (increased resources). Activities suggested by the workshop included: developing and promoting the EAAFP website; Secretariat support in terms of messages and CEPA materials to facilitate Partners' CEPA programmes; representation at relevant meetings and other opportunities for EAAFP promotion such as Migratory Birds Day, World Wetlands Day, etc.; involvement of government agencies in CEPA activities to remind people about EAAFP; corporate membership development; and an awards programme proposal from WI. A Key Result Area was proposed on the **development and strengthening of national partnerships** as a critical mechanism for delivery of the EAAFP implementation strategy, aiming to enhance communication among different arms of government. This is supported by the EAAFP's status as a Regional Ramsar Initiative and as a WSSD Type II Partnership. Such national partnerships should seek to embed EAAFP goals in NBSAPs and other national policies, plans and programmes as a means towards mainstreaming the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

Outcome 7 (Information on flyway status & trends of waterbird populations and habitats):

21. There is overlap with **Outcome 2**, also monitoring of threats is covered in **Outcome 9**. Generally, waterbird monitoring is a core capability for many of the Partners (especially the bird-focused INGOs) and the Partnership as a whole, so it is not surprising that overall progress was strong and also highly collaborative. The Task Force on Monitoring of Waterbird Populations and Sites is well positioned to lead on making improvements in implementation. Some suggestions were made by the Partners, such as to develop habitat monitoring programs for EAAFP network sites (see **Outcome 8**), although at individual site level this may be most appropriate as a specified activity in site management plans (**Outcome 3**), carried out by the responsible authorities and used to guide site management. Increased collaboration on monitoring programs, and incorporating capacity building into monitoring programs were also suggested. Effort should be directed towards making existing well-established monitoring schemes like the AWC more effective and comprehensive (improving coverage, consistency of counts, quality of monitoring through capacity building) as well as encouraging the development of smaller sub-regional monitoring programmes (e.g. WWF's work in south coastal China). These will require sustainable financing for training, coordination, analysis and reporting, which is hard to secure and may represent the main issue for this outcome. See **Outcome 1** re important gaps in FSN site information.

22. The workshop noted that integrating such monitoring programmes into national frameworks for biodiversity indicators such as NBSAPs is of great importance, as is more effective promotion of the value of monitoring schemes to national governments in order to secure their support. The inclusion of migratory waterbirds in monitoring related to the CBD's Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as expressed in CMS COP10 Resolution 10.18 should be promoted (see also **Outcome 2**). The EAAFP Working Groups are well positioned to coordinate and facilitate monitoring efforts related to their subject areas. In addition, increased attention is needed on migratory waterbird habitats in

priority regions (especially those with a rapid rate of habitat loss and those already subject to special attention through EAAFP Task Forces) so that a stronger information base is developed to inform waterbird conservation measures. It was noted that the WI/BirdLife International assessment of FSN sites (habitat and waterbird monitoring, and threats) is in progress, so a baseline will be available in 2012.

Outcome 8 (Information on internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds):

23. Most respondents had lists of internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds and published relevant information on the web. Most respondents also answered that there were some or many training activities providing waterbird survey skills. However, against this, the Site Information Sheets for FSN sites held by the Secretariat have many information gaps and are in need of updating with the support of country Partners (see also Outcome 1). Task Forces for the Yellow Sea and Amur-Heilong Basin were established at MOP 5 to identify the best ways in which the EAAFP can enhance conservation outcomes at transboundary wetlands in these regions through international cooperation, yet these have made little progress to date. Going forward, systematic assessment of the Site Information Sheets is needed to address the large number of gaps and to update existing information, especially for the 95 sites designated before EAAFP started in 2006. Systematic review of information gaps is needed for species groups and geographical areas to focus future survey work.
24. The workshop recognized that the intention behind this outcome is to facilitate discussion and collaboration between partners to fill information gaps, so no detail on specific activities is needed. Informed by the assessment of FSN sites by WI and BLI (in progress) and the recognized weakness of information on existing FSN sites held by the EAAFP Secretariat, going forward this outcome should address the need for improved reporting on FSN sites, including the provision of accurate maps and periodic updating of Site Information Sheets. It should also address the wider need for a more detailed listing of important sites throughout the flyway to inform prioritization of conservation actions. Some examples of useful surveys were given - Japan monitoring 1000 sites, of which 26 are FSN sites. Birdlife International reported that both professional monitoring and citizen science data are being used to update information on IBAs. A lot of Yellow Sea survey work has been conducted with important findings, e.g. one site holds 45% of the Red Knot population, and significant surveys of waterbirds have been conducted across large parts of the middle Yangtze valley. Information on internationally important sites is held by a variety of organizations at different levels and in relation to diverse interests. In order to be of greatest use for flyway conservation, information on FSN sites and other internationally important sites should be made available through channels such as the EAAFP website. The Critical Site Network tool should be adapted for the EAAF if funding can be secured.

Outcome 9 (Threats to sites assessed and management recommendations made):

25. Little progress was made on developing guidelines on conducting threat and impact assessments at important sites at flyway level (see below for further information), and there does not appear to be any coordinated flyway approach to monitoring and responding to threats at present. Less than a quarter of responding partners noted the availability of reviews of the threats and management needs at Network Sites and other important sites. Capacity development activities linked to threat assessment and response planning were still limited. Responding partners have

tried to develop mitigation techniques and guidelines with local experts and specialists. See also the section on EIA in **Outcome 4**, which lists a number of case studies concerning responses to development proposals planned for important waterbird sites. For sites under some form of protected area management, threats should be identified, reported and addressed through official management procedures. Proactive systems should be established by **national partnerships** (see **Outcome 6** above and **cross-cutting issues** below) to identify and respond to potential threats at the policy and programming levels. This should try to integrate biodiversity conservation considerations at an early stage of planning. This is going beyond the current scope of the Partnership's capabilities but should be picked up in future through such national mechanisms. It can also be addressed with support from CBD, Ramsar, CMS, etc. Systematic mechanisms for detecting threats could be promoted at flyway level, such as including a rapid assessment of threats during AWC reporting, or making use of BirdLife's Site Support Groups approach for IBAs.

