



**East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership
Ninth Meeting of Partners (MoP9), Singapore
11-15 January 2017**

Report (Minutes) of the Ninth Meeting of Partners



It is helpful to read this draft report in conjunction with the MoP9 Agenda Documents. [Link](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	6
OPENING CEREMONY	10
Welcome from Singapore, Host Country of MOP9	10
Welcome from the EAAFP Chair	10
Presentation of Certificate to New Partner – Hanns Seidel Foundation	11
Presentation of Certificate to New Flyway Network Sites – Japan (1), Mongolia (5), Australia (4), United States of America (1), Vietnam (1) and Philippines (1)	11
AGENDA ITEM 1: INTRODUCTORY SESSION	12
Agenda Item 1.1: Rules of Procedure for MOP9	12
Agenda Item 1.2: Appointment of Meeting Chairperson and Rapporteurs	12
Agenda Item 1.3: Approval of Draft Report of the 8th Meeting of Partners	12
Agenda Item 1.4: Approval of the Provisional Agenda for the 9th Meeting of Partners	12
Agenda Item 1.5: Welcome to Partners (Existing, New and Potential) and Admittance of Observers	12
Agenda Item 1.6: Presentation of New Partner’s Plans and Activities – Hanns Seidel Foundation	12
Agenda Item 1.7: Overview of New Proposals from Partners	13
1.7.1 Development of New EAAFP Strategic Plan (AWSG)	13
1.7.2 Finance Committee Proposals (USA).....	13
1.7.3 Monitoring the Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites (Ramsar)	14
1.7.4 New Rules of Procedure for MOPs (Australia).....	14
1.7.5 New Terms of Reference for Management Committee (Australia)	14
1.7.6 Technical Committee (Australia)	14
1.7.7 Far Eastern Curlew Task Force (Australia)	15
1.7.8 Southeast Asia Network (Cambodia).....	15
1.7.9 Standardised Waterbird Monitoring (BirdLife International and Wetlands International). 15	
1.7.10 Definition of Migratory Populations (Japan).....	15
1.7.11 Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 (CEPA Working Group)	16
AGENDA ITEM 2: OVERVIEW REPORTING	16
Agenda Item 2.1: Brief Report from the Secretariat (Secretariat)	16
Agenda Item 2.2: Brief Report from the Finance Committee (Vice Chair, USA)	17
Agenda Item 2.3: Brief Report of Independent Review of EAAFP (Secretariat)	18
Agenda Item 2.4 Summary of Partner Reports Submitted to the Secretariat	20
Governments (17).....	20

Non-Governmental Organisations (10)	20
Inter-Governmental Organisations (6)	21
Private Sector (1)	22
Special Partner (1)	22
Brief Report from Working Groups (7)	22
Brief Report from Task Forces (7)	22
Southeast Asia Network	23
Agenda Item 2.5: Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration in Flyway Network Site Designation	23
2.5.1 EAAF131 Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary (State Government of South Australia)	23
2.5.2 EAAF133 Qupaluk (Casey Burns, US Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Arctic Office)	24
2.5.3 EAAF135 Negros Occidental Coastal Wetlands Conservation Area	24
AGENDA ITEM 3: WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES – BREAK-OUT SESSION A	24
Agenda Item 3.1: Shorebird Working Group Meeting	24
Agenda Item 3.2: Baer’s Pochard Task Force Meeting	24
Agenda Item 3.3: Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force Meeting	24
Agenda Item 3.4: CEPA Working Group	24
AGENDA ITEM 4: DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS FROM PARTNERS	25
Agenda Item 4.1: Development of new EAAFP Strategic Plan (AWSG)	25
Agenda Item 4.2: Finance Committee Proposals (USA)	26
Agenda Item 4.3: Monitoring the Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites (Ramsar)	28
Agenda Item 4.4: New Rules of Procedure for MOPs (Australia)	30
Agenda Item 4.5: New Terms of Reference for Management Committee (Australia)	31
Agenda Item 4.6: Technical Committee (Australia)	33
Agenda Item 4.7: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force (Australia)	34
Agenda Item 4.8: Southeast Asia Network (Singapore)	34
Agenda Item 4.9: Standardised Waterbird Monitoring (BirdLife International and Wetlands International)	34
Agenda Item 4.10: Definition of Migratory Populations (Japan)	35
Agenda Item 4.11: Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 (CEPA Working Group)	35
Agenda Item 4.12: Proposed Task Force on Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the EAAF (CAFF)	36
AGENDA ITEM 5: ARCTIC MIGRATORY BIRDS INITIATIVE	36
AGENDA ITEM 6: INTERACTIVE SESSION – DEVELOPING A LONG-TERM VISION FOR EAAFP AND THE FLYWAY (CEPA WORKING GROUP)	36

AGENDA ITEM 7: WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES – BREAK-OUT SESSION B	37
Agenda Item 7.1: Yellow Sea Ecoregion Task Force Meeting	37
Agenda Item 7.2: Anatidae Working Group Meeting and Scaly-sided Merganser Task Force Meeting	37
Agenda Item 7.3: Seabird Working Group Meeting	37
Agenda Item 7.4: Southeast Asia Network Meeting	37
AGENDA ITEM 8: WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES – BREAK-OUT SESSION C	37
Agenda Item 8.1: Monitoring Task Force Meeting	37
Agenda Item 8.2: Avian Influenza Working Group Meeting	37
Agenda Item 8.3: Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group Meeting	37
Agenda Item 8.4: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force Meeting	37
AGENDA ITEM 9: BRIEF REPORT ON EAAFP WORK PLAN 2017-2018	38
Agenda Item 9.1: Secretariat’s Work Plan and Budget (Secretariat)	38
Agenda Item 9.2: National Partnerships (Secretariat)	39
Agenda Item 9.3: Summary of Partner Work Plans Submitted to the Secretariat	41
Governments (17).....	41
Non-Governmental Organisations (10)	42
Inter-Governmental Organisations (6).....	43
Private Sector (1)	43
Special Partner (1).....	43
Brief Report from Working Groups (7).....	43
Brief Report from Task Forces (7).....	44
AGENDA ITEM 10: INTERACTIVE SESSION – MECHANISM FOR INCREASING ENGAGEMENT FOR PARTNERSHIP	45
AGENDA ITEM 11: REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES	45
Agenda Item 11.1: Anatidae Working Group	45
Agenda Item 11.2: Avian Influenza Working Group	45
Agenda Item 11.3: Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group	45
Agenda Item 11.4: Crane Working Group	46
Agenda Item 11.5: CEPA Working Group	46
Agenda Item 11.6: Seabird Working Group	47
Agenda Item 11.7: Shorebird Working Group	47
Agenda Item 11.8: Amur-Heilong Basin Task Force	47
Agenda Item 11.9: Baer’s Pochard Task Force	47
Agenda Item 11.10: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force	48
Agenda Item 11.11: Monitoring of Waterbird Populations and Sites Task Force	48

Agenda Item 11.12: Scaly-sided Merganser Task Force	49
Agenda Item 11.13: Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force.....	49
Agenda Item 11.14: Yellow Sea Ecoregion Task Force	49
Agenda Item 11.15: Southeast Asia Network.....	49
AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	50
AGENDA ITEM 13: REPORT AND APPROVAL OF KEY DECISIONS FROM MOP9	51
Agenda Item 13.1: Election and Appointment of New Chair and Vice Chair	51
Agenda Item 13.2: Election and Appointment of Management Committee	51
Agenda Item 13.3: Secretariat’s Work Plan and Budget for 2017-2018.....	52
Agenda Item 13.4: Development of New EAAFP Strategic Plan (AWSG)	52
Agenda Item 13.5: Finance Committee Proposals (USA)	53
Agenda Item 13.6: Monitoring the Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites (Ramsar).....	56
Agenda Item 13.7: New Rules of Procedure for MOPs (Australia)	56
Agenda Item 13.8: New Terms of Reference for Management Committee (Australia).....	57
Agenda Item 13.9: Technical Committee (Australia).....	57
Agenda Item 13.10: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force (Australia)	59
Agenda Item 13.11: Southeast Asia Network (Cambodia/ ACB)	59
Agenda Item 13.12: Standardised Waterbird Monitoring (BirdLife International and Wetlands International).....	60
Agenda Item 13.13: Definition of Migratory Populations (Japan).....	60
Agenda Item 13.14: Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 (CEPA Working Group).....	60
Agenda Item 13.15: Recommendations from Working Groups and Task Forces	61
AGENDA ITEM 14: NEXT MEETING – ANNOUNCEMENT OF MOP10	61
AGENDA ITEM 15: CLOSURE OF MEETING	61
ANNEX: ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMNS	61

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Partners

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity	Mr. Roberto Oliva	rvoliva@aseanbiodiversity.org
	Ms. Clarissa Arida	ccarida@aseanbiodiversity.org
Australasian Wader Studies Group	Mr. Doug Watkins	doug Watkins@gmail.com
	Ms. Alison Russell-French	alisonrf@inet.net.au
Australia	Mr. Geoff Richardson	geoff.richardson@environment.gov.au
	Dr. Mark Carey	mark.carey@environment.gov.au
	Ms. Arkellah Irving	arkellah.irving@sa.gov.au
	Mr. Jeffrey Newchurch	jeffreynewchurch@hotmail.com
Bangladesh	Mr. Abdullah Al Islam Jakob	jakob.mp118@yahoo.com
BirdLife International	Mr. Vinayagan Dharmarajah	vinayagan.dharmarajah@birdlife.org
	Mr. Simba Chan	simba.chan@birdlife.org
	Dr. Barend van Gernerden	barend.vangernerden@birdlife.org
	Dr. Anuj Jain	Anuj.Jain@birdlife.org
Cambodia	Dr. Srey Sunleang	kampongspeu@yahoo.com
Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna	Mr. Reidar Hindrum	reidar.hindrum@miljodir.no
	Dr. Jennifer Provencher	jennifer@caff.is
	Dr. Yong Ding Li	dingli@caff.is
Convention on Migratory Species	Mr. Borja Heredia	borja.heredia@cms.int
Hanns Seidel Foundation	Dr. Bernhard Seliger	seliger@hss.or.kr
Indonesia	Mr. Bambang Dahono Adji	ditkkh@gmail.com
	Mr. Drajat Dwi Hartono	drajatdh@gmail.com
	Ms Dewi Prawiradilaga	lbbs@mail.lipi.go.id
	Mr. Yus Rusila Noor	yus.noor@gmail.com
International Crane Foundation	Mr. Jim Harris	harris@savingcranes.org
Japan	Ms. Kaori Tsujita	kaori_tsujita@env.go.jp
	Mr. Yusuke Sawa	yusuke.sawa@birdlife.org
Malaysia	Ms. Intan Nurul Azlina Ahmad Kamil	intan.kamil@nre.gov.my
	Ms. Lee Kheng Sim	lksim@sarawakforestry.com
Mongolia	Mr. Tsogtsaikhan Purev	tsojopurev@gmail.com
	Dr. Nyambayar Batbayar	nyambayar@wscc.org.mn
Myanmar	Mr. Than Naing	uthannaing.008@gmail.com
New Zealand	Mr. Bruce McKinlay	bmckinlay@doc.govt.nz
People's Republic of China (EAAFP Chair)*	Dr. Dehui Zhang*	zhangdehui@forestry.gov.cn
	Dr. Hongxing Jiang	jianghongxingcaf@163.com
	Prof. Jun Lu	lujunmail@vip.sina.com
Philippines	Mr. Anson Tagtag	anson_tagtag@yahoo.com
Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust	Mr. David Lawrie	lawrie@ps.gen.nz
Ramsar Convention	Dr. Lew Young	young@ramsar.org
Republic of Korea	Mr. Gi Min Jung	junggimin@korea.kr, red_claw@naver.com
	Dr. Jin Young Park	birdkorea@korea.kr

