

## #24

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 01, 2018 10:54:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 01, 2018 11:11:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:17:05  
**IP Address:** 62.21.255.243

---

## Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Avian Influenza 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>Taej Mundkur</b>
Position	<b>Co-Chair</b>
Address	<b>Wetlands International</b>
Email	<b>taej.mundkur@wetlands.org</b>
Phone	<b>+31614987324</b>

---

**Q4** Person 2 (if needed)

Name	<b>Scott Newman</b>
Position	<b>Co-chair</b>
Address	<b>FAO</b>
Email	<b>scott.newman@fao.org</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

Name	<b>Taej Mundkur</b>
Address	<b>Wetlands International</b>
Email	<b>taej.mundkur@wetlands.org</b>
Phone	<b>+31614987324</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 **The WG has been primarily a mechanism for sharing information on AI and wild birds within the regional network, with the egroup being the main means of communications. Through this we have shared timely updates, particularly from Japan and South Korea**

---

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

a **Representation does not cover the whole EAAFP region (including areas where AI is prevalent in wild birds (Russia, mainland China, Taiwan, Viet Nam)**

b **Limited time availability by the current co-chairs (Taej Mundkur of Wetlands International and Scott Newman of FAO) to support and promote activities of the WG.**

---

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

a **To be determined in consultation with the group, and Partnership on perceived priorities to support their work.**

---

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

The Secretariat has been supportive in updating the website and continued support in this is welcomed.

---

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

Active participation from Partners, Working Group and Task Force representatives are welcomed on the Working Group.

---

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

Taej Mundkur, current co-chair proposes to step down at MOP10 and continue as a member. A replacement will need to be elected.

---

## 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) **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**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) **Respondent skipped this question**

---

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

---

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

---

## 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:  
AI related guidelines are being made available on the EAAF website

---

**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) **No,**  
Optional text box for further information:  
All related guidelines are being made available on the EAAF 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**

---

**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? **No**

---

**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?

**Not applicable**

---

**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?

**In progress**

Optional text box for further information:

Through collecting location information on disease reports, the potential threat to Network and potential network sites have been shared within the group.

---

**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**

---

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)

**Not applicable**

---

**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, EAAF WGs)

**Not applicable**

---

**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)

**Not applicable**

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)

**Not applicable**

**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)

**Not applicable**

**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)

**In progress**

Optional text box for further information:

The WG has mainly focussed on sharing information on outbreaks of AI in wild birds from countries in the region. We have not aimed to develop any projects during this intersessional period.

**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)

**In progress**

Optional text box for further information:

The WG has mainly focussed on sharing information on outbreaks of AI in wild birds from countries in the region and sharing latest research world wide on AI and migratory habits that have linked AI to wild birds, latest genetic studies on HPAI, etc. Optional text box for further information The egroup has been the main means of communication and a record of interaction demonstrates an increase between November to April, when number of incidences of disease outbreaks is higher.

**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)

**In progress**

Optional text box for further information:

Available guidance has been uploaded on the website of the AI WG page on the EAAFP website

---

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)

Respondent skipped this question

---

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

**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