

#27

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, October 08, 2018 11:50:18 AM
Last Modified: Monday, October 08, 2018 3:26:14 PM
Time Spent: 03:35:56
IP Address: 115.90.93.52

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Hanns Seidel Foundation

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

Name	Dr. Bernhard Seliger
Position	Resident Representative
Address	13 Hannamdaero 20-gil, #401 (Sooyoung Bldg., Hannam-dong), Yongsan-gu, Seoul, 04419, Republic of Korea
Email	seliger@hss.or.kr
Phone	+82 2 79 05 344

Q4 Person 2 (if needed)

Respondent skipped this question

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	Felix Glenk
Position	Project manager for DPR Korea
Address	13 Hannamdaero 20-gil, #401 (Sooyoung Bldg., Hannam-dong), Yongsan-gu, Seoul, 04419, Republic of Korea
Email	glenk@hss.or.kr
Phone	+82 2 79 05 345

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 **Having another important partner (DPR Korea) along the flyway included**
 - b **New initiatives to conserve the Yellow Sea**
 - c **Increased and closer cooperation of partners along the flyway**
 - d **Increased awareness on the challenges of the flyway**
 - e **More media attention on the challenges of the flyway**
-

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

- a **Political barriers**
 - b **Lack of funding/resources**
 - c **Lack of attention on the challenges of the flyway**
 - d **Lack of awareness on the challenges of the flyway**
-

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

- a **Increased transboundary cooperation**
 - b **Increased connection of all partners of the flyway**
 - c **Yellow Sea conservation**
 - d **Reducing political barriers for successful conservation efforts**
-

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

The secretariat is doing a wonderful job coordinating and assisting partners on the flyway. However, because of the diversity of issues of challenges, efforts and projects, it is sometimes hard to get an overview about what is going on. It may be good to have an online platform where partners can present their work, or projects. It could also be used to create a publication on the status of the EAAF.

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

See above. To increase cooperation and mutual information exchange of partner, it may be good to have an online platform to check for similarities of projects, challenges, etc., in order to identify potential cooperation partners or consultants.

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

-

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)

No,

Optional text box for further information:

HSF has been supporting the accession of the DPRK to the EAAFP, and a variety of activities in the country, including research of potential Network Sites, of which two are now better analyzed, and also supported the National Wetland Directory of the DPRK, in which more than 50 wetlands and conservation priorities are presented.

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)

Please indicate number in optional text box below

Optional text box for further information:

2, Support of scientific research at Mundok and Kumya Flyway Network Site, which have been already designated, but only formally without any conservation actions. In 2018 both sites have been confirmed as FNS.

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)

Not applicable

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:

1, For Mundok Ramsar Site a visit in May has brought together national government representatives, representatives of the local management board, and international experts to discuss about better conservation efforts of the site, including the update of the management plan. For more than 52 wetlands in the country a first assessment has been conducted and will be published at the Ramsar COP. It was developed and financed with the support of HSF and other partners.

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,

Optional text box for further information:

A first assessment has been conducted of the main wetlands in the DPRK with the support of HSF, and it can not be said at this point how many of these sites may be designated as FNS.

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:

All work on the Korean Peninsula by HSF has been conducted with the support of other NGOs (Birds Korea, Miranda Trust, etc.), the EAAFP secretariat or other international initiatives (e.g. Ramsar Regional Centre – East Asia) and National (RO Korea and DPR Korea) as well as other partners (e.g. IUCN, Beijing Forestry University)

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,

Optional text box for further information:

A project to address threats at the Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve, both in biological and social terms, is currently developed. It also necessarily intends to improve the livelihood of local populations.

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:

HSF has supported the assessment of wetlands mainly in the DPRK (e.g. at Mundok and Rason Migratory Bird Reserve, but also other, not yet protected sites, along the East and West Coast). There are already discussions underway how to create guidelines and policies to conserve these sites better.

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:

Raising awareness using CEPA is one main part of the work of HSF on the Korean Peninsula.

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:

Leaflets for the Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve and the Rason Migratory Bird Reserve, as well as the Baers Pochard and the Scaly-sided Merganser have been produced and distributed in the DPRK, as well as be shared with the EAAFP Secretariat and other partners. At the Rason International Trade Exhibition HSF presents about the EAAFP every year. Videos have been produced on the work of HSF on the flyway, as well as media articles and reports supported about birds, biodiversity and conservation on the flyway.

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?

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

E.g. participation at the EAAFP CEPA workshop in Manila, as well as support of a delegation from DPRK to participate. HSF is also supporting the Yellow Sea Working Group as a mechanism to conserve wetlands in the Yellow Sea, and CEPA is one issue to be addressed there by the government bodies and international / national partners.