26. The workshop noted that in the case of sites that have management plans and institutional backing (see **Outcome 3**), this is often only sufficient to deal with internal issues within the management agency's jurisdiction. Threats arising outside the site boundaries, such as water pollution or diversion often require a higher level of intervention involving inter-sectoral collaboration. For the many sites that have little or no official management support, both internal and external threats can adversely affect their conservation values. There is a need to improve capacity to identify and respond to threats at key sites, as well as to obtain an overview of such threats at flyway level and to provide technical guidance on appropriate mitigation strategies and measures. Such approaches should involve local expertise as well as draw on international experience. The workshop also noted significant overlap between **Outcome 9 and Outcomes 4 and 7**, suggesting restructuring of content in the next IS. While no guidelines (9.1) have been developed, **reviews of threats (9.2) which should be shared through the EAAFP were identified**, including:

- a. a threat assessment for Ramsar Sites in Australia supported by the Australian Government (just finished)
- b. BirdLife International's monitoring framework for IBAs, which is being adapted for the review of 100 FSN sites (in progress), which will also group threats and consider how to respond (mitigate). How applicable such mitigation will be to other sites has yet to be determined and may depend on the causes of the threats – e.g. disturbance.

No progress was noted on 9.3, but Australia has included mitigation as part of EIA procedures. Australia also has a draft Offsets Policy:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/draft-environmental-offsets.html>

Guidance from other flyways (e.g. AEWA) is also available that should be made available for the EAAF through the Secretariat. Australia's policy statement on windfarms can be found here:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/wind-farm-industry.html>

Outcome 10 (Enhanced knowledge of waterbird ecology & migration for conservation):

27. All responding partners were involved in funding, analyses, and dissemination of waterbird migration data and in international collaboration on waterbird migration projects. FAO was

involved in many funded projects including the dissemination of waterbird migration data, capacity building and developing protocols for bird research and AI surveillance. Some partners were mainly focused on endangered species. A Task Force for coordination of colour marking was established at MOP5, which has effectively led efforts on this subject, supported by links to colour marking information developed by the Secretariat and posted on the EAAFP website. The main recommendations going forward are for improved coordination among banding schemes for different parts of the flyway, and increased emphasis on collaborative capacity building efforts with support from Partners.

28. The workshop emphasized the central significance of this Outcome to the Partnership, providing essential knowledge for identifying key sites, demonstrating the flyway network function of sites, understanding species needs, and as a basis for conservation action. **The main challenge is in improving coordination and developing regional projects across the whole range of a species to stimulate an integrated strategic approach.** There has been limited progress on this issue across all guidance points. Focused attention on priority subregions was suggested. It was noted that the **national governments should decide on protocols for information sharing arrangements on banding**, rather than a project by project approach (as happens to some extent now). The Task Force on colour marking is reviewing protocols and information is on the EAAFP website. **The IS could call for more targeted synthesis work (e.g. on key species) under this outcome.**

Outcome 11 (Knowledge on migratory waterbirds role in disease transmission):

29. *The Asia-Pacific Working Group on Migratory Waterbirds and Avian Influenza* is well established, remains actively involved in leading on this subject in the region, and is well networked. Interested Partners have played a major role in establishing a coordinated global response through the CMS Task Force on Avian Influenza, contributing to GAINS and other surveillance programmes, and in capacity building for vulnerable countries. The Partners' involvement in the development of technical and MEA guidance on AI and other wildlife diseases has been a significant contribution to global knowledge on these issues in relation to migratory birds. Going forward, the AI Working Group is well positioned to lead (assuming it is also able to deal with other wildlife disease threats in addition to avian influenza) and should provide recommendations on suitable Key Results Areas for the next IS. More focused effort including international assistance should be invested in capacity building, surveillance and control measures for areas where Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H₅N₁ is endemic / entrenched. There is also a need for national partnerships to bring together wildlife, animal health, human health and other agencies for a more holistic approach towards disease control.
30. The workshop suggested that the focus should be on maintaining a network of scientists and communications (rather than projects). The workshop heard that the 1st Expert Group Meeting for HPAI which was held in Tokyo on 21-22 June 2011 (hosted by Ministry of Environment Japan and convened by OIE) was a good example of collaboration between conservation and animal health sectors. OIE has been invited to attend the next EAAFP MOP. The Secretariat should publicise this and similar collaborative work through the newsletter and website.

Outcome 12 (Capacity building needs for site stakeholders):

31. Half of the respondents noted that some capacity/training needs assessments had been implemented in relation to the management and monitoring of FSN sites. Training needs assessments and training activities were carried out through international projects on wetland conservation (according to their respective focus and scope), contributing towards this outcome. The workshop proposed that this outcome be deleted and integrated into **Outcome 13**, so that capacity needs assessments are included as an integral part of capacity building processes.

