

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 17, 2018 2:34:27 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 17, 2018 4:50:35 PM
Time Spent: 02:16:07
IP Address: 203.81.87.34

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Forest Department

Q2 2. Type of Partner

National Governments

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

| | |
|----------|--|
| Name | Win Naing Thaw |
| Position | Director |
| Address | Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division, Forest Department, |
| Email | nwcdfdmof@gmail.com |
| Phone | +9567405002 |

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

Page 3: B. General Summary of Implementation: Progress and Challenges

Q7 1. What have been the most successful aspects of implementation of the Partnership? (up to five points)

- a **designating flyway network sites**
 - b **networking of flyway network site managers and related organizations**
 - c **effective conservation of migratory waterbirds**
 - d **education programs to conserve flyway network sites**
 - e **nominating two more flyway network sites**
-

Q8 2. What have been the main challenges in implementation of the Partnership? (up to five points)

- a **insufficient staff**
 - b **limited capacity**
 - c **technical support**
 - d **financial support**
 - e **more collaboration between all stakeholders**
-

Q9 3. What are the future priorities for implementation of the Partnership? (up to five points)

- a **to designate more flyway network sites**
 - b **capacity building programs for flyway network site managers and staff**
-

Q10 4. Do you have any recommendations on the support needed from the EAAFP Secretariat?

to raise capacity building and close collaboration with partners

Q11 5. Do you have any recommendations on the support needed from other Partners, Working Groups or Task Forces?

to raise capacity building and close collaboration with partners

Q12 6. Do you have any other general comments on implementation of the Partnership?

nothing special at the moment

Page 4: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q13 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**

Q14 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**

Q15 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:
3

Q16 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

Q17 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**

Q18 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:
Management Plans are developed for flyway network sites

Q19 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) **No**

Q20 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**

Q21 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:
supported by Norwegian Government

Page 6: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q22 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:
to mainstream waterbird conservation into plans and programs

Q23 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)

No

Page 7: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q24 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

Q25 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

Page 8: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q26 2.5.1 Are your Partnership activities being implemented in line with the CEPA Strategy?

Partly

Q27 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

Q28 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:

National Wetland Committee was held twice a year

Page 9: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q29 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

Q30 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?

In progress

Q31 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

Q32 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?

In progress

Page 10: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q33 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)

In progress

Q34 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)

In progress

Q35 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) **In progress**

Page 11: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q36 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) **In progress**

Q37 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) **No**

Q38 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

Q39 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**

Q40 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**

Q41 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

Q42 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)

No

Q43 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:

Conserving the habitat of waterbirds is included in our Habitat Restoration Plan of one Flyway Network Site

Page 14: C. Indicator questions on ongoing and future implementation

Q44 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)

No

Q45 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:

Spoon-billed Sandpiper Action Plan is developed by BANCA, a local NGO in Myanmar

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

Q46 Country name

Myanmar

Q47 Name of FNS

Moeyungyi, Indawgyi and Gulf of Mottama

Q48 EAAFP Site Code

Respondent skipped this question

Q49 Year of joining

2014

Q50 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet?

Yes

Q51 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**

Q52 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **Yes**

Q53 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **Yes**

Q54 4b. If the site has a management plan, what is the starting date of the present Plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?

2019 for Moeyungyi

Q55 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)? **Yes**

Q56 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **Yes**

Q57 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**

Q58 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**

Q59 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

Q60 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

Q61 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**

Q62 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **Yes**

Q63 13. Additional information

Respondent skipped this question

Q64 14. Do you have any additional Sites to declare? (If you click 'Yes', another page for Flyway Network Site will be created) **Yes**

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

Q65 Country name

Myanmar

Q66 Name of FNS

Moeyungyi, Indawgyi, Gulf of Mottama

Q67 Year of joining

2014

Q68 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Yes**

Q69 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**

Q70 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **Yes**

Q71 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **Yes**

Q72 4b. If the site has a management plan, what is the starting date of the present Plan (Key Result Area 2.2)?

2019 for Moeyungyi

Q73 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)? **Yes**

Q74 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **Yes**

Q75 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**

Q76 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**

Q77 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

Q78 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

Q79 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**

Q80 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **Yes**

Q81 13. Additional information **Respondent skipped this question**

Q82 14. Do you have any additional Sites to declare? (If you click 'Yes', another page for Flyway Network Site will be created) **No**

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

Q83 Country name **Respondent skipped this question**

Q84 Name of FNS **Respondent skipped this question**