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,

Optional text box for further information:

HSF has supported research activities in South and North Korea, especially related to the inner-Korean border area (e.g. Baeknyeongdo and Goseong), as well as on the West Sea (e.g. Mundok) and East Sea of the DPRK (e.g. Kumgangsan, Rason). This has contributed to the publication of the Wetland Directory of the DPRK in 2018, as well as to the designation of Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve and Rason Migratory Bird Reserve as Ramsar Sites of International Importance

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:

Espacially Yellow Sea.

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:

Support of the Wetland Directory of the DPRK, and research activities in both FNS in DPRK (Mundok and Kumya)

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) **Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:
Provision of data on wetlands in DPRK.

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 WG) **Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:
HSF has supported research activities in South and North Korea, especially related to the inner-Korean border area (e.g. Baeknyeongdo and Goseong), as well as on the West Sea (e.g. Mundok) and East Sea of the DPRK (e.g. Kumgangsan, Rason). This has contributed to the publication of the Wetland Directory of the DPRK in 2018, as well as to the designation of Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve and Rason Migratory Bird Reserve as Ramsar Sites of International Importance.

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 EAAF website? (Secretariat, other Partners) **Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:
All activities of HSF are uploaded on the HSF website and Facebook, and shared with EAAF and other partners.

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:

HSF has supported research activities in South and North Korea, especially related to the inner-Korean border area (e.g. Baeknyeongdo and Goseong), as well as on the West Sea (e.g. Mundok) and East Sea of the DPRK (e.g. Kumgangsan, Rason). This has contributed to the publication of the Wetland Directory of the DPRK in 2018, as well as to the designation of Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve and Rason Migratory Bird Reserve as Ramsar Sites of International Importance. These activities have been conducted with international partners from the EAAFP (e.g. Miranda Trust, IUCN, etc.) and national partners in South Korea and North Korea

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:

Support of the Yellow Sea Working Group, and activities along the West Sea (e.g. Baeknyeongdo, Mundok, etc.)

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)

No

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)

No

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

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

Yes, sustainable development 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:
6,5,2,2,1

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:
Support of the related Ministries and research institutes in the DPRK.

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:

3, Yellow Sea Working Group Initiative and training for site managers of countries adjacent to the Yellow Sea Rason Migratory Bird Reserve, Capacity-building, awareness raising and research Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve, Capacity-building, awareness raising and research

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)

In progress

,
Optional text box for further information:

Baers Bochard Meeting at Beijing Forestry University Focus on Scaly-sided Merganser and Spoon-billed Sandpiper in DPRK from 2018 ongoing

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

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, If you click 'No', the page will be closed)

Respondent skipped this question

Q66 Country name	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q67 Name of FNS	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q68 Year of joining	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q69 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q70 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
<hr/>	
Q71 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q72 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q73 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
<hr/>	
Q74 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q75 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
Q76 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
<hr/>	
Q77 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
<hr/>	
Q78 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
<hr/>	

Q79 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q80 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**

Q81 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q82 13. Additional information **Respondent skipped this question**

Q83 14. Do you have any additional Sites to declare? (If you click 'Yes', another page for Flyway Network Site will be created) **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 17: D. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

Q84 Country name

DPR Korea

Q85 Name of FNS

Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve

Q86 Year of joining

N/A

Q87 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **No**

Q88 2. FNS should update their Site Information Sheets (SIS) every six years. Does the Site have an update SIS (Key Result Area 1.1)? **No**

Q89 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **Yes**

Q90 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **Yes**

Q91 4b. If the site has a management plan, what is the starting date of the present Plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?

N/A

Q92 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)? **Yes**

Q93 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **No**

Q94 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)? **Yes**

Q95 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)? **Yes**

Q96 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Yes**

Q97 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Yes**

Q98 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)? **No**

Q99 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **Yes**

Q100 13. Additional information **Respondent skipped this question**

Q101 14. Do you have any additional Sites to declare? (If you click 'Yes', another page for Flyway Network Site will be created) **Yes**

Page 18: D. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

Q102 Country nameDPR Korea

Q103 Name of FNSRason Migratory Bird Reserve

Q104 Year of joiningN/A

Q105 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **No**

Q106 2. FNS should update their Site Information Sheets (SIS) every six years. Does the Site have an update SIS (Key Result Area 1.1)? **No**

Q107 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **No**

Q108 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **No**

Q109 4b. If the site has a management plan, what is the starting date of the present Plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?N/A

Q110 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)? **No**

Q111 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **No**

Q112 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)? **Yes**

Q113 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)? **Yes**

Q114 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Yes**

Q115 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Yes**

Q116 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)? **No**

Q117 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **No**

Q118 13. Additional information **Respondent skipped this question**

Q119 14. Do you have any additional Sites to declare? (If you click 'Yes', another page for Flyway Network Site will be created) **No**

Page 19: D. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

Q120 Country name **Respondent skipped this question**

Q121 Name of FNS **Respondent skipped this question**

Q122 Year of joining **Respondent skipped this question**

Q123 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q124 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**