	Ms. Jian You	yujian22@korea.kr
Russia	Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy	ees_jr@yahoo.co.uk
	Dr. Yury Gerasimov	bird@mail.kamchatka.ru
	Prof. Konstantin Klovov	k.b.klovov@gmail.com
Singapore	Mr. How Choon Beng	how_choon_beng@nparks.gov.sg
Thailand	Mr. Wanlop Preechamart	wanloponep@gmail.com
	Mr. Parinya Leelahanon	parinya_lee@yahoo.com
	Mr. Tossapon Piantanakulchai	nu.tossapon@gmail.com
	Mr. Krairat Eiamampai	eiam_kl@hotmail.com
	Mr. Charoenchai Tothaisong	binturongwl27@gmail.com
United States of America (EAAFP Vice Chair)*	Mr. Peter J. Probasco*	pete_probasco@fws.gov
	Mr. Casey Burns	ctburns@blm.gov
Vietnam	Dr. Pham Anh Cuong	pacuong@yahoo.com; phamac60@gmail.com
Wetlands International	Dr. Taej Mundkur	taej.mundkur@wetlands.org
	Mr. Ward Hagemeyer	Ward.Hagemeyer@wetlands.org
Wild Bird Society of Japan	Mr. Seiji Hayama	hayama@wbsj.org
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust	Dr. Martin Spray	martin.spray@wwt.org.uk
	Mr. Richard Hearn	richard.hearn@wwt.org.uk
Wildlife Conservation Society	Dr. Jonathan Slaght	jslaght@wcs.org
World Wildlife Fund for Nature	Mr. Xianji Wen	xjwen@wwf.org.hk
	Mr. Yimo Zhang	ymzhang@wwfchina.org
	Ms. Jieyun Liu	flyingfishliu@yahoo.com
	Ms. Fion Cheung	kwfcheung@wwf.org.hk

Potential Partner

Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Ms. Kyong Sim Ri	
	Ms. Jong Ok Kim	
	Mr. Ri Kyu Song	embdprk@singnet.com.sg

Special Partner

Incheon Metropolitan City	Mr. Sang Bum Lee	leesangbum@korea.kr
	Mr. Dalho Kim	green10136@korea.kr
	Mr. San Gu Choi	chs3240@korea.kr

Working Groups

Anatidae (Chair)* (Cocordinator)**	Mr. Masayuki Kurechi*	son_goose@sky.plala.or.jp
	Dr. Katsumi Ushiyama**	mwwc@dune.ocn.ne.jp
	Prof. Lei Cao	leicao@rcees.ac.cn
	Ms. Fanjuan Meng	mengfanjuan1986@163.com
Avian Influenza (Chair)	Dr. Taej Mundkur	taej.mundkur@wetlands.org
Black-faced Spoonbill (Coordinator)**	Mr. Yat Tung Yu**	bfspoonbill@hkbws.org.hk
	Dr. Hansoo Lee	hslee0509@gmail.com
CEPA (Chair)*	Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie*	shails@bluewin.ch
	Mr. Philip Straw	philip.straw@awsg.org.au

Seabird (Chair)* (Coordinators)**	Mr. Robert Kaler*	robert_kaler@fws.gov
	Mr. Yat Tung Yu**	bfspoonbill@hkbws.org.hk
	Dr. Mark Carey**	mark.carey@environment.gov.au
	Ms. Wai Yan So	ivy_wy_so@afcd.gov.hk
	Ms. Ria Saryanthi	rsyanthi@burung.org
	Ms. Stephanie Avery-Gomm	s.averygomm@uq.net.au
	Dr. Dewi Prawiradilaga	dewi005@lipi.go.id
	Dr. Abdulmula Hamza	a.hamza@umt.edu.my
	Ms. Fransisca Noni Tirtaningtyas	fntirtaningtyas@gmail.com
	Mr. Khaleb Yordan	khalebbyordan@yahoo.com
Shorebird (Chair)*	Dr. Richard Lanctot*	richard_lanctot@fws.gov
	Mr. David Li Zuowei	david_li@nparks.gov.sg

Task Forces

Baer's Pochard (Chair)* (Coordinator)**	Prof. Changqing Ding*	cqding@bjfu.edu.cn
	Mr. Richard Hearn**	richard.hearn@wwt.org.uk
Far Eastern Curlew (Chair)	Dr. Mark Carey	mark.carey@environment.gov.au
Monitoring of waterbird populations and sites (Chair)	Mr. Doug Watkins	doug Watkins@gmail.com
Scaly-sided Merganser (Chair)* (Coordinator)**	Prof. Guangchun Lei*	guangchun8099@gmail.com
	Dr. Diana Solovyeva**	diana_solovyova@mail.ru
Spoon-billed Sandpiper (Chair)* (Coordinator)**	Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy*	ees_jr@yahoo.co.uk
	Dr. Christoph Zöckler**	Christoph.zoeckler@m-h-s.org
	Mr. Sayam U. Chowdhury	sayam_uc@yahoo.com
	Mr. Minoru Kashiwagi	minoru.kash@gmail.com
Yellow Sea Ecoregion (Chair)*	Mr. Bruce McKinlay*	bmckinlay@doc.govt.nz

Technical Advisors and Observers

African Development Bank	Ms. Yuna Choi	greenita3@gmail.com
Audubon Alaska	Dr. Nils Warnock	nwarnock@audubon.org
Bangladesh High Commission	Mr. SM Anisul Haque	anis_1274@yahoo.com
BirdLife Australia (BirdLife)	Ms. Connie Warren	connie.warren@birdlife.org.au
Chonbuk National University	Mr. Yung-Ki Ju	juyki@hanmail.net
BirdLife Malaysia (BirdLife)	Mr. Balu Perluma	
Korean Government Nature Society (Singapore)	Mr. Young Hwan Kim	yohkim06@mofa.go.kr
	Ms. Kihyeon Kim	kihykim06@mofa.go.kr
	Ms. Min Jeong Yu	
	Mr. Gim Cheong Tan	gimcheong345@gmail.com
	Ms. Lim Kim Keang	kimkeang@outlook.com
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (BirdLife)	Ms. Nicola Crockford	nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

The University of Queensland	Mr. Eduardo Gallo-Cajiao	e.gallocajiao@uq.edu.au
	Ms. Micha Jackson	m.jackson@uqconnect.edu.au
Viet Nature (BirdLife)	Le Trong Trai	
World Heritage Promotion Team of Korean Tidal Flats	Prof. Kyung Sik Woo	happyman369@naver.com
	Dr. Kyong O Moon	nacaffy@naver.com

EAAFP Secretariat

Chief Executive	Mr. Spike Millington	chief@eaaflyway.net
Deputy Chief Executive	Mr. Dong Koo Yun	deputy@eaaflyway.net
Finance Officer	Ms. Miyoung Choi	finance@eaaflyway.net
Programme Officer	Ms. Minseon Kim	programme@eaaflyway.net
Communication Officer	Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa	communication@eaaflyway.net
Contributing Photographer	Mr. Eugene Cheah	eugenecheahewejin@yahoo.com

Host Country

National Parks Board, Singapore	Mr. Kenneth Er	kenneth_er@nparks.gov.sg
	Dr. Leong Chee Chiew	leong_chee_chiew@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. Tan Chong Lee	tan_chong_lee@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. Wong Tuan Wah	wong_tuan_wah@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. How Choon Beng	how_choon_beng@nparks.gov.sg
	Ms. Sharon Chan	sharon_chan@nparks.gov.sg
	Ms. Chua Yen Kheng	chua_yen_kheng@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. David Li Zuowei	david_li@nparks.gov.sg
	Ms. Wendy Yap	wendy_yap@nparks.gov.sg
	Ms. Yang Shufen	yang_shufen@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. Jeremy Woon	jeremy_woon@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. Timothy Ong	timothy_ong@nparks.gov.sg

Apologies

Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat	Mr. David Coates	david.coates@cbd.int
Food and Agriculture Organisation	Dr. Scott Newman	scott.newman@fao.org
International Union for Conservation of Nature	Dr. Scott Perkin	scott.PERKIN@iucn.org
Rio Tinto	Mr. Steve Rusbridge	Steve.Rusbridge@riotinto.com

OPENING CEREMONY

Welcome from Singapore, Host Country of MOP9

1. Mr. Kenneth Er, Chief Executive Officer of the National Parks Board, Singapore welcomed the participants to Singapore for MOP9. He noted that the Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve has been a Flyway site of the EAAF since 2002 and outlined Singapore's role and efforts towards the conservation of migratory birds. Through long-term surveys and bird-banding programmes at Sungei Buloh, he highlighted that although Singapore has observed a decline in the number of shorebird arrivals, some species such as the Whimbrel and the Common Redshank seemed to remain stable over the last 10 years. This, coupled with the reappearance of other shorebirds, has given Singapore confidence that its stringent protection and management of Singapore's wetlands are paying off. Some of these measures include increasing the buffer area surrounding Sungei Buloh and ensuring that surrounding sites such as the freshwater Kranji Marshes are sensitively enhanced to establish an ecological network of complementary wetland habitats, in order to support a greater diversity and population of shorebirds.

2. Mr. Er highlighted that NParks will invest in new technologies to better understand bird movement and habitat use. For example, in 2015, NParks started to use radio-transmitters and geo-locators to track the movement of shorebirds coming into Sungei Buloh. He noted Sungei Buloh's public awareness and education efforts and highlighted in particular the Friends of Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve, a ground-up initiative which was established last year to promote stewardship and responsible use of wetlands. He further underlined the importance of regional and global collaboration, in particular capacity building, to conserve migratory shorebirds effectively and noted that the Arctic Migratory Birds Initiative (AMBI) workshop held in Sungei Buloh prior to MOP9 is an example of how Flyway Partners could come together to address mutual conservation concerns of Arctic migratory birds along the EAAF. Finally, he thanked the EAAFP Secretariat, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore and the Singapore Tourism Board for their support; and the participants for making MOP9 the largest turnout to date and wished the meeting a fruitful deliberation.

