

## #25

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 01, 2018 11:09:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 01, 2018 11:50:20 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:40:25  
**IP Address:** 164.159.60.2

## Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Shorebird Working Group

**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>Ding Li Yong</b>
Position	<b>Shorebird Working Group Rep/ BirdLife Flyways Coordinator (EAAF)</b>
Email	<b>dingli.yong@birdlife.org</b>
Phone	<b>+65 6479 3089</b>

**Q4** Person 2 (if needed)

Name	<b>Jonathan Slaght</b>
Position	<b>Russia &amp; NE Asia Coordinator</b>
Address	<b>2300 Southern Blvd, Bronx, NY, USA</b>
Email	<b>jslaght@wcs.org</b>
Phone	<b>+1-612-205-7784</b>

**Q5** Person 3 (if needed)

Name	<b>Yuri Gerasimov</b>
Position	<b>Senior Researcher, Pacific Geographical Institute of Russian Academy of Science</b>
Address	<b>Koroleva str., 29-5? Peteropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy, 683009,</b>
Email	<b>bird@mail.kamchatks.ru</b>
Phone	<b>+79098386670</b>

**Q6** Person 4 (if needed)

Name	<b>Mohammad Shamsul Azam</b>
Position	<b>Deputy Chief Conservator of Forests</b>
Address	<b>Bangladesh Forest Department, Bana Bhaban, Agargaon, Dhaka, Bangladesh</b>
Email	<b>shamsforest@gmail.com</b>
Phone	<b>+88-01761494656</b>

---

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

Name	<b>Richard Lanctot</b>
Position	<b>Shorebird Working Group Chair</b>
Address	<b>USFWS, 1011 E. Tudor Road, MS 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99503</b>
Email	<b>Richard_lanctot@fws.gov</b>
Phone	<b>1-907-312-4859 (c), 1-907-786-3609 (w)</b>

---

## 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 | <b>Development of a broad-based guidance and vision to conserve key migratory waterbird sites in the EAAF</b>  |
| b | <b>Strengthening engagement with key partners (Ramsar Secretariat, CBD, CMS, Wetlands International) to develop initiatives to conserve and restore coastal wetlands</b> |
| c | <b>Identified and built capacity for local advocacy and development of management plans for key shorebird sites</b>  |
| d | <b>Conducting regular monitoring of shorebirds</b>   |
| e | <b>Conservation of threaten species like Spoonbill Sandpiper, Great Knot, Far Eastern Curlew etc</b>   |
-

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

- a **The voluntary, non-binding nature of the EAAFP is a challenge to implementation as it does not create any legally-binding obligations on Partners**
- b **No stable funding base and inadequate staff to support activities**
- c **Securing government buy-in to the EAAF in general and its activities**
- d **The infrequent meetings and the various authoritative levels of people attending the MoPs is not helpful for implementation**
- e **International diplomacy**

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

- a **Ensure smooth implementation of the ASEAN Flyway Network Project, to identify key sites (including potential and new FNS) for migratory shorebirds in the ASEAN region, and advocate for their long-term conservation**
- b **Conservation of threatened species and protection of key stopover sites**
- c **Standardization and implementation of regular site monitoring**
- d **collaborative research using emerging technologies**
- e **Better connection between EAAFP secretariat and working groups/task forces**

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

Secretariat should more focus on coordination between country focal person and working groups or task forces.

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

Task Force/Working Groups can ensure better coordination between research/survey work being done and the country focal person.

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

We need to implement a better process for ensuring partners commit and produce relevant products between MoPs

**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:

We have worked closely with colleagues in EAAFP, respective country governments and International NGOs (Wetlands International) to shortlist sites for resources to be focused on under the ASEAN Flyway Network Project. We are also working to promote relevant sites within the Yellow Sea for the World Heritage nomination.

**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)

**No**

**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:

Some of our SWG members produce quarterly newsletters that emphasize these points.

**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)

**Yes (please indicate the number of management plans in optional text box below)**

Optional text box for further information:

Wildlife Conservation Society, working with the SWG and US federal agencies plan to conduct additional studies at the Qupaluk FNS in Alaska. These studies will ultimately help in the development of management plans.

**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:

We are working with the Ramsar Secretariat, the Yellow Sea/West Sea Working Group (coordinated by IUCN) and Indo-Burma Ramsar Regional Initiative. New Zealand and PMNT are advising DPRK on important sites on west coast, and also sending people to China each year to survey shorebirds

**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)

**Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:

We believe so or at least in part.

**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:

Members have produced short articles for the EAAFP website

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:

The SWG members generally believe so.

**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:

The SWG collaborated closely with the Secretariat and other working groups/task forces of the EAAFP. The SWG also collaborates and supports other international and national groups such as the International Wader Study Group, Western Hemisphere Shorebird Group, Australia Wader Study Group, and the Russian Working Group on Waders.