Outcome 13 (Capacity building for waterbird and habitat conservation):

32. Most responding partners were aware of some national capacity building networks that had been developed to facilitate the ongoing improvement in the management of migratory waterbirds and their habitats. The Secretariat presented a briefing paper on “*facilitating development and activities of national partnerships*” at MOP5 (see cross-cutting issues below), noting that national partnerships are active in some flyway countries such as Japan and are being considered in others. Some significant capacity building assistance was provided through major projects including both specific network sites and wider outreach to the networks (especially in China). The sister site arrangements and other collaborative activities between sites across the East Asian – Australasian Flyway (EAAF) (see <http://www.eaaflyway.net/sister-site.php>) have contributed to capacity building outcomes. The collaborative nature of this work is notable and it has also contributed to CEPA outcomes. Overall, progress was patchy, and a more systematic and sustainable approach towards capacity building is desirable, perhaps in collaboration with better resourced initiatives for greater impact. Going forward, the need remains for institutionalized training programmes that will provide long term capacity building support at regional and national levels, and more proactive involvement of government Partners is needed in supporting capacity building efforts through their existing institutions which often have significant capacity and resources.

33. The workshop recognized that capacity building is cross-cutting across most of the outcomes above, and is anticipated to form an integral part of many of the activities under these outcomes (note that former guidance points on capacity building from the other outcomes have now been consolidated under this outcome). Capacity building is highlighted in this outcome in view of the recognized need for continued intervention, especially in less developed parts of the flyway, in order to achieve the EAAFP’s goal. Being heavily resource dependent, capacity building is often linked to specific projects and programmes, and the intention should be to ensure that such activities address recognized needs at local level, whilst also addressing identified priorities at the flyway level through collaborative action. Capacity building programmes are needed in a range of fields in order to support migratory waterbird conservation, based upon targeted needs assessments. This can be delivered through various means (tailored to local needs and situations), including training, site staff exchanges, management improvements, provision and training in use of equipment, and access to instructional materials and resources in local languages such as the development of a toolkit for site managers by compiling available materials. On strengthening national partnerships, the EAAFP Secretariat should collect information on good examples of national partnerships to assist the partners, and consider updating the document *Building National Partnerships* (MoP2, Doc 7.23). The example of Japan

was given during the workshop – they have been holding workshops for site managers nationally for 12 years, varying in scope (e.g. Anatidae, shorebirds, Ramsar COP preparation, etc). Korea has also held a meeting for site managers with the Secretariat’s assistance.

Outcome 14 (Collaborative flyway wide actions for waterbird and habitat conservation):

34. Nearly all responding partners were involved and are interested in future involvement in the development and/or implementation of coordinated projects for priority species. Overall, there was significant focused effort for selected high priority species through international species action plans and collaborative approaches led by EAAFP Working Groups, Task Forces and Partners (e.g. cranes, Black-faced Spoonbill, Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Scaly-sided Merganser, etc.). Some of these efforts focused on flagship species have significant spin-off benefits for other less prominent species utilizing the same sites. Looking forward, there is a need for increased emphasis on the establishment and involvement of national and site partnerships in habitat conservation at various scales; increased effort to involve range states in collaborative flyway conservation initiatives for key species; systematic development and implementation of international species action plans to inform national priority-setting (while resources for implementation will mainly have to come from the range state governments); strengthened focus on key sites / complexes that are of outstanding conservation significance for a range of waterbird species as key links in migration cycles; and strong focus on developing synergies with related initiatives (e.g. CMS and Ramsar) towards more efficient and targeted intervention from EAAFP Partners.

35. The workshop noted that priority should be given to migratory waterbird species with an unfavourable conservation status or with potential as flagship species for international collaboration and habitat management. Priority should also be given to projects that involve a number of countries and address major threats to a range of migratory waterbirds. Good examples exist of collaborative activities, which should be compiled and disseminated as best practice case studies through the EAAFP Secretariat. The collaborative work on the Black-faced Spoonbill was highlighted as one of the best examples of sustained collaboration between both government and NGO partners, building on some 20 years of cooperation. The downgrading of the species conservation status from Critically Endangered to Endangered is a clear indication of impact. Positive features of this collaboration included efficient information feedback to participants, and successful defence of its Taiwan wintering site from development plans for tourism and recreational use. It is a charismatic bird, which has popular appeal. On the habitat conservation side, a desk study on tidal flats in East Asia is being conducted by several partners led by IUCN, which has potential to evolve into a habitat conservation programme.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

36. The Implementation Strategy generally does not cover operational and administrative issues, such as following up on the EAAFP’s WSSD Type II Partnership status, where there may be opportunity for increased government support related to the Rio +20 meeting in 2012. Similarly, the involvement of corporates and multilateral agencies such as the Asian Development Bank, World Bank, UN agencies, etc may be an area where EAAFP conservation efforts could be linked