Welcome from the EAAFP Chair

3. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China), EAAFP Chair, welcomed the delegates to MOP9 and was encouraged to see so many participants at the meeting. He noted that through cooperation and hard work by all Partners in the Flyway, there has been considerable progress on the conservation of migratory birds and information exchange. Despite these efforts, the Flyway continues to face challenges, in particular, the loss of habitats of waterbirds. He noted the establishment of specific task forces to address the problems faced by specific species of migratory birds and the efforts of various countries. He highlighted, for example, in China a wildlife protection law was revised in 2016 to include habitat protection and address illegal poaching and trade in wildlife. He also recognised the contributions of inter-governmental organisations (IGOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to the work of the Flyway.

4. He noted that there is a lot of work ahead at this meeting with a tight agenda. He called for delegates to contribute their time and expertise to this meeting. Finally, he

expressed appreciation to the EAAFP Secretariat and to the Government of Singapore in the organisation and hosting of the meeting respectively. Dr. Zhang also referred to the AMBI Workshop at Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve which preceded MOP9 and highlighted the complementarity and collaborative efforts of both the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna Working Group (CAFF) and the Flyway Partnership.

Presentation of Certificate to New Partner – Hanns Seidel Foundation

5. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair), and Dr. Bernhard Seliger, representative from Hans Seidel Foundation-Korea (HSF-Korea), mutually signed and exchanged the EAAFP Partner certificate. The Chief Executive of EAAFP Secretariat (CE/EAAFP) highlighted that HSF-Korea applied to be a Partner in March 2016 and their application was approved within the same month.

6. CE/EAAFP noted that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) also applied to be a Partner. However, due to concerns of an existing Partner, he noted that this matter would be referred to the Management Committee for further discussion.

Presentation of Certificate to New Flyway Network Sites – Japan (1), Mongolia (5), Australia (4), United States of America (1), Vietnam (1) and Philippines (1)

7. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) presented certificates to the following new Flyway Network Sites (FNS):

Japan

EAAF124 Higashiyoka-higata (certificate was presented to Ms. Kaori Tsujita, Japan)

Mongolia

The following certificates were presented to Mr. Tsogtsaikhan Purev (Mongolia):

EAAF126 Buir Lake

EAAF127 Ganga Lake

EAAF128 Khar-Us Lake

EAAF129 Khyargas-Airag Lake

EAAF130 Uvs Lake

Australia

The following certificates were presented to Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia):

EAAF125 South East Gulf of Carpentaria Nijinda Durlga (Tarrant)

EAAF131 Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary (for the presentation of this certificate, Mr. Richardson was joined by Ms. Arkellah Irving from the South Australian Government and Mr Jeffrey Newchurch, an Indigenous Elder from the Sanctuary)

EAAF132 Ashmore Reef Commonwealth Marine Reserve

EAAF136 Pulu Keeling National Park

United States of America (USA)

EAAF133 Qupaluk (certificate was presented to Mr. Peter Probasco, USA)

Vietnam

EAAF134 Tram Chim National Park (certificate was presented to Dr. Pham Anh Cuong, Vietnam)

Philippines

EAAF135 Negros Occidental Coastal Wetlands Conservation Area (certificate was presented to Mr. Anson Tagtag, Philippines)

AGENDA ITEM 1: INTRODUCTORY SESSION

Agenda Item 1.1: Rules of Procedure for MOP9

8. The Rules of Procedure (ROP) for MOP9 would be as adopted by MOP5 in Siem Reap, Cambodia in December 2010. CE/EAAFP reminded that Observers must obtain the right to speak from the Chair as per the ROP. He also emphasised that strict timekeeping would be adhered to, in light of the tight agenda.

Agenda Item 1.2: Appointment of Meeting Chairperson and Rapporteurs

9. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) and Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) of the EAAFP would alternate as session chairs of MOP9. The rapporteurs for the meeting are Mr. Eduardo Gallo-Cajiao, Ms. Micha Jackson, Ms. Wendy Yap, Mr. Jeremy Woon and Mr. Timothy Ong.

Agenda Item 1.3: Approval of Draft Report of the 8th Meeting of Partners

10. The draft report of MOP8 was approved by MOP9 without amendments. The adopted report of MOP8 is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 1.4: Approval of the Provisional Agenda for the 9th Meeting of Partners

11. The Partners approved the [Agenda for MOP9](#) without amendments.

Agenda Item 1.5: Welcome to Partners (Existing, New and Potential) and Admittance of Observers

12. The Chair welcomed the Partners, potential Partners and Observers and noted the apologies from the following partners: Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Rio Tinto. The representatives of Partners, chairs and coordinators of Working Groups and Task Forces briefly introduced themselves. The List of Participants is on pages 6 and 7. The Observers to MOP9 were admitted by the Partners.

Agenda Item 1.6: Presentation of New Partner's Plans and Activities – Hanns Seidel Foundation

13. Dr. Bernhard Seliger (HSF-K) outlined the organisation's work in particular in the Republic of Korea (ROK) and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). He highlighted the work on the conservation and sustainable development in the inner-Korean border area of Gangwon since 2005 in ROK; and for DPRK their work on economy, finance and trade since 2004 and more recently on wetland and bird-related surveys in Rason since 2014. The presentation is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 1.7: Overview of New Proposals from Partners

1.7.1 Development of New EAAFP Strategic Plan (AWSG)

14. Mr. Doug Watkins (Australasian Wader Studies Group, AWSG) noted that the current EAAFP Implementation Strategy 2012-2016 had expired. As such, MOP9 was an appropriate time to conduct a review and develop a new framework for the implementation of the Partnership's goals and objectives. The Independent Review of the EAAFP called for a new strategy to be developed and provided a number of recommendations for a new strategy. The proposals were to extend the current Implementation Strategy until 2019; set a vision on what needs to be achieved within the time period; and establish an EAAFP Strategic Plan Task Force (SPTF) to review the existing implementation plan and develop a new framework with a view for its adoption at MOP10 in 2019. The proposals and the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) are available for consideration in [Document 1.7.1](#).

1.7.2 Finance Committee Proposals (USA)

15. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair), highlighted the key recommendations from the Finance Committee which was set up at MOP8 to develop a Sustainable Financing Strategy to contribute to meeting the Partnership's goals and objectives. The recommendations for consideration and decision at MOP9 ([Document 1.7.2](#)) are as follows:

- (i) Establish a benchmark that would build a shared understanding about funding levels being contributed to national and international Flyway priority actions to form the basis about how to expand those resources.
- (ii) Encourage Partners to strengthen their efforts to identify funding, provide direct contributions and help raise funds for priority actions and EAAFP support.
- (iii) Implement the voluntary fee-based contribution system.
- (iv) Hire a Fundraising Officer based at the Secretariat, subject to funding availability, and approve the TOR for this position.
- (v) Establish a Finance Committee and approve its TOR.

16. Another set of recommendations which required further consideration post MOP9 or to be adopted at MOP10 are as follows:

- (i) Develop an EAAFP supporter programme.

- (ii) Develop EAAFP offices in Flyway countries other than ROK.

1.7.3 Monitoring the Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites (Ramsar)

17. Ms. Minseon Kim (EAAFP Secretariat) on behalf of Dr. Lew Young (Ramsar Convention (Ramsar)), noted there are more than 950 sites that have been identified as being internationally important for migratory waterbirds, of which only about 136 are FNS. She outlined the proposed guidelines for monitoring the status and management of FNS to address the limited feedback received from Partners on the status and threats to existing FNS. The guidelines include Country Partners updating the Site Information Sheet (SIS) every 6 years; the Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA) Working Group (WG) to work with relevant Partners to conduct capacity building workshops for FNS managers and to collate and disseminate good practices for the management of these sites; and for Country Partners to report on the status of their FNS prior to each MOP using the proposed template. Please see [Document 1.7.3](#).

1.7.4 New Rules of Procedure for MOPs (Australia)

18. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that the Independent Review of EAAFP identified a number of challenges on the conduct and content of MOPs, for example, insufficient time allocated in the agenda to discuss and agree on future priorities and explore potential collaborative Flyway-wide actions. MOP9 is requested to consider the proposed revised ROP (as in [Annex Document 1.7.4.2](#) New ROP for EAAFP MOPs) to address challenges identified in the Independent Review.

1.7.5 New Terms of Reference for Management Committee (Australia)

19. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that MOP5 (December 2010) adopted the TOR for the Management Committee of the EAAFP which provides for a review of the TOR every three years. The TOR has not been reviewed since 2010. The Independent Review of the EAAFP highlighted that the EAAFP's organisational structure is inadequate to support the delivery of the Partnership's goals and objectives. The revised TOR clarifies and strengthens the functions of the Management Committee. He requested MOP9 to consider and adopt the revised TOR as in [Annex Document 1.7.5.2](#) New TOR of Management Committee which would address the challenges identified.

1.7.6 Technical Committee (Australia)

20. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) highlighted that the proposal addresses two governance challenges of the Independent Review of the EAAFP, namely the current organisation is inadequate to support the delivery of the Partnership's goals and objectives; and the WG/ Task Force (TF) mechanism is not being effectively used to serve the scientific and technical needs of Partners and FNS. He also noted that there is currently no dedicated scientific or technical officer at the EAAFP Secretariat and suggested that the Technical Committee could help fulfil this role. He requested Partners to consider the establishment of the Technical Committee and its TOR and ROP ([Document 1.7.6](#)).

1.7.7 Far Eastern Curlew Task Force (Australia)

21. Mr. Mark Carey (Australia) mentioned that at MOP8, the Far Eastern Curlew TF was established in response to the rapid decline of the species and was tasked to develop a single species action plan to be adopted at MOP9. Partners were encouraged to adopt the action plan and consider how they would implement this plan within their respective jurisdictions. The document ([1.7.7](#)) was reviewed at the pre-TF meeting on 10 January 2017 and there would be opportunities for further comments at the TF break-out session on 14 January 2017. The updated document would be circulated prior to the end of the meeting for adoption by MOP9.

1.7.8 Southeast Asia Network (Cambodia)

22. Dr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) highlighted that MOP8 approved the proposal to establish a Southeast Asia Network along with a draft TOR ([Annex Document 1.7.8.1](#)). The TOR for the network focusses on planning, information sharing, capacity building, CEPA, resource mobilisation and translation of documents. A draft proposal would be presented and discussed at a later session during MOP9 ([Annex Document 1.7.8.2](#)).

1.7.9 Standardised Waterbird Monitoring (BirdLife International and Wetlands International)

23. Mr. Simba Chan (BirdLife International) highlighted that this proposal is a follow-up of a joint project between BirdLife International and Ministry of Environment, Japan. He invited interested partners to form a small group to discuss proposed objectives and activities to further develop waterbird and site monitoring of the Flyway ([Document 1.7.9.1](#)) with a view to adopt a decision on standardised waterbird monitoring by the next MOP.

24. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) emphasised the need for better monitoring, despite noting an increase in the number of single species action plans. There are still large gaps in the geographic coverage of the Flyway and the Partnership needs to discuss how a comprehensive Flyway-scale monitoring programme could be developed. He noted that it was important to develop common methodologies that could be implemented by Partners on the ground. Wetlands International proposed actions are in [Document 1.7.9.2](#).

1.7.10 Definition of Migratory Populations (Japan)

25. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) highlighted that the term ‘migratory waterbird’ is defined in Appendix II of the EAAFP Partnership document, adopted on 6 November 2006 as “the East Asian-Australasian Flyway population of any species or lower taxon of waterbirds of the taxonomic groups identified in Appendix III, a significant proportion of whose members cyclically and predictably cross one or more national jurisdictional boundaries”.

26. Some issues have arisen with this definition, specifically for populations that are not actually migratory in nature, but were included in the EAAFP’s FNS, or species whose migratory behaviour have been altered: (1) species which lost the migratory habit due to a

significant decrease in population size, but are recovering migratory habits as well as undergoing an increase in population size as a result of conservation efforts; (2) species which are likely to meet the definition but have not yet been proven to do so; (3) species for which a portion of the population migrates across national boundaries but only to countries outside the EAAF. A TF on the definition of 'migratory waterbird' was established at MOP8 in 2015 to study these issues.

27. Ms. Tsujita explained that this proposal seeks to broaden the coverage of the Flyway, ensure that sites could not be added to FNS until migratory behaviour has been confirmed, and allow for sites to be added to FNS only when there are one or more species that meet/s one of the criteria. The recommendations on the EAAFP definition on migratory waterbird is in [Document 1.7.10](#).

1.7.11 Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 (CEPA Working Group)

28. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie, Chair of the CEPA WG presented the draft CEPA Strategy and Action Plan ([Document 1.7.11](#)), noting that this took into account the conclusions of the CEPA workshop held at MOP8 and other international developments on CEPA. The CEPA Strategy and Action Plan builds upon and replaces its predecessor which was developed in 2012, and its target audience is all implementers, including governments, NGOs, IGOs, etc. She highlighted that there would be two interactive sessions at MOP9 organised by the EAAFP Secretariat and the CEPA WG, the outcomes of which would be considered for the further development of this Strategy and Action Plan.

AGENDA ITEM 2: OVERVIEW REPORTING

Agenda Item 2.1: Brief Report from the Secretariat (Secretariat)

29. CE/EAAFP provided updates on the status of the EAAFP. In terms of FNS, 13 new sites were added since MOP8. There are now 138 FNS out of a total of 950 identified sites. Some FNS have no existing documentation due to historical reasons, as they were adopted from an Asia Pacific Migratory Waterbirds Strategy. He added that the EAAFP Secretariat encouraged FNS nominations and provided technical support to finalise submissions, and where original site nominations were made in other languages, support was provided for translation into English. The Secretariat provides technical support for FNS facing issues or threats; and hopes to do more work with sister-sites, as the FNS was intended to link sites within network. Partners were encouraged to develop sister-site relations with other FNS in the EAAFP.

30. CE/EAAFP noted that CEPA is an important aspect of the Partnership, and the Secretariat works with interns to produce newsletters every month, and engages people using social media, websites, etc. Partners are encouraged to increase their level of contribution by providing information, articles and updates to the Secretariat for sharing. The sharing of information on the website and other media channels would help to raise the EAAFP profile. Other efforts include the organisation of events such as the World Migratory Bird Day.

31. On technical WGs and TFs, since MOP8, small grants were provided for example to the CEPA WG, Black-faced Spoonbill and Avian Influenza WGs; and the Yellow Sea and Spoon-billed Sandpiper TFs for meetings and surveys. The Secretariat also organised pre-meetings of WGs and TFs at MOP9 and requested feedback on the usefulness of such pre-meetings for consideration as a model for future MOPs.

32. The Secretariat supported capacity building activities such as site manager workshops, often in collaboration with Ramsar. National workshops were held in local languages and highlighted the issues specific to each country and were held in Mongolia and Indonesia. International workshops bringing together site managers from the region were also held in ROK and Thailand. The workshop evaluations indicated that generally, participants expressed great appreciation for the workshops. The Secretariat also made some progress in the following Flyway-wide approaches: AMBI; Yellow Sea and Southeast Asia cooperation.

33. CE/EAAFP highlighted that the key issues faced by the Secretariat include:

- staffing and budget,
- Partner leadership in national partnerships and conduct of national partnership meetings,
- Partners engagement in information sharing and promoting actions, and
- the need for guidance on issues such as criteria for nomination of FNS, due to ambiguity in the rules.

34. Ms. Miyoung Choi (EAAFP Secretariat) presented a summary of the Financial Report of the EAAFP for FY2015 and FY2016, including a budget plan for FY2017 and FY2018. The details of the report from the EAAFP Secretariat is in [Document 2.1](#).

Agenda Item 2.2: Brief Report from the Finance Committee (Vice Chair, USA)

35. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) provided a report from the Finance Committee established at MOP8. He highlighted that in order to meet the obligations of the EAAFP, there is a need for a long-term, stable stream of funding for staffing, operations and activities under the Partnership. This would also be needed in order to enable partnerships and activities, and carry out plans for the future of the EAAFP. The main challenges are that costs are increasing, and it is not feasible to depend solely on the Incheon Metropolitan City Government for funding, particularly if the Partnership wishes to conduct more activities along the Flyway, especially with Partners that do not have the resources needed to implement such activities.

36. The Finance Committee made the following recommendations for the consideration of MOP9:

- the Finance Committee should be continued intersessionally, between MOPs,
- adopt the revised TOR for the Finance Committee,
- develop a database of contributions to track contributions of Partners,
- hire a fundraising officer,

- set up a system for voluntary fee-based contributions with a minimum contribution amount,
- develop a Partnership supporter programme, and
- explore Partnership offices in other Flyway countries besides the ROK, as this would allow other Partners to support EAAFP activities through both financial and in-kind support for staff and office operations

37. CE/EAAFP emphasised that the amount contributed is not as important as having a system in place to allow contributions, which would facilitate greater access to government funds; and noted that the details of amounts and scales of contributions could be discussed at a later point. A voluntary contribution structure would help with governance and supporting the continued levels of funding for the Secretariat. He also noted that a common question was how the setting up of offices in other countries would save cost for the operations of the Secretariat when it would appear to create additional expense. CE/EAAFP clarified that the intent is for the functions currently supported by Secretariat to be taken on by host countries of these additional offices, hence saving cost and reducing the burden on the Secretariat.

38. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) requested clarification on whether there is a need for a Memorandum of Understanding to be undertaken for the voluntary contributions or if the current agreement is sufficient. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) responded that clarity is important, and that the Finance Committee would consider the comments received in the development of the framework for voluntary contributions.

39. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) requested clarification on why the presentation by Ms. Miyoung Choi on the Financial Report for FY 2015 and 2016 showed there was unutilised budget that was carried over to subsequent years, yet CE/EAAFP mentioned in his presentation that the Secretariat could not continue the Science Officer position due to lack of funds. CE/EAAFP highlighted that funds are provided for specific purposes such as personnel, operations, activities and so on. Funds designated for personnel were set in 2009 and have not changed since, and funds designated for other purposes may not be used for personnel. He highlighted that the voluntary contribution system would help to address this issue.

40. Mr. James Harris (ICF) expressed that the EAAFP needs more resources to achieve its objectives and that it is not safe to rely on just one or two sources. The voluntary nature of this proposal means that no Partner is under pressure to contribute, but that contributions are encouraged, and the EAAFP would be better off with more Partners contributing even small amounts.

41. Mr. Sang Bum Lee (Incheon Metropolitan City) informed the meeting that Incheon City would continue to support the EAAFP, but highlighted that only 20% of the budget is spent on activities and the remaining 80% on salaries and office maintenance. He expressed strong support for the voluntary fee-based contribution system in order to carry out more activities which are core to the Partnership. He highlighted some examples of similar models and suggested the development of guidelines based on these.

Agenda Item 2.3: Brief Report of Independent Review of EAAFP (Secretariat)

42. CE/EAAFP presented a brief report on the Independent Review of the EAAFP ([Annex Document 2.3.1](#)), The EAAFP is a Type II initiative that is informal and voluntary. The objective of the Independent Review was to assess effectiveness of the EAAFP structures, mechanisms, programmes and processes in achieving the Partnership's goals and objectives. The recommendations of the Independent Review were to be considered in 2016 with a view to preparing a strategic plan for consideration at MOP9. The Independent Review's methodology included review of Partnership documents, stakeholder surveys, individual interviews and review of similar initiatives.

43. The Independent Review identified eight main governance and five main financing challenges respectively. The recommendations include increase engagement with sustainable development processes; improve governance structures, develop a monitoring framework for the Implementation Strategy; enhance the effectiveness of Management Committee and the WGs and TFs, strengthen the EAAFP Secretariat and mainstream Partnership issues into policy and planning. The Independent Review also proposed changes to the structure of the EAAFP which includes the establishment of a Board of Advisors and a Technical Advisory Sub-Committee. CE/EAAFP highlighted that the three key recommendations to consider at this meeting are sustainable financing, connecting with the corporate sector, and protecting and using the FNS.

44. CE/EAAFP noted that some elements of the TOR for the Independent Review remained unaddressed in the draft report; and the Consultant failed to incorporate comments provided by Partners and EAAFP Secretariat. As such the final payment was not made to the Consultant resulting in cost savings to address the gaps and comments. CE/EAAFP further noted that the proposals submitted by Australia at MOP9 on new rules of procedure for MOPs, new TOR for Management Committee and the establishment of a Technical Committee addressed some of the challenges and recommendations of the Independent Review.

45. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) requested a clarification on the relationship between the Technical Committee proposed by Australia and the existing WGs and TFs. CE/EAAFP clarified that the technical committee as recommended in the Independent Review was intended, *inter alia*, to improve communication among working groups and task forces.

46. Mr. Wanlop Preechamart (Thailand) sought clarification on the reference to the output of the Independent Review as a "draft" report, and if MOP9 should agree on adopting the report so that it could be considered a "final" report. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) suggested that the report should reflect the suggested amendments that Partners requested the consultant to make, as these are the gaps in the report, and should be retained for documentation. CE/EAAFP clarified that as the consultant has completed the Independent Review albeit unsatisfactorily, these amendments could not be incorporated into the draft report. However, the EAAFP Secretariat has a record of the suggested amendments which could be made available as necessary.

47. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) suggested that the draft report could not be adopted given that it is incomplete, and stated a preference for the draft report be taken as

a guiding document. She suggested the Management Committee assess the remaining recommendations of the draft report not addressed by the Australian proposals. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) agreed that there is a need to identify how to use the findings of the Independent Review, as the Australian proposals to the present MOP do not address all the findings. CE/EAAFP responded that Partners have to provide feedback on what recommendations from the Independent Report they wish EAAFP to take up as not all the recommendations may be worth adopting. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) supported the suggestion of AWSG to have the Management Committee look into the recommendations of the Independent Review before the next MOP.