**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:

The Alaska Shorebird Group met for two days in Anchorage in December 2017, with a principal goal of updating the state shorebird conservation plan. During this meeting, an update on the EAAFP was presented. Russia reports 2 national meetings being held.

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:

Birds New Zealand has continued to conduct biannual national counts of migratory waterbirds to contribute to EAAFP population estimates. The SWG chair participated in a Russian-focused international migratory bird tracking workshop in Ternei, Russia.

**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?

**No,**

**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,**

Optional text box for further information:

New Zealand partner has supported the work of Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust in DPR Korea to identify key sites for migratory waterbirds. The SWG Chair in coordination with Wildlife Conservation Society, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Russian biologists, and Manomet conducted surveys for Spoon-billed Sandpipers in NW Alaska. Important breeding and migration sites in Alaska were identified in the recent revision of the Alaska Shorebird Conservation Plan.

**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 EAAF website to illustrate examples of best practice mitigation measures?

**No**

**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:

Members of the SWG participated in monitoring of shorebirds at priority shorebird breeding, staging, and wintering areas (see details below). • Members of the Alaska Shorebird Group, in coordination with Wildlife Conservation Society, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Russian biologists, and Manomet, conducted surveys for Spoon-billed Sandpipers in NW Alaska. • The SWG shared shorebird count data from EAAF sites with the Asian Waterbird Census. • In Australia monitoring of non breeding populations are led by BirdLife Australia and their Shorebirds 2020 Monitoring project

<http://www.birdlife.org.au/projects/shorebirds-2020>. This is supplemented by AWSG's summer and winter surveys (MYSMA) of the important shorebird areas of North-west Australia. • Shorebirds 2020 coordinates twice annual counts of a proscribed set of shorebird sites. This is a particularly valuable resource for governments and land managers. • The February data collected in Shorebirds 2020 is shared with the Asian Waterbird Census to enable revision of population flyway estimates and the identification of internationally important sites. • Global Flyway Network has conducted valuable surveys on the Luannan Coast, Bohai Bay, China for 6 weeks during northward migration every year since 2010 in close collaboration with Chinese universities and WWF-China. • Surveys and other components on the Yalu Jiang and parts of North Korea are in the Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists' Trust report. The Fuller Lab at University of Queensland continues to publish valuable information on shorebird population trends and changes in tidal habitats in the Yellow Sea region.

**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)

**No**

**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:

Many members of the SWG, working via national governments, NGOs, etc. have contributed information. Some of this has been through the EAAFP website.



## 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:

Members of the SWG participated in conducting surveys, capturing and marking birds, and conducting tracking studies throughout Australia, New Zealand, Alaska, Russia, China, Singapore, South Korea, Mongolia, and perhaps other countries. This information helped expand databases on population estimates, stopover duration, biometrics, moult and age structure and survival rate studies. Focal species include Red Knot, Great Knot, Whimbrel, Dunlin, and Spoon-billed Sandpipers. SWG members participated in the development, promotion, and implementation of the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative's EAAF plan. The SWG collaborated closely with the Global Flyways Network, the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative, other university, NGO and governmental groups in fly-wide migratory connectivity studies on a variety of shorebird species. A Colour Flagging Protocol, resighting database and Facebook site are maintained to document resightings of birds by a number of groups throughout the EAAF. Members of the Alaska Shorebird Group continue to conduct research studies on shorebirds; see annual summary of projects, which includes papers published, at [https://www.fws.gov/alaska/mbsp/mbm/shorebirds/working\\_group.htm](https://www.fws.gov/alaska/mbsp/mbm/shorebirds/working_group.htm).

**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:

The SWG Chair worked with Russian Biologists to get a small EAAFP grant to begin a study on the Nordmann's Greenshank. We are continuing to develop this into a long-term breeding ecology program.

**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,**

Optional text box for further information:

The SWG chair has provided comments related to marking Nordmann's Greenshank and Redshanks in Russia.

## 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:

Shorebirds have been sampled for avian malaria on Alaska breeding sites. Other work has occurred in Latin America.

**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)

**Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:

The SWG shared and disseminated information via a listserv set up specifically for the SWG in 2015. See <https://www.fws.gov/lists/listinfo/eaafswg>

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

,

Optional text box for further information:

There has been at least one training in monitoring and at least one training in conservation.

**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)**

,  
Optional text box for further information:

SWG members began a study on Nordmann's Greenshank in collaboration with Russian biologists and Wildlife Conservation Society. Shorebird enthusiasts from Asia continue to come to Alaska for training at the Utqiaġvik (formerly Barrow), Alaska shorebird breeding ecology study site. Spoon-billed Sandpiper work continues in Russia. Australian biologists have spearheaded work on the Far-Eastern Curlew, with efforts starting up throughout the flyway.

**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,**

Optional text box for further information:

Shorebird Working Group members have been very active in the Spoon-billed Sandpiper and Far Eastern Curlew Task Force teams. A new effort is starting on the Nordmann's Greenshank.

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