

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, September 16, 2018 7:53:43 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, September 16, 2018 8:49:39 AM
Time Spent: 00:55:56
IP Address: 60.234.205.74

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

Q1 1. Name of Partner, Working Group or Task Force

Pukokokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust

Q2 2. Type of Partner**International Non-Governmental Organisations****Q3** 3. Name, title and contact details of designated contact person(s) Person 1

Name	David Lawrie
Position	International liaison
Address	52B Mill Road, RD 2, Pukekohe, New Zealand 2677
Email	lawrie@ps.gen.nz
Phone	+64 9 23 88407

Q4 Person 2 (if needed)**Respondent skipped this question****Q5** Person 3 (if needed)**Respondent skipped this question****Q6** Person 4 (if needed)

Email	gradys@xtra.co.nz
-------	--------------------------

Q7 4. Name, title and contact details of the person completing this form

Name	David Lawrie
------	---------------------

Page 3: B. General Summary of Implementation: Progress and Challenges

Q8 1. What have been the most successful aspects of your implementation of the Partnership? (up to five points)

- | | |
|---|---|
| a | continuation of shorebird survey in DPRK |
| b | advocacy to about 10,000 visitors to center |
| c | The Flock Advocacy project |
| d | International collaboration with China and DPRK |
| e | increasing interest in shorebirds and their plight in NZ |
-

Q9 2. What have been the main challenges in your implementation of the Partnership? (up to five points)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| a | lack of finance |
| b | lack of experienced volunteers |
| c | isolation in NZ |
-

Q10 3. What are the future priorities for your implementation of the Partnership? (up to five points)

- | | |
|---|--|
| a | increasing advocacy |
| b | finalisation of DPRK surveys |
| c | achieve more protection on Yellow Sea stopover points |
-

Q11 4. Do you have any recommendations on the support needed from the EAAFP Secretariat?

Respondent skipped this question

Q12 5. Do you have any recommendations on the support needed from other Partners, Working Groups or Task Forces?

Respondent skipped this question

Q13 6. Do you have any other general comments on implementation of the Partnership?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q14 1.1.1 Have you been involved in developing a list of internationally important sites to support the life cycles of the Flyway's waterbirds? (Secretariat, WGs, INGOs and/or Monitoring Task Force)

Yes,
Optional text box for further information:
providing information to Government partner

Q15 1.1.2 Have you been involved in prioritization of the above sites (1.1) for nomination in the FSN and to review/revise this list at each successive MoP? (Secretariat / Consultant / Monitoring Task Force)

Yes,
Optional text box for further information:
assistance to NP during National meeting

Q16 1.1.3a How many new Flyway Network Sites have you been involved in designating since the last reporting period? (National Government Partners)

Not applicable

Q17 1.1.3b How many new Flyway Network Sites do you intend to designate between MOP10 and MOP11? (National Government Partners)

Not applicable

Page 5: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q18 1.2.1 Have you helped to make available management guidelines and case studies to enhance the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats, emphasizing participatory management processes and benefits to local communities? (CEPA WG, Secretariat, with support from all Partners)

Yes,
Optional text box for further information:
through our quarterly newsletter and participation in the CEPA workshop

Q19 1.2.2a During the reporting period, how many management plans for FNS and other internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds have you been involved in developing, implementing, review or updating? (National Government Partners; Subnational: Local Government with support from INGOs)

Yes,
Optional text box for further information:
our local site

Q20 1.2.2b Between now and MOP11, how many management plans for FNS and other internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds do you intend to develop, implement, review or updating? (National Government Partners; Subnational: Local Government with support from INGOs)

Not applicable

Q21 1.2.3 Have you helped to develop collaboration with other international initiatives relating to the management of migratory waterbird habitat? (Secretariat, INGOs, National Government Partners)

Yes,
Optional text box for further information:
hosting teams from China reserves and government agencies to show how we operate as a model

Q22 1.2.4 Have you helped to develop model projects at Flyway Network Sites to address key threatening processes, social and economic needs, and contributing to sound integration of wetland biodiversity conservation and sustainable development that benefits local communities? (National Government Partners) **Not applicable**

Page 6: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q23 1.3.1 Are you working to mainstream migratory waterbird conservation into national policies, plans, and programmes, facilitated by National Partnerships? (National Government Partners) **Not applicable**

Q24 1.3.2 Have you been working to adapt and make available guidelines and case studies on development and impact assessment processes relevant to network sites and their catchments? (Secretariat, INGOs, National Government Partners) **Yes,**
Optional text box for further information:
developing a case for future protection of the Manukau Harbour as a site of importance in close proximity to a major human population

Page 7: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q25 2.4.1 Are you using the flyway-wide CEPA strategy at national and site levels as ongoing guidance for the awareness and communication activities of the Flyway Partnership? (All Partners) **Yes,**
Optional text box for further information:
support of Knot painting project, attendance at CEPA workshop

Q26 2.4.2 Have you been involved in the production of CEPA resources and have made these available to the Secretariat for distribution more widely? (CEPA WG, Secretariat, supported by all Partners) **Yes,**
Optional text box for further information:
case studies presented to CEPA workshop

Page 8: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q27 2.5.1 Are your Partnership activities being implemented in line with the CEPA Strategy? **Yes,**
Optional text box for further information:
through our newsletter and visitor advocacy

Q28 2.5.2a Are you working to support the development and strengthening of national and sub-regional partnerships as mechanisms for delivery of the EAAFP Implementation Strategy?

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

attend national partnership meetings and maintain regular contact with Government partner

Q29 2.5.2b If there are national and/or sub-regional partnerships, please indicate the number of meetings that have been held since the last reporting period

Number of national or sub-regional meetings held ,

Optional text box for further information:

one national during each year

Page 9: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q30 3.6.1 Have you been involved in collaboration and integration activities to increase assessment and monitoring programmes to provide scientifically sound information on the status and trends of migratory waterbird populations?

