

#28

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 15, 2018 3:56:44 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 15, 2018 5:46:49 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:50:05  
**IP Address:** 203.217.176.85

---

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

MALAYSIA

**Q2** 2. Type of Partner**National  
Governments****Q3** 3. Name, title and contact details of designated contact person(s) Person 1

Name	<b>Haji Zolkipli bin Mohamad Aton</b>
Position	<b>Chief Executive Officer</b>
Address	<b>Sarawak Forestry Corporation</b>
Email	<b>zolaton@sarawakforestry.com</b>
Phone	<b>(+6) 082 610088</b>

---

**Q4** Person 2 (if needed)

Name	<b>Abang Arabi Abang Aimran</b>
Position	<b>Deputy General Manager</b>
Address	<b>Sarawak Forestry Corporation</b>
Email	<b>arabi@sarawakforestry.com</b>
Phone	<b>(+6) 082 610088</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>Sim Lee Kheng</b>
Position	<b>Biologist</b>
Address	<b>Sarawak Forestry Corporation</b>
Email	<b>lksim@sarawakforestry.com</b>
Phone	<b>(+6) 082 610088</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>Documentation</b>
b	<b>Dossier compilation</b>
c	<b>Collaboration with stakeholders</b>
d	<b>Proposal to gazette protected areas</b>

---

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

a	<b>Stakeholders' participation</b>
b	<b>. Lack of sustainable funding</b>
c	<b>Legislation - different jurisdiction</b>

---

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

a	<b>Effective implementation of dossier</b>
b	<b>Designation of new sites</b>

---

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

Capacity building and expertise support

---

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

? Capacity building and expertise support.

---

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

Strengthening support from partners in the implementation process.

---

## 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:

Yes, initially. Sarawak has proposed three more Flyway Network Sites ie. Kuala Baram, Terusan and Pulau Bruit-Patok National Park, where a large number of migratory waterbirds are recorded.

**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:

1- For Sarawak, it's Bako Buntal Bay which is the first site for the state as well as for Malaysia/country.

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

**Please indicate number in optional text box below** ,

Optional text box for further information:

2

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:

1.Stakeholders consultation pre- and post-nomination of the site (Bako Buntal Bay).2.Migratory Waterbird counts with NGOs, other stakeholders at feeding and roosting sites.  
3.Launching of a structure/monument at prime area (Buntal Bay) involving stakeholders & local communities

**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:

The drafting of Site Management Plan (Bako Buntal Bay East Asian-Australasian Flyway Network Site-Concepts for Sustainable Use). A digital copy is available at the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership website.

**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:

Reason: Three proposed flyway sites have not been nominated yet.

**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)

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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)

**Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:

Under National Policy on Biological Diversity 2016-2025, waterbird conservation is spelled under Goal 2, Target 3, where it is targetted by 2025, biodiversity conservation has been mainstreamed into national development planning and sectoral policies and plans.

**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)

**Partly,**

Optional text box for further information:

Partly because stakeholders consultation has been ongoing since pre-nomination of the site (BBB).

**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:

Yes, a small number of flyers/pamphlets were produced in collaboration with Federal Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment of Malaysia for MOP8 in 2015. The flyers were on migratory waterbirds in Bako Buntal Bay.

---

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:

Programs such as Honorary Wildlife Rangers programs and awareness talks have been conducted on site and surrounding areas.

**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:

Yes, we are in consultation with Country focal person on any activities and reporting for MOPs.

**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,**

Optional text box for further information:

No meeting with country focal point so far. Consultation is via telephone or emails.

---

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?

**In progress**

Optional text box for further information:

We are working together with NGOs (MNS Kuching chapter) for migratory waterbird counts, for key areas along the nominated site ie Bako Buntal Bay.

**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**

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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)

**No**

**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:

Yes, if migratory waterbird count qualify for this aspect.

**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:

A digital copy of the Bako Buntal Bay dossier has been uploaded on the EAAF website, with emphasis on our funding agency ie. Ministry of Water, Land and Natural Resources

## 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)

**No,**

Optional text box for further information:

We are not involved but we are aware that Malaysia has a special colour code for flagging on shorebirds.

## 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)

**Yes,**

Optional text box for further information:

Yes, if our presence during the Avian Influenza Task Force is considered as such, although there was no mention of guidelines. Discussion points were included in report to top management.

## 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, CEPA training programme (if 'Yes', please mention the number in the text box below)**

**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)

**No**

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:

Yes, sister-site partnership between Kushiro Wetlands and Bako Buntal Bay. The MOU has been signed.

**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:

Initial drafting of the Species Action Plan for Far Eastern Curlew, during the FEC Task Force meeting.

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

**Q47** Country name

Malaysia

**Q48** Name of FNS

Bako Buntal Bay

**Q49** EAAFP Site Code

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q50** Year of joining

2013



<b>Q51</b> 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q52</b> 2. FNS should update their Site Information Sheets (SIS) every six years. Does the Site have an update SIS (Key Result Area 1.1)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q53</b> 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q54</b> 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q55</b> 4b. If the site has a management plan, what is the starting date of the present Plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q56</b> 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q57</b> 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q58</b> 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)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q59</b> 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)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Q60</b> 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)?	<b>No</b>
<b>Q61</b> 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)?	<b>No</b>
<b>Q62</b> 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)?	<b>Yes</b>

**Q63** 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **Yes**

**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) **No**

Page 16: D. Indicator questions on the status of Flyway Network Sites

**Q66** Country name **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q67** Name of FNS **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q68** Year of joining **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q69** 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Respondent skipped this question**

**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**

**Q71** 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**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**

**Q74** 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **Respondent skipped this question**