Agenda Item 2.4 Summary of Partner Reports Submitted to the Secretariat

Governments (17)

48. Australia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, People's Republic of China, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russia, Singapore, Thailand, United States of America and Vietnam submitted their reports and are available [here](#).

49. Mr. Abdullah Al Islam Jakob (Bangladesh) reported that that wetlands in Bangladesh are under numerous threats, resulting in loss of habitat and biodiversity. Bangladesh takes a community-based wetlands management approach in order to balance the needs of people and the environment. The Government of Bangladesh has placed high priority on the conservation of natural resources including wildlife in her Constitution. Strategically situated, Bangladesh lies on two flyway networks: the EAAFP and Central Asian Flyway Network, and has five FNS. Bangladesh expressed hope for the EAAFP to focus on strengthening institutional capacity, sharing of knowledge and experiences, harmonisation of policies and laws, and promoting national, regional and international partnerships.

50. Mr. Than Naing (Myanmar) reported that Myanmar currently has three FNS (Gulf of Moattama, Indawgyi Wildlife Sanctuary and Moeyongyi Wildlife Sanctuary), with another two under preparation (Inle Lake and Mainmahla Island Wildlife Sanctuary). On the CEPA objective of the EAAFP, many environmental conservation awareness programmes have been conducted on a regular basis, approximately one event every three months. Myanmar has carried out surveys in all protected areas in the country under the research objective of the EAAFP, but lacks resources to do this effectively. There has been a lack of capacity building and would like to conduct more trainings with the technical assistance from INGOs and NGOs.

Non-Governmental Organisations (10)

51. AWSG, International Crane Foundation (ICF), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), IUCN, BirdLife International, Wild Bird Society of Japan, Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT), and Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust (MNT) submitted their reports and are available [here](#).

52. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) affirmed Wetlands International's commitment to contribute to the Partnership and noted that it has been actively working at the Flyway level as well as national level, in particular where it has offices for example, in Indonesia, Malaysia, Japan and China to support the implementation of the national priorities of the Partnership. He highlighted that Wetlands International constantly looks for ways to bring their expertise and experience at Flyway level down to site level. In terms of monitoring of waterbirds at FNS, Ramsar sites and other wetlands within the Asian Waterbird Census, he noted that a regional overview for 2008-2015 is included in [Annex Documents 4.9.2.1](#) and [4.9.2.2](#). He also highlighted that Wetlands International chairs or is involved in the WGs on migratory waterbirds, avian influenza and monitoring of waterbirds.

53. Dr. Mundkur also briefly outlined their work in Indonesia which includes working closely with the government in developing FNS; conducting workshops and trainings to strengthen the capacity of network site managers, local NGOs and university networks; and conducting CEPA related activities targeted at events such as World Wetlands Day and World Migratory Birds Day. In China, the focus is on strengthening networks of site managers along the Yellow Sea. In April 2016, during the northward migration, Wetlands International organised a major coordinated survey which involved experts and government agencies. Finally, he emphasised that based on their experience, it is important to adopt a landscape approach in addressing wetlands and migratory birds conservation and this entails working with main stakeholders at the critical sites as well as other stakeholders surrounding these sites for example companies and sectors involved in agriculture and fisheries.

54. Dr. Jonathan Slaght (Wildlife Conservation Society, WCS), the WCS Coordinator for Russia and Northeast Asia noted that WCS, which has key programmes operating locally throughout East Asia and is engaged in multiple international agreements such as the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), is well placed to contribute in a meaningful way to effect conservation change along the EAAFP. In terms of research and monitoring, WCS' research focus is on the Dunlin and is in partnership with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and Manomet, as well as from individuals from the Russian Academy of Sciences. The research on Dunlin would help in documenting the stopover and wintering areas for Arctic waders in general. In 2016, WCS contributed to three peer-reviewed papers, and there are a few more under review.

55. Dr. Slaght noted that on capacity building, WCS Russia Programme has been involved in the southern Russia Far East since 2000 and has expanded its scope in April 2016 from tiger conservation in Amur to offering trainings on broader scientific skills including statistical analysis and scientific writing which help to strengthen the capacity of Russian scientists along the Flyway. He noted that in 2016, WCS conducted two major international workshops involving 79 attendees from more than 20 protected areas, scientific institutions and NGOs in Russia. Finally, he noted that WCS' engagement in other international partnerships including AMBI and the Global Flyways Working Group of the CMS.

Inter-Governmental Organisations (6)

56. The CMS, Ramsar, CAFF, and the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) submitted their reports and are available [here](#).

57. There were no reports from FAO and the CBD as they were not present at the meeting. CE/EAAFP highlighted that the CBD has been a Partner of EAAFP since MOP8, and the Secretariat has been quite active in introducing migratory waterbirds and their habitats into training and workshops in the region, including current work on ecologically and biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs). The regional EBSA for the East Asian Seas includes a set of 20 intertidal waterbird sites.

Private Sector (1)

58. Rio Tinto was not present at the meeting and as such there was no report.

Special Partner (1)

59. Incheon City Government's report is available [here](#).

Brief Report from Working Groups (7)

60. The Anatidae WG, Black-faced Spoonbill WG, Seabird WG, Shorebird WG and CEPA WG submitted their reports and are available [here](#).

61. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International), Chair of the Avian Influenza (AI) WG highlighted that the WG has been communicating actively on avian influenza issues, particularly on outbreaks taking place in Asia and Europe in wild birds and poultry. The WG noted that the membership of the WG has increased and now includes Alaska, Australia, IUCN and Bangladesh. The WG has contributed towards the development of films, posters and information on the resources section of the EAAFP website and welcomes partners to use these for raising awareness of avian influenza. The WG also aims to determine the role of wild birds in avian influenza through improved surveillance.

62. Mr. Simba Chan (BirdLife International) informed that the Crane WG has not met since the previous MOP due to transitions in the members of the WG. Mr. James Harris (ICF) updated on networks that have been formed for four out of five species of cranes, and these networks have had various meetings.

Brief Report from Task Forces (7)

63. Baer's Pochard TF, Far Eastern Curlew TF, Scaly-sided Merganser TF and Yellow Sea Ecoregion TF submitted their reports, which are available [here](#).

64. CE/EAAFP informed that the Amur-Heilong Basin TF has been relatively inactive in recent years.

65. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG), chair of the Monitoring of Waterbird Populations and Sites TF reported that the TF would be reviewing its scope of work and hopes to update the TF's TOR after discussions at this MOP.

66. Dr. Christoph Zockler, Coordinator of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF highlighted that the TF conducted numerous activities which have been reported in the EAAFP newsletters. The TF noted that from their work in Russia there seems to be a halt in population decline or even a slight increase of population for this species; and in China they engaged local and state forest agencies to improve conservation efforts in Jiangsu province, while in Southern China the collaboration with state government agencies resulted in improvement in the hunting situation. In Myanmar, the TF is working with the government on securing wintering sites and trying to get possibly two Ramsar sites nominated. The TF acknowledged that there is good support from outside the Flyway, for example from Europe and USA; and that it receives funding, logistical and scientific support from various countries and agencies, particularly United Kingdom and WWT with the implementation of programmes on conservation breeding.

Southeast Asia Network

67. The Southeast Asia Network submitted its report and is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 2.5: Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration in Flyway Network Site Designation

2.5.1 EAAF131 Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary (State Government of South Australia)

68. Ms. Arkellah Irving (Australia) from the State Government of South Australia made a presentation on the stakeholder consultation efforts at the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary. The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary has long been known as a significant site for migratory shorebirds, being situated at the terminal end of the Flyway. However, the area was more commonly used by the locals for dumping rubbish and recreational activities.

69. There was a need to raise awareness about the site, and to encourage people to see the importance of the site. To do this, they applied a social sector model known as the collective impact model where each partner has an equal role and responsibility for making change. A considerable amount of time was spent engaging with the leadership groups which ensured that the local community had the opportunity to engage and find significance in the meaning of the area. They developed a collaborative vision for how the sanctuary should be developed which involved conservation of shorebirds as well as creating opportunities for people. It became a people-led development, and she emphasized the importance of celebrations in the form of festivals or similar. She invited Mr. Jeffrey Newchurch, an Indigenous Elder from the Kurna people who live in the area to share from his perspective on the establishment of the Sanctuary. Mr. Newchurch emphasised the

sense of importance that the local people had for conserving the environment, particularly for the birds.

2.5.2 EAAF133 Qupaluk (Casey Burns, US Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Arctic Office)

70. Mr. Casey Burns (USA) from the Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, presented their experience in engaging with local communities in the nomination of the Qupaluk FNS. This involved organising outreach and communication events with the local community and Alaskan natives to introduce the Flyway site and the EAAFP and to educate them on the biology of migratory birds and the importance and value of having a FNS. He emphasized the need to understand local perspectives and to involve them in the entire process, and to pay attention even to issues that may not be directly related, and he placed particular emphasis on the timely sharing of information and updates. They managed the issue of compatibility in land use, by ensuring that the existing rights and practices were not being removed. He indicated that they were interested to establish a sister site with other FNS important for Dunlin.

2.5.3 EAAF135 Negros Occidental Coastal Wetlands Conservation Area

71. There was a video presentation on EAAF135 Negros Occidental Coastal Wetlands Conservation Area. Mr. Anson Tagtag (Philippines) noted that the new FNS, which is also a Ramsar site, is an important migratory site for birds. He highlighted that the government had to work with ten different local governments with jurisdiction over the area to get them to agree to jointly manage the ecosystem.

AGENDA ITEM 3: WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES – BREAK-OUT SESSION **A**

Agenda Item 3.1: Shorebird Working Group Meeting

72. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) chaired the Shorebird WG meeting.

Agenda Item 3.2: Baer's Pochard Task Force Meeting

73. Prof. Changqing Ding chaired the Baer's Pochard TF meeting, supported by Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT), its global coordinator.

Agenda Item 3.3: Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force Meeting

74. Dr. Evgeny Syroyechkovskiy (Russia) chaired the Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF meeting, supported by Dr. Christoph Zockler, its coordinator.

Agenda Item 3.4: CEPA Working Group

75. Ms. Sandra Hails-Downie chaired the CEPA WG meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 4: DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS FROM PARTNERS

Agenda Item 4.1: Development of new EAAFP Strategic Plan (AWSG)

76. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) presented the draft resolution ([Document 1.7.1](#)) on the development of the new EAAFP Strategic Plan (SP) for the Partnership. He highlighted that a core element of the proposal is the formation of a TF to develop or update the SP for the EAAFP for a five-year period. He requested comments on the draft TOR and the proposed composition of the TF. He added that new elements recommended should be focused and specific on the desired outcomes and what needs to be achieved in the next five years.

