

#20

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 6:32:41 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 7:21:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:48:35
IP Address: 180.148.211.49

Page 2: A. Institutional Information

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

Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force

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

Name	Dr. Evgeny Syroyechkovsky
Position	Task Force Chair
Address	Address: All-Russian Research Institute for Nature Conservation The estate Znamenskoe-Sadki Moscow 117628 Russian Federation
Email	ees_jr@yahoo.co.uk
Phone	+7 495 423 03 22

Q4 Person 2 (if needed)

Name	Dr. Christoph Zöckler
Position	Task Force Coordinator
Address	Manfred Hermsen Foundation/ Goeben Str. 1, D-28209 Bremen, Germany
Email	Christoph.zoekler@m-h-s.org
Phone	+447890021823

Q5 Person 3 (if needed)

Name	Sayam U. Chowdhury
Position	Task Force Assistant Coordinator
Address	16/C, Flat - 501, Tallabag, Sobhanbag, Dhaka - 1207, Bangladesh
Email	sayam_uc@yahoo.com
Phone	+8801717689413

Q6 Person 4 (if needed)

Respondent skipped this question

Q7 4. Name, title and contact details of the person completing this form

Respondent skipped this question

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 | Establishment of various task forces and working groups |
| b | Direct communication with national government |
| c | Development of FNS |
-

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| a | Rising profile of EAAFP within governmental agencies, which will encourage countries to take EAAFP more serious and do more by their own initiatives. |
| b | Lack of support and communication of network sites from EAAFP |
| c | More fundraising is needed to strengthen all directions of work |
| d | Cooperation of GVMT and NGO partners could be more efficient |
-

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

- a **Engage more with countries that are currently not actively involved**
- b **Rise profile of EAAFP in national governments and make them active in their own countries more**
- c **Strengthen ‘EAAFP project support fund’ to 30-50 K USD a year and support number of projects annually**
- d **Identify “EAAFP Ambassadors” to lobby EAAFP needs in countries on higher level including personal connections and diplomatic channels**
- e **Work with Embassies, cooperate with partners who can bring more recognition to EAAFP and lobby high level conservation decisions in flyway countries**

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

The SBS TF is kindly requesting all EAAFP members to continue to actively support its member organizations and members in the range state – • in the monitoring of SBS and its threats and • to help mitigate the threat from hunting of the species and • to prevent further reclamation at the remaining SBS sites on the EAA Flyway All EAAFP range state members are requested to help protect the stop over and wintering sites of the species, stop the reclamation of crucial stop over sites and follow the excellent example of Myanmar and China. Further involvement of countries such as North Korea

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

Work with CAFF to involve more diplomatic level support for EAAFP activities.

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

1. Develop the institute of “EAAFP Ambassadors” to lobby EAAFP needs in countries on higher level including personal connections and diplomatic channels. 2. Encourage network sites from countries with resources do more concrete support of work in sister ship Network sites in the countries were resources are limited.

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:
We have largely supported to identify internationally important sites in China, Myanmar and Bangladesh in collaboration with our local parents.

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)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

Optional text box for further information

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

Not applicable,

Optional text box for further information:

Optional text box for further information

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

Not applicable,

Optional text box for further information:

Optional text box for further information

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:

We have helped with all above-mentioned points for Gulf of Mottama [EAAF117] and Nan Thar Island in Myanmar as well as Sonadia Island in Bangladesh.

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)

Yes,

Optional text box for further information:

Working closely with Russia and CAFF

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) **Not applicable**

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? **Not applicable**

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:

Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force meeting was held in Mawlamyine, Myanmar on 18-19 January 2017 in collaboration with BANCA and regional government of Mon State, where approximately 60 national and international participants took part.