- to donor programmes. Such issues may be best maintained in workplans for the Secretariat (with support needs from Partners identified). The workshop noted that such issues could potentially be included in **Outcome 6** of the Implementation Strategy (see **paragraph 70** below on Core and Shared Outcomes).
37. The distinction between national government responsibilities, including funding for domestic level actions, and the role of the EAAFP needs to be kept clear: EAAFP activities should involve international collaboration, and international technical support for national actions at designated FSN sites and where benefits of intervention will have flyway-wide application (see **paragraph 70** below on Core and Shared Outcomes, and also the **draft preamble** to the new IS).
38. Linked to the CEPA outcomes, recognition of the EAAFP should be integrated into Partner programmes and activities through “badging” or appropriate acknowledgement where these are collaborative and contribute to EAAFP goals. This will be incorporated into **Outcome 6**.
39. The [Partnership Document](#) sets out the general approach of the EAAFP, which embraces the establishment of Partnerships between organizations at different levels – international, national and site. All of these are necessary to achieve the integrated management of migratory waterbirds and their habitats, yet national and site level partnerships have made very limited progress to date (Japan is apparently most advanced, with some progress reported for China, Thailand and Myanmar). The achievement of certain Outcomes (for example, 3 and 4) is highly dependent on the existence of such national and site partnerships (in various forms appropriate to different national and local situations - stakeholder committees, advisory groups, forums, etc). This is an area that demands serious attention from the Partnership as a whole, and from Government Partners in particular, and **raises the question whether establishing such mechanisms should be identified as a specific outcome in the IS?** A possible additional measure for strengthening Government Partner response would be to support and train a dedicated “flyway officer” for Government Partners where a need is identified. See the **draft preamble** to the new IS for text on institutional arrangements.
40. The importance of engaging with other sectoral agencies in addition to the Government Partner agencies is shared by the Ramsar Convention (which encourages the establishment of national Ramsar Committees. Perhaps shared coordinating / consultation mechanisms should be sought at national level for all the international biodiversity-related agreements (CBD, CMS, Ramsar, etc, including EAAFP), while recognizing that this task goes well beyond EAAFP interests alone. Related issues, that have also been flagged by other international agreements, are the increasing demands on government environment agencies that are often not matched by corresponding increases in available staff and budgets resulting in limited capacity to take on new responsibilities; and the larger question of whether EAAFP should align with the wildlife divisions, which tend to be lower profile and less experienced in international work, or with the Ramsar-supporting divisions (where these are separate). Although stronger technical support may arise via the wildlife divisions, their weaker political status compared to international/Ramsar divisions, may pose a major constraint on EAAFP implementation. The EAAFP’s Ramsar Regional Initiative status may provide rationale for such realignments.
41. The EAAFP’s approach of assigning Task Forces on specific issues (species, key regions) appears to be effective, promoting focused leadership, collaborative actions and projects delivering to

practical timelines (associated with annual MoPs). The Working Groups are also providing longer term leadership on key species groups as well as CEPA and AI with approved TORs and varying planning arrangements. However, the workshop noted the need for more effective integration of the WGs into the EAAFP planning and reporting processes, including supporting the identification, prioritization and nomination of internationally important sites in the flyway for different waterbird groups, addressing knowledge gaps through survey and monitoring activities and capacity building.

42. An emerging issue is the need to improve the effectiveness of communications, including potential approaches at the top levels of government in view of the many constraints inherent in engaging at lower levels of organization (especially in terms of promoting inter-agency collaboration). As an example, should EAAFP be supporting the recent moves to get key global leaders involved in promoting major conservation issues that have flyway-wide implications? The draft EAAFP CEPA Strategy developed in September 2011 and shared at the EAAFP IS workshop provides an appropriate basis for incorporating CEPA activities in the next IS.

NEW SUBJECT AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE NEXT IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

43. As a general principle, expansion of activities into new subject areas should be based on a clear rationale, such as providing improved prospects of success in one of the focal outcome areas, or addressing a significant emergent threat to waterbirds in the region. Otherwise, effort should be focused on improving performance and using existing limited resources towards achieving core EAAFP goals. Subject areas worthy of consideration are described below, supported by the workshop. These were generally cross-cutting across the outcomes, and it is unlikely that their incorporation would require significant re-structuring of the Implementation Strategy – instead they might be embedded into existing and planned activities. The assessment of threats in **Outcome 9** above provides one such opportunity to include some of these issues.
44. **Climate change adaptation and mitigation.** There are many aspects to this huge subject and the Partnership's approach would need to be carefully targeted to ensure that efforts are not dissipated with little impact or detract from core outcomes. While it is a subject that cannot be ignored in view of its significance for waterbird populations and habitats (such as the immediate impacts due to ice melt and lowering of permafrost tables in Alaska, Russia, Mongolia and parts of China; and effects of rising sea levels on the availability of coastal habitats), it is important to keep it in context: human impacts remain a greater threat to waterbird populations at the current time. Some potential areas of intervention for EAAFP are: a) raising awareness of the potential impacts of climate change on migratory waterbirds; b) incorporating ecosystem-based adaptation into guidance for site management plans and revisions to larger scale policies, programmes and plans – including measures to increase the resilience of local communities to climate change impacts; c) incorporating climate change mitigation into plans for wetlands that are significant for carbon sequestration such as forested wetlands and peatlands. These connections have the potential to increase access to funding sources that may not otherwise be available. Some comments provided during the workshop are as follows. Include landward areas for coastal sites during site identification to allow for the possibility of coastal retreat in view of

sea level rise. Consider conducting climate change vulnerability assessments at the time of site nomination, and/or include a review of FSN sites in national vulnerability assessment programmes, consider some country pilot studies in order to develop tools of wider use. BirdLife is modeling impacts of climate change in the lower Mekong, and impacts of sea level rise on IBAs in coastal Vietnam. While some capacity exists for modeling in the region, there is a need to build local capacity as well as for reliable information. The Australian Research Council is supporting a Queensland University study on climate change effects in parts of the Yellow Sea using remote sensing analysis, and will provide some results next year. Overall, it was felt that EAAFP should provide recommendations for embedding relevant indicators and information requirements into national plans and programmes on climate change as the most simple and cost effective approach. CBD, CMS and Ramsar all have significant guidance on climate change, which EAAFP can promote highlighting waterbird conservation concerns.