77. CE/EAAFP commented that the current Implementation Strategy is for five years and the proposal is to develop another five-year SP. He noted the merit of developing a SP with a longer time horizon and sought clarification on how the SP would differ from the Implementation Strategy. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) responded that there are some advantages in having a longer time frame, to enable long-term planning, but there is still a need to identify what the Partnership wants to achieve in the next five years. He suggested using similar terminologies to other frameworks such as Ramsar or other international initiatives for greater clarity. Dr. Martin Spray (WWT) noted it is important to have a long-term view which means that such plans are usually at a broader level and would need a regular review process.

78. CE/EAAFP highlighted that the Independent Review noted that there is a lack of a framework to review and monitor the delivery of the Implementation Strategy and recommended that it may be useful to conduct an assessment to identify its strengths and weaknesses, and that such an exercise may be useful in the development of the SP.

79. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) obtained clarification from Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) that the proposal is to extend the current Implementation Plan until MOP10 and for the new SP to be adopted at that MOP10. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) supported the proposal in principle and noted that the outcomes of the CEPA WG break-out sessions would be useful in the development of the SP.

80. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) sought clarification on why the proposal for the Chair and Vice Chair which shall be chosen among the members of the TF are to be chosen at the first meeting of the TF to be held “no later than two months after MOP9”. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) clarified that this was to allow for time to identify partners committed to assist in the development of the SP. He also suggested that a side-meeting be held with all interested Partners during this MOP to discuss the proposal.

81. CE/EAAFP requested clarification on the role of the EAAFP Secretariat in the development of the SP in particular, the commitment in terms of time and effort. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) said that this would be part of the discussion at the side-meeting. CE/EAAFP highlighted that some resources have been allocated for the development of the SP in the proposed Secretariat’s Work Plan for 2017-2018 which would be considered in a later agenda.

82. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) commented that the title of this proposal referred to the development of a SP, whereas the current “plan” is called an “Implementation Strategy”. He highlighted the need to avoid confusion through the use of different terminologies and to provide clarity on the expectations by Partners. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) explained that the proposal seeks to change the terminology to make it more aligned to other international organisations, and that the proposal is for a more forward looking strategic framework which will identify the work which EAAFP wants to carry out within the period of the SP. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) suggested that the SP could cover a longer time period than the Implementation Strategy, and the latter would be more detailed in terms of concrete actions and timelines.

83. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) requested clarification on what is meant by “new implementation framework” (item 2 of the draft resolution); the basis of why the composition of the TF is limited to six Partners; and whether the other Partners would have the opportunity to comment on the draft of the SP. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) noted that these were important concerns to be discussed at the side-meeting.

84. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) requested for more information on time commitment, knowledge and expertise required for the TF. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) noted that the SP presents an opportunity to be more ambitious and not only serves as a guiding framework on what we do but informs on our resources and priorities. Partners’ key priorities could also be highlighted and recognised by the EAAFP.

85. The following Partners expressed interest to participate at the side-meeting on the development of the SP: Australia, China, Japan, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, BirdLife International, ICF, Wetlands International, WWT, WWF and CE/EAAFP.

Agenda Item 4.2: Finance Committee Proposals (USA)

86. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) presented the Finance Committee proposals as in [Document 1.7.2](#). The key proposals are to maintain a Finance Committee and approve its TOR; estimate the current baseline of contributions by Partners; hire a Fundraising Officer; and implement a volunteer fee-based contribution system.

87. Mr. Gi Min Jung (Republic of Korea, (ROK)) said that ROK was agreeable to the proposals but suggested renaming the “Finance Committee” to “Finance Sub-committee” as this would make clear the relationship of this committee with the Management Committee which should have oversight over financial issues. Similarly, he also suggested for the proposed “Technical Committee” (under Agenda 4.6) to be renamed as the “Technical Sub-committee” for similar reason.

88. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) requested clarification on how the amount of voluntary fees required is determined and the utilisation of such fees. He noted that while recurring costs are required for the Secretariat (such as salaries and operational costs), funds are also needed to run programmes and activities.

89. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) noted that the voluntary fees proposed were to address the financial deficit of the Secretariat, and to have access to funds which were not earmarked. CE/EAAFP clarified that the development of the table on voluntary fees took into consideration the financial needs of the Secretariat in terms of both personnel and activities; which is then used as a baseline to cover the deficit from the contribution of Incheon City.

90. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) highlighted that the Partnership should identify activities to be carried out and these should be budgeted for. CE/EAAFP commented that on the conduct of activities, many Partners use their own budget or raise funds for the implementation of activities. CE/EAAFP noted that the Secretariat has a very limited budget for activities; and funds for activities are largely provided by Partners. As such, his main focus is to fulfil the Secretariat's Work Plan, in terms of staff and budget to support the Partnership, for example, hiring of a science officer to support the technical needs of the Partnership or a fundraising officer to assist in raising funds.

91. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) highlighted that the Partnership's impact is mainly created through activities and would like some clarity on what is the minimal fund required to create an impact. He commented that the hiring of a fundraising officer may be more appropriate to achieve the desired level of funding. He also requested clarity on whether the voluntary contributions would be spent on activities or would go towards supporting staff for the Secretariat. CE/EAAFP responded that the voluntary funds were intended to increase the effectiveness of the Secretariat in achieving EAAFP objectives and the hiring a fundraising officer would lead to a greater impact for this Partnership in the long-term.

92. Dr. Martin Spray (WWT) expressed strong support for the appointment of a fundraising position but cautioned on the title and scope of the position. He noted that a fundraising officer needs to have the requisite experience and connections to engage with a wide network of individuals/ donors/ sponsors for the Partnership and as such may be costly to recruit but the expense may be recovered if the right person is hired.

93. Mr. James Harris (ICF) stressed that a diversity of income/funding sources is required for the sustainability of the Partnership. He acknowledged that different Partners have different capacities to contribute financially, but encouraged Partners to contribute to the extent of their capacity. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) recalled that at MOP8, the ROK agreed to continue to fund the Secretariat, but emphasized that ROK could not continue to be the sole contributor.

94. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) commented that a SP would help to address the funds required and how it would be utilised. He highlighted that the Independent Review identified challenges in the EAAFP structure which needs to be addressed, and the clarity provided by a SP would help Partners to justify additional funding to be allocated to the Partnership. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) noted the USA shared similar concerns and that there was a need for greater clarity on how the funds would be utilised.

95. Mr. Sang Bum Lee (Incheon City) noted that Incheon City found the model of secondments to the EAAFP Secretariat a feasible option of contribution, and suggested that Partners consider this model as a potential way to contribute towards the Partnership.

Agenda Item 4.3: Monitoring the Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites (Ramsar)

96. Ms. Minseon Kim (EAAFP Secretariat) presented the proposal ([Document 1.7.3](#)) on behalf of Ramsar and noted the reporting template ([Annex Document 1.7.3.1](#)) for FNS has been circulated three months prior to MOP9. She provided a status update on the submission of Site Information Sheets (SIS) and sought suggestions on encouraging submissions of SIS and the preferred mechanisms for Government Partners to report and update on their FNS. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro MNT) highlighted that the SIS form has now been simplified and designed to be easy to complete, with three sections, namely, management, CEPA and status of FNS. He noted that to understand the threats to FNS, Partners must first submit the SIS to facilitate analysis and actions to address the threats.

97. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) noted that Japan had provided SIS for most of their sites, and requested clarification on why Japan was reflected in the update as having 27 missing SIS. Ms. Minseon Kim (EAAFP Secretariat) highlighted that while the original nominations of FNS were accompanied by a detailed SIS, the SIS she referred to in her update were those submitted to the secretariat after 2009. The SIS for FNS established prior to 2009 and transferred from previous Networks were not reflected in this update unless they have been updated. For clarification, the reporting template on the status of the FNS Country Partners submit prior to each MOP is not referring to the SIS form. CE/EAAFP emphasised the importance that all FNS should have an SIS, and that this should be updated with the most recent template, and encouraged all Partners to submit their outstanding SIS for their respective FNS.

98. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) requested clarification on how some FNS were recognised despite not having a baseline SIS. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) clarified that in the initiation of the EAAFP, information from Ramsar was used as a basis for designating FNS. He encouraged Government Partners to use expertise of NGO Partners to assist in completing the SIS, in particular on waterbird counts. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) highlighted that Wetlands International has information on at least half of the FNS from the Asian Waterbird Census and offered to share the information with Partners and the Secretariat. Mr. Simba Chan (BirdLife International) called for all FNS to be engaged in waterbird monitoring which would contribute to the information required in the SIS.

99. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro MNT) suggested that SIS of all FNS should be looked through to generate a list of perceived threats which could then be raised as an agenda item for discussion on how to address these threats at MOP10.

100. In terms of addressing threats to FNS, Mr. Lew Young (Ramsar) presented a [flow chart](#) on the process proposed when information is received by the Secretariat on perceived threat/s to the FNS. He also proposed for the Secretariat to prepare a paper for each future

MOP on FNS where threats have been reported and verified, and the actions taken to address those threats.

101. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) sought clarification on what the Secretariat could do working with Country Partners to address the threats as this is currently not very clear. Mr. Lew Young (Ramsar) noted that there is a range of actions that could be taken and it would depend what the Country Partner would think as the most appropriate action in addressing the reported threat. This could include assisting the Country Partner on fundraising or more direct actions.

102. CE/EAAFP expressed concern that the Secretariat may receive a lot of reports on perceived threats which would require the Secretariat to expend considerable resources to follow-up on these reports. He highlighted the need for practical considerations and suggested that the Monitoring TF or species related WGs/TFs could also have a potential role in assisting to address threats to the sites.

103. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that further discussion is needed before Australia could support the proposal. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro MNT) recognised that the Partnership needs to play a role in addressing threats. However, he was not sure how the Partnership as a collective could assist and as such there is a need to develop a response framework to address the threats reported. CE/EAAFP noted that there is a difference if the threat report is from a site manager or from a newspaper report; and as such more thought is required on the development of criteria which would trigger a response and the follow-up procedures.

104. Mr. Lew Young (Ramsar) recalled that prior to MOP8, an NGO reported threats to an FNS to the Secretariat. There were subsequent discussions on how to deal with such reports but no decision was made. He also highlighted that Ramsar also received information about a threat to a site in the intersessional period and in that case, he worked with the EAAFP Secretariat to write to the Country Partner about the threat. He further highlighted that being a member of the Flyway should confer some benefits and as such the Partnership should have a process in place to address the reported threats. CE/EAAFP concurred with Mr. Young that there has to be a benefit to being part of the Flyway; and the questions was not on whether there was a need to address the issue but rather the best process to address this.

105. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) highlighted that one of the objectives of the EAAFP is to better manage sites. He suggested that the Partnership applies the proposed process and document how many reports are received and the follow-up actions taken; and subsequently to evaluate the effectiveness of the process. He offered to share information with the Secretariat to inform the decisions which would be taken; and that WI offices in Partner countries could assist in responding to such reports including working closely with the Government.

106. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) noted that in principle threats in the country should be addressed by the Government themselves as they usually would have more information than the Secretariat on the threats. She added that as the Secretariat is small, Partners

should not add to the work burden of the Secretariat on domestic matters. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) shared similar sentiments and raised the issue on the Secretariat's response to third party's report on threats. He noted that responding to threats is a matter for Government Partners of the Flyway.