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:

Zöckler, C., Beresford, A. E., Bunting, G., Chowdhury, S. U., Clark, N. A., Fu, V. W. K., Htin Hla, T. Morozov, V.V., Syroechkovskiy, E.E, Kashiwagi, M., Lappo, E. G, Tong, M., LeLong, T., Yat-Tung Y., F. Huetmann, F., Akasofu, H. K., Tomida, H. and G. M. Buchanan (2016) The winter distribution of the spoon-billed sandpiper *Calidris pygmaeus*. *Bird Conserv. Internat.* 26: 476–489. Peng, He-Bo, Guy Anderson, Qing Chang, Chi-Yeung Choi, Sayam U. Chowdhury, N.A. Clark, X. Gan, R.D. Hearn, J. Li, E.G. Lappo, W. Liu, Z. Ma, D.A. Melville, J.F. Phillips, E.E. Syroechkovskiy, M. Tong, S. Wang, L. Zhang & C. Zöckler. (2017) "The intertidal wetlands of southern Jiangsu Province, China—globally important for Spoon-billed Sandpipers and other threatened waterbirds, but facing multiple serious threats." *Bird Conservation International* 27: 305-322. Kelly, C., C. Zöckler, B. Scampion & E.E. Syroechkovskiy. 2017. Hammer, filter or microphone: How does the Spoon-billed Sandpiper *Calidris pygmaea* use its bill to feed? *Wader Study* 124(2): 99-111. Clark, N.A., Anderson, G.Q.A., Li, J., Syroechkovskiy, E.E., Tomkovich, P.S., Zöckler, C., Lee, R. & Green, R.E. (2018) First formal estimate of the world population of the Critically Endangered spoon-billed sandpiper *Calidris pygmaea*. *Oryx*, 52, 137-146. Zöckler, C., D. Li, S.U. Chowdhury, M. Iqbal & C. Yu. 2018. Winter distribution, habitat and feeding behaviour of Nordmann's Greenshank *Tringa guttifer*. *Wader Study* 125(1): 7–14. Pain, D., Hughes, B., Syroechkovskiy, E., Zöckler, C., Chowdhury S. and Clark, N. Saving the Spoon-billed Sandpiper: a conservation update. (2018) *British Birds* 111 (323 –333). Chowdhury, S. U. and Foysal, M. A five-year study of over-summering shorebirds on Sonadia Island, Cox's Bazar district, Bangladesh. *Forktail* 33 (2017): 120–123. Chowdhury, S.U., M. Foysal, M.A.A. Diyan & S. Ahmed.

2017. Discovery of an important wintering site of the Critically Endangered Spoon-billed Sandpiper *Calidris pygmaea* in the Meghna Estuary, Bangladesh. Bird Conservation International 27: 1–12. Aung, P.P. et al (2018). Recent changes in the number of spoon-billed sandpipers *Calidris pygmaea* wintering on the Upper Gulf of Mottama in Myanmar. Oryx (accepted).

Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force News Bulletin 17: March 2018.
 Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force News Bulletin 16: April 2017. <https://www.saving-spoon-billed-sandpiper.com>
<https://web.facebook.com/sbstf>
<https://blog.conservation.org/2018/07/bird-watchers-spot-illegal-hunting-in-china/>
https://www.theguardian.com/environment/gallery/2018/may/22/12-conservation-success-stories-in-pictures?CMP=share_btn_fb <https://news.mongabay.com/2018/05/a-boon-for-birds-once-overlooked-chinas-mudflats-gain-protections/?fbp> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QRiBSDyhl-k>

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:
 Myanmar and partly China

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

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?

Yes,
 Optional text box for further information:
 See SBS TF newsletters No 16 and 17.

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

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) **Yes**

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**

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:
The actual spirit of the TF is on connectivity; also the Nordmann's Greenshank project with partners in Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar and Bangladesh.

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:
Yellow Sea

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) **Yes**

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) **Not applicable**

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) **Not applicable**

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)

Not applicable

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)

,
Optional text box for further information:
Myanmar and China

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)

Yes (Please indicate the number of such projects, including sister-site projects)

,
Optional text box for further information:
Several collaborative

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:
Species Action Plan drafted 2008, implementation ongoing, updates drafted 2011 and 2017

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

Q47 Country name

N/A