45. **Water management and environmental flows for key wetlands** – this is closely linked to human development pressures increasing demand for water and climate change, which may exacerbate the pressures on natural wetlands (including emplacement of dams; water diversion for irrigation; water diversion for urban consumption; channelization and ‘improvement’ of rivers; and conversion of natural lakes to reservoirs) . This issue should be carefully examined in the development of site management plans, to ensure that external demand for water resources does not impact conservation values (as is currently happening for protected wetlands in many areas). EAAFP could raise the awareness of conservation agencies to these risks and promote inter-agency collaboration with ministries and provincial and other local agencies responsible for water resource management. The workshop noted that water management is often a high level development priority and it can be difficult to influence on environmental grounds as a result. However, some points of entry exist towards achieving a balance that ensures human needs are met while sustaining essential environmental services including biodiversity conservation.
46. **Avoiding mortality from powerlines and wind turbines** – a significant issue in some locations and one that is likely to increase as the renewable energy industry develops. A related key threat in NE Asia is from the development of massive tidal power plants – several are approved to go ahead – which will change/stop tidal regimes over vast areas of mudflat that is critical stopover habitat. There is already a growing body of global experience that could be applied to this region, and some examples of mitigation within the region are available. EAAFP can play a role in facilitating the exchange of experiences from other regions and between countries, and in resolving specific conflicts at FSN sites. The workshop also heard that Australia has developed guidance on windfarms (see **Outcome 9** above).
47. **Environmentally sustainable agricultural practices and managing waterbird conflicts on agricultural land.** With agricultural land occupying significant and increasing areas of landscapes used by waterbirds across the region, the impacts of agricultural practices (such as habitat changes due to agricultural land claim, crop intensification and increased grazing pressure, use of agrochemicals - especially nutrient enrichment of wetlands, drainage, unsustainable irrigation practices, etc.) on waterbird populations that use affected lands at various stages of their life cycles is of increasing importance. Waterbirds may also show a preference for feeding on agricultural lands (e.g. ricefields, harvested cereal fields, improved grasslands, etc) – sometimes with resulting improvements in population status - that can bring them into conflict with farmers. The same applies to commercial fisheries, where fish-eating birds can impact profits.

EAAFP can play a role in facilitating the exchange of experiences from other regions and between countries in advising on agro-environmental policy changes and resolving specific conflicts at FSN sites (for example, the [AEWA Guidelines on reducing crop damage, damage to fisheries, bird strikes and other forms of conflict between waterbirds and human activities](#)). The workshop noted that EAAFP's response on this issue should take note of [Ramsar COP10](#) resolutions and [CBD COP10](#) decisions on enhancing biodiversity in ricefields and the [Satoyama Initiative](#) on agrobiodiversity, perhaps led by Japan.

OBSERVATIONS FROM REVIEW OF SIMILAR INITIATIVES

48. A comparison with similar implementation planning and review processes was undertaken. The comparative review was restricted to a small number of initiatives that may serve to inform the present analysis. These are as follows:

- a. The Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (CMS/AEWA)
- b. The Indian Ocean – South-East Asian Marine Turtle Memorandum of Understanding (CMS/IOSEA)
- c. The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
- d. The Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network (WHSRN)

49. As far as possible, a standardized approach was taken in reviewing the planning and review processes of related initiatives. The comparison revealed many similarities despite some obvious differences in scope and administration. The following observations raise some strategic considerations for the partnership to evaluate:

50. It is difficult to assess changes in actual impact on the ground without systematic reporting of specific quantitative indicators. A logframe-driven approach including quantitative indicators provides stronger direction and means for assessing progress towards objectives and impacts.

51. Such an approach may work for countries and organizations where planning has reached complex levels but will be challenging for those with more limited capacity and cultural differences, especially where English is not easily used in procedures of government agencies. It also carries a heavier reporting, data collection and management, and administrative burden that is likely not appropriate for a voluntary partnership with limited resources.

52. Those initiatives involving formal agreements can afford to aim for a heavier reporting burden because of the obligations on member countries to comply with the terms of the agreement. This is much less likely to work for a voluntary partnership like EAAFP, as is evident from the reporting rate during 2007-2011 using a relatively simple and user-friendly reporting template.

53. Existing reporting burdens on countries imposed by membership in MEAs (CBD, Ramsar, UNFCCC, UNCCD, CMS, etc) is already considerable and overlaps occur. It may be possible to find synergies with other reporting requirements (e.g. for Ramsar and CBD) that are mutually beneficial.

54. The pragmatic **Key Result Areas** approach used by the [Ramsar Strategic Plan 2009 – 2015](#) allows for the prioritization of issues within wider fields which does not need to be set out in logframe style (but retaining clear objectives and outcomes). This responded to feedback that the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2003-2008 was too thorough, and that a more rigorous prioritization and tighter focus on the most pressing issues was needed rather than an exhaustive list.
55. The focused niche of **WHSRN** (on the site network alone) is of particular interest, representing both similarities to the origins of the EAAFP as well as a possible future option for EAAFP should the partners support such an idea. However, the enabling conditions of strong national capacity for biodiversity conservation that exist in North America (but not throughout the Americas) may not apply to East Asia to allow such a narrowing of focus.
56. The following **recommendations** are proposed, based on the above observations:
57. The EAAFP's role in relation to other initiatives should be periodically reviewed to check for consistency, possibilities for synergies and potential changes in scope or implementation mechanisms. EAAFP should actively try to learn from the approaches, techniques, knowledge and lessons learned from other similar initiatives. There are many parallels, so adapting their approaches and tools (such as the [Critical Site Network tool](#)) may offer a quick route towards building capacity in parts of the region.
58. The next EAAFP Implementation Strategy should be informed by the current [Ramsar](#), [AEWA](#) and [WHSRN](#) Strategic Plans and seek synergies where possible (assuming this does not become too complex and cumbersome). Such an approach may enable EAAFP to narrow its own distinctive forward plan to a simpler and highly focused set of desired outcomes.
59. NBSAP linkages could be significant in supporting national implementation of the EAAFP IS (as for the Ramsar Strategic Plan) – country partners should make such links during NBSAP review and revision, and in determining national implementation of the EAAFP IS. The recent [CMS COP10 Resolution 10.18](#) on *Guidelines on the Integration of Migratory Species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and Other Outcomes from CBD COP10* is of particular relevance.
60. **Prioritization approaches** for site conservation such as that used by [WHSRN](#) could be applied to EAAFP if sufficient information is available to support an exercise and it is not too complex. A similar prioritization approach without much complexity was applied to the sites listed in the Asian Wetlands Inventory some time ago (see Scott and Poole, 1989).
61. The workshop discussion on the Flyway Site Network arising from comparison with the WHSRN approach resulted in a recommendation for preparation of a discussion paper for the Task Force by Paul O'Neill, Doug Watkins and Cristi Nozawa, which was subsequently drafted as "*A concept for identifying priority sites for inclusion into the Flyway Site Network*". The paper provides background information for the revision of the Implementation Strategy (specifically Outcome 1, which has been revised accordingly). The outlined process is not intended to replace the current Flyway Site Network concept, but rather provide it with context and prioritised goals. The primary difference with the revised approach is that it recognizes and prioritises all sites of importance for waterbirds in the flyway (e.g. IBAs, Ramsar Sites & other sites known to meet the

