

#19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 5:35:33 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 9:49:02 AM
Time Spent: Over a week
IP Address: 192.206.154.2

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Department of Conservation New Zealand

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

Name	Bruce McKinlay
Position	Department of Conservation Representative to the EAAFP
Address	PO Box 5244 Dunedin new Zealand
Email	bmckinlay@doc.govt.nz
Phone	0064272247989

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	Bruce McKinlay
Position	Department of Conservation Representative to the EAAFP
Address	PO Box 5244 Dunedin new Zealand
Email	bmckinlay@doc.govt.nz
Phone	0064272247989

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 **Nomination and acceptance of two FSN during the reporting period**
- b **Strengthened ties for international cooperation and for sharing information.**
- c **The voluntary nature of the Partnership is helpful when encouraging new Partners and offering inclusion to a wide range of organisations.**

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

- a **Development of bilateral projects with PR China**
- b **The voluntary, non-binding nature of the EAAFP is a challenge to implementation as it does not create any legally-binding obligations on Partners**
- c **It also does not assist in creating a stable funding base to support activities carried out under the auspices of the Partnership.**
- d **The Management Committee is not transparent in it's operation, it is difficult to establish the level of work undertaken by this main body during the intersessional period.**

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

- a **Commitment to improved Governance structure to represent the interests of the Partners inter-sessionally.**
- b **The MOP need to focus on developing structures that support decision making processes so that decisions are effectively implemented to support the Partnership.**
- c **Being able to clearly link the work of the Strategy to a MOP approved implementation programme.**

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

I would prefer that in preparation for future MOP's that Working Groups and TaskForces have a separate reporting template than that used by Partners.

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

I will report on this in the Yellow Sea Taskforce Report.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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)

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

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:

Two

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:

One

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:

New Zealand has been able to support partners in China with improved options of control of Spartina.

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)

No

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) **No**

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) **No**

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) **No**

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) **No**

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) **No**

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) **No**

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**

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

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:

Two

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.

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?

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

We have supported the work of Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust in DPR Korea to identify key sites for migratory waterbirds.

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 EAAFP 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:

National Counts have been completed and contributed.

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

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,

No,

Optional text box for further information:

Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust have provided leadership on collaborating with DPRK colleagues in research and surveys into sites in the West Sea. Associate Professor Phil Battley at Massey University continues to lead research into the biology of migratory waterbirds in the Flyway. Recent outputs include: • Battley, P.F. 2018. An evaluation of the impact of a national kite boarding championship on shorebird behaviour at the Manawatu Estuary. DOC Research and Development Series 351. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 14 p. • Battley, P.F. and J.R. Conklin. 2017. Geolocator wetness data accurately detect periods of migratory flight in two species of shorebird. Wader Study 124: 112–119. • Phil F. Battley, Angela M. Parody Merino, Jesse R. Conklin, Francisco Prosdocimi and Andrew E. Fidler. The search for the basis of consistent migration timing in Bar-tailed Godwits. International Ornithological Congress, symposium 13 (“Seasonal Timing: from Genome to Phenotype”), Vancouver, Canada, August 2018. • Choi, C.Y., P.F. Battley, M.A. Potter, Z. Ma, D.S. Melville & P. Sukkaewmanee. 2017. How migratory shorebirds selectively exploit prey at a staging site dominated by a single prey species. Auk 134: 76–91 • Jesse R. Conklin and Phil. F. Battley. Habitat degradation overrides compensation for climate change in migration timing of Bar-tailed Godwits. British Ornithologists’ Union conference on “From avian tracking to population processes”, Warwick, UK. March 2017. • Angela M. Parody Merino. 2018. Genetics of migration timing in bar-tailed godwits. PhD thesis, Massey University.

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:

Through leadership of the Yellow Sea Taskforce

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

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) **No**

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) **No**

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) **No**

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

Q47 Country name

New Zealand

Q48 Name of FNS

Firth of Thames

Q49 EAAFP Site Code

019

Q50 Year of joining

1996

Q51 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Yes****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)? **Yes****Q53** 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **No****Q54** 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **No****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)? **Yes****Q57** 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **Yes****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)? **Yes**

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)? **Yes**

Q60 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **Yes**

Q61 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

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)? **Yes**

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) **Yes**

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

Q66 Country name

New Zealand

Q67 Name of FNS

Farewell Spit

Q68 Year of joining

1996

Q69 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Yes**

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)? **Yes**

Q71 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **No**

Q72 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **No**

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)? **No**

Q75 6. Does Site staff have access to relevant capacity development and training programmes (Key Result Area 10.1)? **No**

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)? **Yes**

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)? **Yes**

Q78 9. Are there any possible, actual or future threats to the Site and its migratory waterbirds (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

Q79 10. If so, have these threats been reported to the EAAFP Secretariat (Key Result Area 6.4)? **No**

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)? **No**

Q81 12. Has an assessment of the ecological, social and economic values of the Site been conducted (Outcome 3)? **No**

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) **Yes**

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

Q84 Country name

New Zealand

Q85 Name of FNS

Avon- Heathcote Estuary/ Ihutai

Q86 Year of joining

2018

Q87 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Yes**

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)? **Yes**

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)? **No**

Q91 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**

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)? **Yes**

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)? **No**

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 name

New Zealand

Q103 Name of FNS

Awarua Bay- New River Estuary

Q104 Year of joining

2018

Q105 1. Does the site have a Site Information Sheet? **Yes**

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)? **Yes**

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)? **Respondent skipped this question**

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)? **No**

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

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)? **Yes**

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**

Q125 3. Does the Site have a site management committee that includes local community members and stakeholders? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q126 4a. Does the Site have a site management plan (Key Result Area 2.2)? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q127 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**

Q128 5. Does the Site have an active CEPA programme (Key Result Area 4.1)? **Respondent skipped this question**
