

## #10

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, September 11, 2018 1:17:27 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, September 11, 2018 1:31:49 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:22  
**IP Address:** 124.47.132.150

## Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Far Eastern Curlew Task Force

**Q2** 2. Type of Partner

Respondent skipped this question

**Q3** 3. Name, title and contact details of designated contact person(s) Person 1

Name	<b>Dr Mark Carey</b>
Position	<b>Chair – Australian Government</b>
Address	<b>Po Box 787, Canberra, ACT, 2601, AUSTRALIA</b>
Email	<b>mark.carey@environment.gov.au</b>
Phone	<b>+ 61 2 62741873</b>

**Q4** Person 2 (if needed)

Name	<b>BirdLife Australia</b>
Position	<b>Task Force Coordinator</b>
Address	<b>Suite 2-05, 60 Leicester Street, Carlton VIC 3053 AUSTRALIA</b>
Email	<b>dan.weller@birdlife.org.au</b>
Phone	<b>+61 3 9347 0757</b>

**Q5** Person 3 (if needed)

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Person 4 (if needed)

Respondent skipped this question

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

Respondent skipped this question

## 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 **Raising awareness of the threats to migratory waterbirds and their habitats, such as the Far Eastern Curlew.**
  - b **Promoting World Migratory Bird Day in the Flyway.**
  - c **Promoting World Curlew Day.**
- 

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

- a **Lack of resources to implement high priority actions outlined in the Single Species Action Plan.**
  - b **Lack of coordination and communication amongst Task Force members, and other relevant working group and task forces.**
- 

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

- a **Greater effort to enhance the coordination and communication amongst Task Force members and between other relevant EAAFP working groups and task forces. We recommend this be facilitated by the Technical Committee.**
  - b **Seeking access to resources to fund high priority actions outlined in the Single Species Action Plan.**
- 

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

Assistance with the development and/or distribution of CEPA materials, translation and social media support.

---

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

Greater participation from Partners in the activities of the task force.

---

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

Working groups and task forces should have a simple plan that outlines their upcoming intersessional work, and priorities attached to those activities, but it should not be an elaborate document. These tasks can be included in the EAAFP's intersessional work plan. Species focused Task Forces could prioritise and report against their Single Species Action Plan (if it has been developed and adopted). Working groups and task forces need financial and organisational assistance from the Secretariat and Partners to advance their intersessional work. Working groups and task forces would benefit from the support of the Technical Committee to advance their intersessional work. Working groups and task forces would also benefit from having a standard reporting template, different to the Partner reporting template that seeks to highlight key achievements/activities undertaken in the previous intersessional period.

---

## 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**

**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**

**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**

**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) **Not applicable**

**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**

**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) **Yes**

---

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**

---

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**

---

**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**

---

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**

---

**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? **Not applicable**

---

**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 **Not applicable**

---

## 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**

---

**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? **Not applicable**

---

**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**

---

**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? **Yes**

---

## 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**

---

**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**

---

**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**

---

## 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**

---

**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**

---

**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) **Yes**

---

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) **Not applicable**

---

**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) **Not applicable**

---

**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) **Not applicable**

---

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) **Not applicable**

---

**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) **Not applicable**

---

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)**

---

**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) **Yes**

---

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

**Q47** Country name **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**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**

---