Ramsar waterbird criteria for international importance), including those that have not been designated/endorsed by site managers and national governments as flyway network sites. This approach requires, but is not necessarily limited to: 1) an enabling clause in the Implementation Strategy (draft Outcome 1 above); 2) identifying all sites of international importance for each waterbird group in the flyway (shadow list); 3) ranking/assigning conservation priority to these identified sites, and; 4) presenting information on these sites on the EAAFP website.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

STRUCTURE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

62. The revised IS may benefit from a preamble explaining how strategic planning comprises several key elements: vision >> goal >> objectives >> expected outcomes >> indicators. While the IS was originally written along these classic lines and the outcomes are correctly phrased to illustrate what the world should look like once the implementation has been done, it lacks indicators to assess the impact of activities under each outcome. Once the five or so elements of forward planning are adequately explained, then one can see the benefit of having this kind of picture to guide the organisation. Without clear outcome statements and indicators, the organisation may not be able to assess progress meaningfully towards its goal. The workshop also agreed that the preambular section should explain the roles and functions of various EAAFP bodies (taking inspiration from the document “How BirdLife Works”); and emphasising the importance of national partnerships as key mechanisms for strategy implementation.
63. The workshop noted that **the Goal and Objectives** are specified in the Partnership Document and therefore it is not desirable to try to change them. No significant problems were identified with the Goal and Objectives during the review (although note that the CEPA WG recommended a change to the wording of **Objective 2**, to “*Enhance awareness of the values of migratory waterbirds and their habitats, especially for supporting local livelihoods*”). Perhaps the preamble to the next Implementation Strategy should include the EAAFP Purpose as well as the Goal.
64. Significant time was spent reviewing and revising the **existing Outcomes and Guidance Points** during the workshop, although due to limited time the revisions should be regarded as preliminary and subject to further refinement. In particular, the guidance points required additional work in order to convert them into Key Result Areas with measurable targets (where possible) and responsibilities assigned, and to provide adequate explanation of their intent.
65. The workshop proposed revisions to the **Outcomes** (see separate document) and indicated that a short explanation should be provided of the intended scope and priorities for each outcome, noting the role of the EAAFP in addressing particular issues and emphasising collaboration.
66. **Below the outcome level**, there is a question as to how much flexibility is allowed for implementation. In the IS for 2007-2011, “guidance points” were included for each outcome, although perhaps their intention was not well understood (they are not outputs, activities or indicators, as some may have thought). For the next IS, the workshop supported using a similar level of guidance through “**Key Result Areas**” as in the [Ramsar Strategic Plan](#), including targets for the reporting period and identification of responsibilities (as far as possible). It was suggested

that these replace the system of “guidance points” as they are more action-oriented and measurable (as far as possible). The Chair suggested that 2-3 sentences should be added for each KRA to explain them more fully (some of the current guidance points are hard to interpret, and have been revised accordingly). It would be possible to report on progress against these KRAs and effectively to use them as indicators of progress.

67. It would be too prescriptive and rigid, and complicate the document if specific ‘recommended actions’ were added to the present framework. In any case, there may be a wide range of possible actions that could be developed in response to any one objective or expected outcome and might best be written on a case-by-case basis as opportunities arise. Furthermore, the wording needed to usefully explain recommended actions might be too long for this document.

IMPACT INDICATORS

68. It is proposed that **indicators are included through the Key Result Areas for each outcome** where practical, as a means of assessing the impact of the activities conducted during the reporting period. The feasibility of applying these (or other) indicators requires careful consideration, as well as the monitoring and reporting effort and financing involved.
69. With the use of KRAs, specific Outcome indicators will not be necessary, although it may still be **useful to include indicators for the Goal** so that the overall *conservation impact* of the partnership’s efforts can be tracked. The Ramsar Convention’s approach of developing and applying [Indicators of Effectiveness](#), linked to information requested in the National Reports, is an option for this. Some of the Ramsar indicators have potential to be applied to EAAFP, but the benefits and level of effort involved need to be carefully assessed.

