

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 06, 2018 2:39:36 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 2:04:04 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 120.51.39.250

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Crane

Q2 2. Type of Partner

Respondent skipped this question

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

Name	Yan Xun
Position	Chair of Working Group
Address	18 Hepingli, Beijing, China
Email	yanxun@forestry.gov.cn

Q4 Person 2 (if needed)

Name	Kim Jin Han
Position	Vice Chair of Working Group
Email	birdkr@korea.kr

Q5 Person 3 (if needed)

Name	Simba Chan
Position	Coordinator of Working Group
Address	1F Unizo Kakigara-cho Kitajima Bldg, Nihonbashi Kakigaracho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan
Email	simba.chan@birdlife.org
Phone	81-3-62062941

Q6 Person 4 (if needed)

Respondent skipped this question

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

Name	Simba Chan
Position	Coordinator of Working Group
Address	1F Unizo Kakigara-cho Kitajima Bldg, Nihonbashi Kakigaracho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan
Email	simba.chan@birdlife.org
Phone	81-3-62062941

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 | bring all important sites in NE Asia together |
| b | inviting the DPRK to the Flyway Network |
| c | identification of the importance of avoiding over-concentration of wintering birds |
| d | empowering network site managers |
| e | training of younger generation of researchers and conservationists in NE Asia |
-

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| a | communication between different countries (language) |
| b | searching for supporting funds |
-

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| a | develop a closer communication network between sites |
| b | training course to site managers |
| c | awareness activities at important sites |
| d | identify more network sites esp in the DPRK |
-

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

the species group approach of the Flyway Network should be reconsidered.

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

Better coordination and communication

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

Need to focus more on Network Sites but not 'policy'

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:
Mundok is the best example

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)

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

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? **Not applicable**

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? **Partly**

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? **Yes**

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? **Not applicable**

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) **Yes**

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) **Not applicable**

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**