107. CE/EAAFP noted that it was quite straightforward for Secretariat to forward the information received on the perceived threats to the Government Partner concerned. However, the Secretariat would not be in a position to assess or address the threats unless requested by Government Partners. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) noted that the Secretariat's role is to document the reported threats against the list of FNS. Mr. Lew Young (Ramsar) requested the Secretariat to provide a paper for the consideration at a future MOP on the status of FNS including an analysis of the information provided in the SIS, including threats. In response to a question by the Vice Chair on the relevance of this issue to the development of the SP, Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) responded that to maintain the value of the FNS, it could be linked to achieving some targets which Partners could report against.

Agenda Item 4.4: New Rules of Procedure for MOPs (Australia)

108. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) proposed new rules of procedure for application for future MOPs ([Document 1.7.4](#)) which respond to challenges identified in the Independent Review. He notes that there are no financial implications on the Secretariat. The proposal seeks to outline rules governing the MOPs, for example the admission of observers, appropriate time-frame for submission of agenda documents, etc.

109. Mr. Gi Min Jung (Republic of Korea) initially proposed to amend the proposed threshold for Rule 7.3 on observer attendance at MOPs from one third to two thirds of the Parties present at the meeting, as they had interpreted the rule to mean that Observers would be allowed to vote, which generated some concern. It subsequently became clear that this was a misunderstanding, and that the rule was in relation to attendance at MOPs rather than voting rights, and ROK retracted its earlier intervention.

110. Mr. Gi Min Jung (ROK) made a suggestion to replace the phrase "the session of the Meeting of the Partners shall be held in the country where the Secretariat has its seat" in Rule 3.2 with "shall send a request to the country where the Secretariat has its seat". Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia), Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) and Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) supported ROK's suggestion on Rule 3.2.

111. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) expressed his concern on Rule 10 which requires Partners to submit their documents ninety days before the opening of a MOP and inquired on the implications of this rule if Partners failed to meet the deadline. CE/EAAFP noted that while the rules provide an ideal approach to facilitate the preparation of Partners for MOPs, the Secretariat has taken a flexible approach and encouraged Partners on their timely submission. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) noted that such rules indicated the maturity of the Partnership and further noted that whereas NGO Partners are flexible, Government Partners decision-making process requires time and non-timely submission of documents may affect the ability of Government Partners to make decisions at MOPs.

112. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that flexibility on deadlines could be applied for example to documents such as country reports but noted that strategic papers need to adhere to the deadline to facilitate decision-making at MOPs. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) commented that substantive documents would need greater consideration than regular reports, and suggested making a distinction between different types of documents. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) agreed and suggested that penalties may ensure that deadlines are met.

113. CE/EAAFP raised the issue of Partners potentially proposing new agenda items at the MOP itself to circumvent the deadline of 90 days prior to the meeting. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) responded that Rule 32.3 addresses this concern by determining that papers raised at the meeting may only deal with issues that could not be foreseen beforehand. He informed the MOP of a duplication, and suggested removing rule 7.1 to prevent confusion.

114. Mr. Wanlop Preechamart (Thailand) requested a clarification on whether Rules 6.2 and 7.3 were the same. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) explained that Rule 6.2 referred to range states which were invited to attend, whereas Rule 7.3 referred to observers to the MOP.

Agenda Item 4.5: New Terms of Reference for Management Committee (Australia)

115. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) outlined that the proposal sought to revise the TOR for the Management Committee of the EAAFP ([Document 1.7.5](#)) He noted that the TOR should be reviewed every three years, but has not been reviewed since 2010. The proposed representation of the Management Committee remains the same, with an appointment of two years, allowing for extension. The new TOR would apply post MOP9.

116. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) requested clarification on Item 11 with regard to the composition of the Management Committee, and if there would be a situation where more than two vice chairs would be elected to the Committee. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that there would only be one vice chair of the partnership and that would not change.

117. CE/EAAFP requested clarification on Item 17 which noted that any Partners not members of the Committee requesting to be involved in the Management Committee would be invited with the right to participate as observers, which could potentially lead to problems if a large number of people attend the Management Committee meetings. Mr. James Harris (ICF) highlighted that this was at the discretion of the Chair, who would be able to manage attendance at the meetings. Mr Geoff Richardson (Australia) explained that the proposal on Item 17 was premised on transparency. However, he noted the practicality aspect and that the meeting may end up having a large number of participants. He would take these comments into consideration.

118. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) expressed his support for Item 18 which allows the Chair to invite any person or representative to the meeting as an observer without the right to vote as it would allow the Chair to bring people with specific expertise as necessary to the

meeting. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) shared the same views as Mr. Spray and noted that the discretion to invite was with the Chair and this could also be applied to Item 17. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) noted that the size of the committee is important and there is a need to manage the size to get the work done; and as such the Partnership should not develop something that could be counterproductive in terms of number of participants.

119. Ms. Jong Ok Kim (DPRK) requested clarification on the timeline for the admission of new Partners, and stressed the need for timely communication regarding the outcome of admission into the Partnership. She highlighted that DPRK submitted its application to be a Partner on 1 December 2016; and their understanding was that if no issues were raised within a month, the applicant would be admitted as a Partner. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) highlighted that EAAFP does not have a process in place to address the application for admission of a potential Partner when there is an objection. He noted the need for the Management Committee to address this issue as a priority well in advance of MOP10; and also to discuss potential unanticipated situations which the Committee may face. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) suggested the current Management Committee try to resolve this issue before the new Management Committee takes over. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) supported Australia's suggestion and noted for the new rules to take into consideration such issues.

120. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) noted that in reference to Item 13, some of the duties requested of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Management Committee seemed to be supporting the Secretariat rather than the Partnership. He further noted that some of these duties are administrative and would take up considerable resources of the Chair and Vice Chair and therefore would recommend that these duties be delegated to the Secretariat and for the Chair and Vice Chair to take up more oversight/ supervisory roles. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that it was not the intent for the Chair and Vice Chair to take up administrative roles but rather oversight of the Secretariat.

121. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) noted that on Item 11, the composition of the Management Committee, that while the Chair and Vice Chair could come from any Partner, regardless of organisation, other positions have specific requirements that the member should come from particular groups with the goal of diversifying the members of the Committee. The current structure of the entire Partnership included many government Partners compared to others, but the Management Committee structure only allows for one government Committee member. He highlighted the need for flexibility in the organisational requirements of the Committee, noting that other groups faced difficulties finding representatives for their committees. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) agreed on the need for flexibility in order to form a full committee, as some Partners may not be able to participate. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that the existing TOR required that the Chair of the Partnership be restricted to Government Partners, whereas the Vice Chair could come from other organisations, and that he could add this in the revised TOR for clarity.

122. CE/EAAFP highlighted a concern on ensuring continuity in the Committee, and suggested some form of staggering of incoming and outgoing committee members. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) suggested a variable length of term to provide this

continuity, where some members are appointed for two years, while others are appointed for four years to ensure continuity between MOPs. Mr. James Harris (ICF) suggested to have all committee members enter on a two-year commitment, followed by an extension at the end of the term for some members for the purpose of continuity due to the difficulty to commit four years from the outset.

Agenda Item 4.6: Technical Committee (Australia)

123. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) presented the proposal to establish a Technical Committee ([Document 1.7.6](#)) to support the work of the WGs and TFs, the members of which are appointed to contribute in an expert capacity and not as representatives of Partners. He added that the proposal is for a 10-member Committee and that this Committee could address the loss of the Science Officer position at the Secretariat. The appointment to the Technical Committee would occur at MOP10.

124. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro MNT) expressed support for the proposal, but stated a preference that MOP9 should adopt the proposal and establish the Technical Committee immediately. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that the challenge to Mr. Lawrie's suggestion was agreeing on the process to select the members; and suggested that an option would be to appoint the existing WG and TF Chairs to the Technical Committee. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) noted that the need for a Technical Committee would be seen most in between MOPs, with many cross-cutting technical issues that needed to be addressed by such a body. He supported the immediate formation of the Technical Committee and offered Wetlands International's experience as a contribution to the Technical Committee. He also volunteered to be part of the Technical Committee as Chair of the Avian Influenza WG, if Chairs of the WGs and TFs are called to form the first Technical Committee.

125. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that Item 6 on the functions of the Technical Committee would help clarify the role of the Committee vis-à-vis the WGs and TFs. CE/EAAFP pointed that for the Technical Committee to have the responsibility for coordinating research on migratory species may be beyond its mandate and capacity. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) suggested that the Technical Committee could be more useful in identifying priority areas for research and not necessarily coordinating research. He suggested that "coordinating" should be replaced by "having oversight" or some other term implying a higher level function. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) suggested removing the coordinating function on research which could be better left to the WGs and TFs; and to focus on coordination of Flyway-wide issues. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia), speaking as TF Chair, commented that research is not necessarily a high priority across all WGs and TFs, and asked for clarification of what is considered "technical", that is, only research or does it encompass education and awareness raising. He noted that while it may be good for WG and TF Chairs to be part of the Technical Committee, the Partnership should consider involving experts from countries outside of the Partnership who have specific expertise and could contribute to the Technical Committee. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT) suggested that the Technical Committee should focus on emerging issues and horizon scanning, whereas WGs and TFs should focus on implementation of plans.

126. CE/EAAFP highlighted that the Technical Committee should not be confused with a Scientific Committee; and Technical Committee members could be technical experts for example in education, policy development and social sciences. He suggested deleting Item 10(b) which notes that the EAAFP Science Officer is part of the Committee as there are currently no plans to recruit a Science Officer.

127. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) inquired that if there are no plans for a Science Officer, what would be the relationship between the Technical Committee and the Secretariat. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) commented that in other bodies, the secretariat typically participates in the meetings of the technical committee and generally report directly to the Secretariat. He noted that his may be a model for consideration in defining the role of the proposed Technical Committee. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) reiterated that the proposal includes both TOR and ROP for the Technical Committee; and that Rule 14 of the ROP notes that the Secretariat shall service the meetings of the Technical Committee.

128. The following Partners expressed interest to work with Australia on the proposals for the Technical Committee: USA, AWSG, Pukorokoro MNT, Wetlands International and WWT.

Agenda Item 4.7: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force (Australia)

129. Dr. Mark Carey (Australia), Chair of the Far Eastern Curlew TF expressed his appreciation to the members of the TF for their contributions to the development of the International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of Far Eastern Curlew; and suggested the TF continue to oversee the implementation of the plan. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia) commended the TF for the good plan and that he would provide Australia with some comments. Dr. Mark Carey (Australia) noted that there would be a break-out session for this TF which would provide opportunities to further discuss and invite comments on the plan with the view for its adoption at the end of MOP9. The plan is available in [Annex Document 1.7.7.1](#).