CORE AND SHARED OUTCOMES

70. The structure of the IS for 2007-2011 consists of 14 Outcomes under 5 Objectives. It may be possible to group these outcomes into two categories – those that are best led by EAAFP because they require international cooperation (e.g. counting birds across their ranges); and those that are essentially domestic responsibilities, with lead help from existing mechanisms such as Ramsar and CBD, but which will benefit from EAAFP ‘support’ and collaboration. The first category might be regarded as EAAFP “**Core Outcomes**” which EAAFP would lead and is more likely to achieve and report well, and thus have a greater sense of benefit from collaboration. For the other “**Shared Outcomes**”, EAAFP would be playing more of a supporting role in collaboration with others such as Ramsar, as it is more difficult to influence change, monitor effectively and report on these. While this distinction is not clear in all cases, Core Outcomes are the waterbird-specific ones and would likely include Outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12/13 and 14. The Shared Outcomes are the more general outcomes that have a high level of overlap with other conservation initiatives such as 2, 3, 4 and 9. Establishing a narrower focus through the IS would more clearly convey the unique role and purpose of EAAFP. The workshop clarified the role of the EAAFP against other initiatives as far as possible during its deliberations on revisions of the Outcomes and guidance points. Clarification of the EAAFP’s role will also be enhanced including more narrative description of the Outcomes. The introduction of Key Result Areas identifying main responsibilities below each outcome will further assist in clarifying and focusing effort.

OTHER ISSUES RAISED BY THE WORKSHOP

71. **Flagship species:** There has been some success with flagship species projects / programmes (e.g. Black-faced Spoonbill, Siberian Crane), resulting in benefits to conservation of habitats and other species. What other flagship species can be identified in this region? It was suggested that the WGs should identify suitable candidates, and Birdlife to identify seabird options.

POST-WORKSHOP PROCESS

72. The Chair summarized the next steps at the end of the workshop:

1. Consultant to produce a short report on the workshop
2. A longer substantive document should be developed based on pages 50-60 of the consultant's report (synthesis section) embellished by the ideas from the workshop
3. Proposed Outcomes and Key Result Areas for the next implementation Strategy
4. Short document on implementation mechanisms for the next IS
5. The reporting template will need to be reviewed in due course after the contents of the next IS has been confirmed. Some programming work is also needed to allow Partners to save and print the information in the form before submission (Maki / Dr Choi)
6. A paper on the roles and functions of different bodies based on the Birdlife document (How Birdlife Works)
7. Timing of reporting on the above to be confirmed by the chair – to be completed before the next MoP, which is tentatively scheduled for late March 2012 (so by early February)
8. Except for the short report on the workshop, any additional inputs from the Consultant will require a new TOR, which the Task Force Chair will identify and confirm with the EAAFP Secretariat.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS

The Secretariat, in consultation with the Task Force, appointed a consultant, Nature Management Services, to give substantial impetus to meeting these responsibilities through preparation of a report and facilitation of a workshop. The report “*Review of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership Implementation Strategy 2007-2011*” was distributed to the Task Force, and presented and discussed at a *Workshop on the Review of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy* on 12-14 October 2011 at the EAAFP Secretariat in Incheon, Republic of Korea. It provided material addressing points 1-5 above for the review of the Task Force, including proposals for consideration in the preparation of the Implementation Strategy 2012-2016.

The Terms of Reference of the consultant were subsequently extended in January 2012 to:

1. Develop a substantive document (the present document), for circulation to all EAAFP Partners, based on the synthesis section of the consultant’s report, embellished by the ideas from the Implementation Strategy Review workshop. This revised, stand-alone document is intended as the main background paper for consideration by all Partners.
2. Develop – through an iterative process involving all Task Force members who wish to participate – the Proposed Outcomes and Key Result Areas for the next Implementation Strategy, based on suggested revisions and preliminary comments from the workshop. Effectively, this document will come as close as possible to the final version of the next Implementation Strategy, recognizing that some issues may need to be presented as ‘options’ for consideration/decision by the Meeting of Partners.
3. Draft a preambular section to the Implementation Strategy that explains the roles and functions of the various EAAFP bodies, emphasising the importance of national partnerships as key mechanisms for strategy implementation.

ANNEX 2: METHODOLOGY AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The review of progress against the 2007 – 2011 Implementation Strategy was conducted by desk study of information compiled by Dr Choi Chang-Yong, Science Officer of the Secretariat, including a table summarizing the reports received. This was supplemented by the consultant’s review of EAAFP MoP documents and related literature, including a comparative review of the implementation planning and reporting processes used by selected similar initiatives. The outcomes sought through this review were as follows:

1. Review of implementation progress to date against the 2007-2011 Implementation Strategy, including a gap analysis identifying strengths and weaknesses in implementation. The gap analysis reviewed each of the 14 outcomes (and approximately 50 guidance points) to assess the extent to which the outcomes have been achieved; identified noteworthy examples of best practice as well as any significant short-comings in implementation; and made recommendations as to how more progress could be made in relation to these expected outcomes in the next strategy period. The assessment was expected to draw upon information compiled by the Secretariat, but also to incorporate information and knowledge from other sources.
2. Guidance and recommendations for formulation of the Implementation Strategy 2012-2016, informed by the review of progress, gap analysis, and comparative review of similar initiatives, including:
 - a) Priority actions to be undertaken to address identified weaknesses in implementation
 - b) More detailed steps or mechanisms needed to achieve the desired outcomes
 - c) New elements beyond the Implementation Strategy 2007-2011
 - d) Refinement of guidance points that are not sufficiently clear or precise
 - e) Additional guidance points, indicators and outcomes that would facilitate measurement of implementation progress

The main deliverables were:

- 1) The review report, and a subsequent synthesis document incorporating feedback from the Implementation Strategy Review Workshop
- 2) Facilitation of the Implementation Strategy Review Workshop in conjunction with the Task Force leader and the EAAFP Secretariat. Apart from reviewing the outputs of the consultant, and identifying any outstanding tasks or outputs in need of refinement, the workshop made recommendations as to priority areas of work for attention during the next strategy period. A summary report was produced on the workshop.
- 3) Proposed Outcomes and Key Result Areas for the next Implementation Strategy, based on suggested revisions and preliminary comments from the workshop.
- 4) A preambular section to the Implementation Strategy that explains the roles and functions of the various EAAFP bodies, emphasising the importance of national partnerships as key mechanisms for strategy implementation.