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

biannual shorebird counts with data provided, regular catching of birds for banding to enable tracking of migrations and longevitiy studies

Q31 3.6.2 Have you been involved in developing wetland assessment programmes for any of the Task Force priority regions to provide information on the status of migratory waterbird habitats?

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

shorebird counts in DPRK to identify priority areas

Q32 3.6.3 Have you been involved in gathering updated information on the status and threats to internationally important sites and to Flyway Network sites in particular?

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

DPRK survey, and support on Hebei reserve

Q33 3.6.4 Have you been involved in identifying the key threatening processes to migratory waterbirds in the EAAF, and compiling technical briefs for the EAAFP website to illustrate examples of best practice mitigation measures?

No

Page 10: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q34 3.7.1 Have you been involved in providing input or analyzing count data to identify internationally important sites and gaps for migratory waterbirds in the Flyway and inform conservation measures? (Wetlands International and BirdLife International, with input from National Government Partners and Working Groups)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:
providing count data from New Zealand

Q35 3.7.2 Have you been involved in surveys to prioritize knowledge gaps at internationally important sites and to progressively address those gaps? (National Government Partners, EAAFP WGs)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:
DPRK survey

Q36 3.7.3 Have you been involved in making data available on internationally important sites and share that data amongst Partners, such as through the EAAFP website? (Secretariat, other Partners)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:
DPRK reports and the Yalu Jiang 10 year count data report

Page 11: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q37 3.8.1 Have you been involved in implementing international collaborative research projects for migratory waterbirds to better understand the connectivity across the Flyway and inform development of the Flyway Site Network? (All Partners)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:
support for Technical Committee

Q38 3.8.2 Have you been involved in improving the knowledge base on migratory waterbirds for the three priority subregions, i.e. the Yellow Sea and Amur/Heilong Basin? (Task Forces for these regions, including relevant Government Partners)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:
Yellow Sea surveys

Q39 3.8.3 Have you been involved in reviewing and developing the Migratory Waterbird Marking Protocols for migratory waterbirds? (Task Force on Colour Marking)

Not applicable

Page 12: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q40 3.9.1 Have you been involved in international collaborative projects of surveillance programmes at Flyway Network Sites and other important sites to increase the understanding of avian influenza (and other relevant zoonotic diseases) and their impacts on migratory waterbirds? (Partners, APWG-MWAI)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:
as part of our bird catching program the birds are regularly tested by Government agencies

Q41 3.9.2 Have you been involved in enhancing the network for communication on migratory waterbirds and disease related-issues amongst environment and wildlife agencies and researchers, and other relevant partners? (APWG-MWAI)

No

Q42 3.9.3 Have you been involved in the dissemination, review or update of guidelines for improved management planning of wetlands of international importance for waterbirds, aimed at reducing the risk of disease? (Partners, APWG-MWAI)

No

Page 13: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q43 4.10.1 Have you been involved in capacity development and training programmes that address needs in the areas of migratory waterbird monitoring and conservation, habitat management, sustainable development, and communication, education and public awareness, and participatory (CEPA) methods? (All Partners)

Yes, migratory waterbird monitoring training programme (if 'Yes', please mention the number in the text box below)

,

Yes, CEPA training programme (if 'Yes', please mention the number in the text box below)

,

Optional text box for further information:

run up to 4 courses at the center each year covering these aspects

Q44 4.10.2 Have you been involved in establishing site based or national capacity building programmes to facilitate the ongoing management of migratory waterbirds and their habitats? (National Partners)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

we are enhancing areas to facilitate shorebird roost sites for the future

Page 14: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q45 5.11.1 Have you been involved in developing new, or ongoing collaborative projects across the ranges of priority species of migratory waterbirds? (All Partners)

Yes (Please indicate the number of such projects, including sister-site projects)

,

Optional text box for further information:

sister site agreement with Yalu Jiang reserve in China and joint agreement with agency in DPRK

Q46 5.11.2 Have you been involved in producing or implementing International Single Species Action Plans for globally threatened species and populations of migratory waterbirds to act as a flagship for wetland conservation? (All Partners)

Not applicable

Page 15: D. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

Q47 Country name

-

Q48 Name of FNS

Respondent skipped this question

Q49 EAAFP Site Code

Respondent skipped this question

Q50 Year of joining

Respondent skipped this question

Q51 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet?

Respondent skipped this question

Q52 2. FNS should update their Site Information Sheets (SIS) every six years. Does the Site have an update SIS (Key Result Area 1.1)?

Respondent skipped this question

Q53 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders?

Respondent skipped this question

Q54 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?

Respondent skipped this question

Q55 4b. If the site has a management plan, what is the starting date of the present Plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?

Respondent skipped this question

Q56 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)?

Respondent skipped this question

Q57 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)?

Respondent skipped this question

Q58 7. Does the Site have a regular monitoring programme to assess the status of the site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.3)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q59 8. Have the results of the monitoring on trends of the status of the site and its migratory waterbirds been shared with the EAAFP Secretariat and Partners (Key Result Area 7.3)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q60 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q61 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q62 11. Have model projects been developed at the Site with the full involvement of related national and site partnerships, to address key threatening processes, social and economic needs. (Key Result Area 2.4)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q63 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q64 13. Additional information **Respondent skipped this question**

Q65 14. Do you have any additional Sites to declare? (If you click 'Yes', another page for Flyway Network Site will be created) **No**

Page 16: D. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

Q66 Country name **Respondent skipped this question**

Q67 Name of FNS **Respondent skipped this question**

Q68 Year of joining **Respondent skipped this question**

Q69 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Respondent skipped this question**