ANNEX 3: COVERAGE AND CONSTRAINTS

The first EAAFP Implementation Strategy was adopted at MoP1 in November 2006. While this spanned the five years from 2007 to 2011, it was only at MoP2 in November 2007 that a draft reporting template was introduced and the Partners agreed to annual implementation reporting, with reports to be submitted 6 weeks in advance of the following MoP. The reporting template was simplified and circulated to partners before MoP3 in November 2008. While some reports had been submitted in time for MoP4 in February 2010, some difficulties in its use were reported and the meeting agreed to *conduct review and further development of the EAAFP Reporting Template (Partner annual reports to MoP) to accommodate issues raised by users*. At MoP5 in December 2010, the Secretariat's Science Officer presented a summary of analysis of Partner Reports received from seven Partners about their activities during the reporting period (Feb-Dec 2010). The reporting template is available on the EAAFP website at: <http://www.eaaflyway.net/5th-meeting.php>

The above protracted process to develop and refine the reporting format impacted the reporting coverage during the review period, with no reports available from the Secretariat for the first year (2007). As reports for 2011 were not yet due at the time of this review (they will be submitted in time for MOP 6 in early 2012), the annual reports considered during this review cover the years 2008 (5 reports), 2009 (9) and 2010 (7), totalling 21 reports from 13 respondents (see **Table 1**). The information available through this reporting progress was incomplete and patchy. Therefore this review of implementation has had to be supported by additional information as far as possible.

Table 1. Status of annual implementation report submission 2008-2010					
Partner	Date Endorsed*	Implementation Reports Submitted**			
		2008	2009	2010	Total
Countries (14)					
Australia	6/11/2006	1		1	2
Bangladesh	3/6/2010				0
Cambodia	13/11/2007	1			1
China	17/3/2008			1	1
Indonesia	6/11/2006	1	1	1	3
Japan	6/11/2006		1	1	2
Mongolia	3/12/2010				0
New Zealand	18/9/2011				0
Philippines	6/11/2006	1	1	1	3
Republic of Korea	6/11/2006				0
Russian Federation	6/11/2006		1		1
Singapore	6/11/2006				0
Thailand	8/9/2010				0
USA	6/11/2006				0
Inter-governmental Organizations (3)					
Convention on Migratory Species Secretariat	6/11/2006				0

REVIEW OF THE EAAFP IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY 2007-2011 – SYNTHESIS

UN Food and Agriculture Organization	6/11/2008		1		1
Ramsar Convention Secretariat	6/11/2006				0
Non Governmental Organizations (9)					
Australasian Wader Studies Group	6/11/2006	1	1		2
BirdLife International	9/11/2006				0
International Crane Foundation	6/11/2006		1		1
IUCN	6/11/2006				0
Miranda Naturalists' Trust	18/5/2010			1	1
Wetlands International	6/11/2006				0
Wild Bird Society of Japan	18/7/2007				0
Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust	21/1/2010		1	1	2
World Wide Fund for Nature	6/11/2006				0
Others					
Anatidae Working Group			1		1
TOTAL (26 Partners)		5	9	7	21
<i>* Source: EAAFP Partnership Document v7 (indicates when the Partner applied to join EAAFP)</i>					
<i>**Source: EAAFP 2011. Overall Survey Results 2008-2010</i>					

ANNEX 4: STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW

This review section of the report was structured as follows for each outcome of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy, as summarized in the synthesis:

- Assessment of progress by objective, outcome and related guidance points*
- Notable responses and other advice (where available, and if not included in other points)
- Strengths – including notable examples of best practice
- Weaknesses – especially significant shortcomings in implementation
- Recommendations for priority actions to address weaknesses and steps or mechanisms needed to strengthen progress towards outcomes during the next strategy period
- Recommendations for outcome indicators for the next implementation strategy

**The questions under each outcome – they are not indicators or outputs and are not directly addressed in the reporting template in some cases.*

ANNEX 5: REFERENCES

Convention on Migratory Species Secretariat 2011. Guidelines on the Integration of Migratory Species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and Other Outcomes from CBD COP10. [CMS COP10 Resolution 10.18](#)

EAAFP 2007. Implementation Strategy for the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership: 2007-2011. <http://www.eaaflyway.net/implementation.php>

EAAFP 2011. Partnership for the Conservation of Migratory Waterbirds and the Sustainable Use of their Habitats in the East Asian – Australasian Flyway. Version 7. <http://www.eaaflyway.net/partnership-document.php> accessed 22 August 2011.

EAAFP CEPA Working Group 2011. Draft CEPA Strategy for the East Asia – Australasian Flyway Partnership. Unpublished draft document. 3pp.

EAAFP Secretariat 2011. Issues Identified in the Review of the Implementation Strategy for the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership: 2007 – 2011. Unpublished Report.

EAAFP Secretariat 2011. Overall Survey Results 2008-2010. Unpublished data on EAAFP Annual Implementation Reports.

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module (integrated with the World Database on Protected Areas website): <http://www.wdpa.org/ME/Default.aspx>

Ramsar Convention Secretariat 2010. The Changwon Declaration on Human Well-being and Wetlands. Ramsar Resolution X.3. http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-resolutions-of-10th/main/ramsar/1-31-107%5E21247_4000_0

Scott, D.A. & Poole, C.M. 1989. A status overview of Asian wetlands. Asian Wetland Bureau, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.