Agenda Item 4.8: Southeast Asia Network (Singapore)

130. Ms. Wendy Yap (Singapore) outlined the proposal to establish a Southeast Asia/ASEAN Network ([Annex Document 1.7.8.2](#)), which was agreed upon at MOP8, together with a TOR for the network. There are currently eight EAAF Partners who are ASEAN member states, in addition to the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity. She sought further inputs from partners, with the aim of submitting the proposal for funding support through the ASEAN framework. Noting that the overall budget of the three-year proposal was fairly high at USD 4 million, she advised to prioritise and package the activities into a few smaller proposals to facilitate funding from different donors. She encouraged interested Partners, in particular representatives from ASEAN member states to provide their comments on the proposal.

Agenda Item 4.9: Standardised Waterbird Monitoring (BirdLife International and Wetlands International)

131. Mr. Simba Chan (BirdLife International) invited partners who are interested in the proposal to standardise waterbird monitoring for planning and conservation measures to attend the break-out session on 14 January 2017. Mr. Simba's presentation is available [here](#).

132. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) emphasised the importance of having scientifically sound information on waterbirds in the Flyway. He noted that Partners need to address the monitoring needs of the single species action plans, and that there is a large number of sites of international importance that have not been designated which require monitoring to better understand what is happening in the Flyway. He suggested Partners strengthen the waterbird monitoring programme, building on existing programmes such as the Asian Waterbird Census. He encouraged Partners to identify resources for monitoring at both national and Flyway levels; and noted in particular the big data gap in Southeast Asia which could be addressed through building capacity in Southeast Asia. He also suggested that the Partnership could play a more active role in the synthesis of data from such programmes and to provide such information as intersessional updates or to MOPs. Dr. Mundkur's presentation is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 4.10: Definition of Migratory Populations (Japan)

133. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) highlighted that she had only received comments on the definition from Mr. Simba Chan (BirdLife International). Mr. Chan noted that the addition of sites to the FNS may be delayed as it is a long process to determine if a species is truly migratory, and that may impact conservation efforts on the ground. She emphasised that some elements of this concern could be addressed by the proposed framework, in which potential migratory species are covered under the EAAFP at the request of Partners, and that it was only the designation of FNS that would experience any delay. She further recommended that sites should not be added to the FNS until the species for which the site is nominated is proven to be migratory, since the EAAFP deals with migratory waterbirds, hence migration is a key factor. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) and Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) supported the proposal in its current form ([Document 1.7.10](#)), for evidenced based addition to the FNS.

Agenda Item 4.11: Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 (CEPA Working Group)

134. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie, Chair of the CEPA WG, informed the MOP that the WG had developed the CEPA Strategy and Action Plan for 2017-2021 ([Document 1.7.11](#)) and that the WG at its break-out session on 11 January 2017 provided comments on the presentation of the document which require rethinking on the structure to reflect current trends in CEPA, which involved a bottom-up approach as compared to a top-down approach which the current document had adopted. Discussions between the CEPA WG members, CE/EAAFP, Vice Chair and various Partners such as Wetlands International concluded that if Partners had no objections to the Strategy and Action Plan in its current form, it could be approved in principle at MOP9, and revised by the CEPA WG intersessionally with a view for its formal adoption at the next MOP. This decision was reached on the basis that the document in its current form is seen as a useful guiding document which could be used to seek resources for the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan.

Agenda Item 4.12: Proposed Task Force on Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the EAAF (CAFF)

135. Dr. Jennifer Provencher (AMBI) outlined the background to this proposal which included EAAFP decision 7.9 of MOP8s in 2015 (to consider work on illegal hunting); the AMBI work plan 2015-2019 which includes illegal hunting, of which EAAFP is a project partner; and a key recommendation of the AMBI Workshop in Singapore which preceded MOP9. She noted that a side-group meeting gathered 17 persons with many countries and partners represented. She requested that the draft TOR developed by the group be circulated for comments. She articulated that the goal of this TF is to provide a platform for partners to work together, and to exchange experience and knowledge with the ultimate goal of taking action to significantly reduce the impact of illegal hunting, taking and trade of migratory waterbirds in the EAAF. She requested that an interim TF be formed immediately by MOP9 and that CAFF would be willing to be the interim vice chair (if agreed by the Partners). She would work with Partners to find an interim Chair for the TF. She further proposed the TF begin work immediately during the intersessional period and the formal establishment of the TF would take place according to protocol at MOP10.

AGENDA ITEM 5: ARCTIC MIGRATORY BIRDS INITIATIVE

136. Dr. Jennifer Provencher, AMBI Coordinator for Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), presented an overview of the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative (AMBI), an initiative under CAFF. She highlighted that an Arctic Biodiversity Assessment was completed in 2013 providing a better understanding of the status and trends of Arctic flora and fauna. She noted that the under AMBI, there are four Flyways: Circumpolar, Americas, African-Eurasian and the East-Asian Australasian.

137. She highlighted the conservation issues of the AMBI EAAF include habitat loss, pollution and unsustainable hunting and the key species of concern which are the spoon-billed sandpiper, bar tailed godwit, dunlin, great knot, red knot and lesser white-fronted goose. She further highlighted the outcomes of the AMBI Singapore Workshop which was held back to back with MOP9 from 9-10 January 2017. The key recommendations included the establishment of an international WG to consider illegal hunting, take and trade of birds in the EAAF; development of guidelines, action plans or other recommendations to respond to specific problems as necessary and for the EAAFP as a convener.

138. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia) highlighted the complexity of the issue of illegal hunting and the need for continued dialogue between all Partners along the EAAF on this issue. As such, he proposed the establishment of a task force to address illegal hunting of migratory birds along the EAAF. The following Partners expressed interest in joining the task force: Indonesia, Philippines, Japan, Russia, Singapore, USA, CMS and WCS. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy would take the lead in this task force, and report back to the Partnership on the outcome of an informal meeting of the Partners mentioned above.

AGENDA ITEM 6: INTERACTIVE SESSION – DEVELOPING A LONG-TERM VISION FOR EAAFP AND THE FLYWAY (CEPA WORKING GROUP)

139. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie, Chair of CEPA WG facilitated the interactive session on developing a long-term vision for EAAFP and the Flyway.

AGENDA ITEM 7: WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES – BREAK-OUT SESSION **B**

Agenda Item 7.1: Yellow Sea Ecoregion Task Force Meeting

140. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) chaired the Yellow Sea Ecoregion TF meeting.

Agenda Item 7.2: Anatidae Working Group Meeting and Scaly-sided Merganser Task Force Meeting

141. Mr. Masayuki Kurechi chaired the Anatidae WG meeting, supported by Dr. Katsumi Ushiyama, its coordinator.

142. Prof. Guangchun Lei (China) chaired the Scaly-sided Merganser TF meeting, supported by Dr. Diana Solovyeva, its coordinator.

Agenda Item 7.3: Seabird Working Group Meeting

143. Mr. Robb Kaler (USA) chaired the Seabird WG meeting, supported by Mr. Yat-tung Yu and Dr. Mark Carey (Australia), its coordinators

Agenda Item 7.4: Southeast Asia Network Meeting

144. Dr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) facilitated the discussion of the Southeast Asia Network meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 8: WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES – BREAK-OUT SESSION **C**

Agenda Item 8.1: Monitoring Task Force Meeting

145. Mr. Doug Watkins (Wetlands International) chaired the Monitoring TF meeting.

Agenda Item 8.2: Avian Influenza Working Group Meeting

146. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) chaired the Avian Influenza WG meeting.

Agenda Item 8.3: Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group Meeting

147. Mr. Yat-Tung Yu (Hong Kong Birdwatching Society) chaired the Black-faced Spoonbill WG meeting.

Agenda Item 8.4: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force Meeting

148. Dr. Mark Carey (Australia) chaired the Far Eastern Curlew TF meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 9: BRIEF REPORT ON EAAFP WORK PLAN 2017-2018

Agenda Item 9.1: Secretariat's Work Plan and Budget (Secretariat)

149. CE/EAAFP presented the Secretariat's Work Plan and Budget for the next two years ([Document 9.1](#)). It follows the five objectives and format of previous work plans. The objectives are (i) develop FNS, (ii) CEPA, (iii) research, monitoring, knowledge generation and exchange, (iv) capacity building and (v) Flyway-wide approaches. On the objective to develop FNS, the Secretariat would facilitate completion of SIS forms and provide support such as translation of SIS. Some funds are budgeted for small workshops and consultancies for the FNS. On the CEPA objective, he highlighted that much of the work involved maintaining and updating the EAAFP website in different languages, circulating regular newsletters, producing brochures of new FNS and organising events such as World Migratory Bird Day as well as attending international events to profile the work of the EAAFP, such as the Flyway-wide World Youth Forum. Research, monitoring, knowledge generation and exchange would form a significant portion of the Work Plan. A technical training manual is planned, and a consultant would be hired to develop it. The activities under the capacity building objective include site workshops and national partnership meetings which are dependent on relevant Partners to organise. The Secretariat would continue to support Flyway-wide approaches like the Yellow Sea Initiative, SE Asia Network, World Heritage nominations and the organisation of MOPs. The Secretariat has also budgeted for a meeting of the Finance Committee and for a workshop to develop the Strategic Plan.

150. Mr. Nils Warnock (Audubon Alaska) inquired on the time frame of the new SP; and the CE/EAAFP stated a preference for a ten-year time frame but noted that the SP TF would convene to decide. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) added that the break-out group is suggesting a ten-year SP with a review after five years.

151. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) commended that this was a good work plan with a good range of activities. He sought clarification on the way in which these activities would be funded – with some to be funded from carry-over funds while others from the core budget. He noted that any unutilised money could be an indication of under-delivery of the previous work plan, and asked if there was a strategy in place to help ensure delivery of the proposed Work Plan.

152. CE/EAAFP informed that the financial paper provides details on the budget sources for each activity; and explained the reason for unutilised funds was due to partner-dependent activities that did not materialise, such as national partnership meetings. He highlighted that planned support to TFs and WGs is dependent on these groups coming up with activity proposals, and he encouraged TFs and WGs to consider proposing activities that the Secretariat could support.

153. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) requested clarification on how the outputs from the current MOP may impact the proposed budget, such as the new TOR for the new

Management Committee, as these deal with governance of the Partnership. CE/EAAFP replied that there was a low chance of any significant reallocation of funds even though the new Management Committee may have a different mode of operations

154. Mr. Anson M. Tagtag (Philippines) announced that the CMS COP-7 would be hosted by Philippines in Oct 2017, and would like to work with EAAFP and the Secretariat to highlight the work of the Partnership. CE/EAAFP added that the CMS COP is a good opportunity to encourage Government Partners to accede to the CMS, especially since CMS is an EAAFP Partners. He noted that there is some budget for the Secretariat's participation in CMS COP and it would be an opportunity to strengthen collaboration between EAAFP and CMS, and for the WGs and TFs to review which species could be listed. He further noted that Partners should consider how they could contribute to the CMS COP.

155. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) expressed support for the Work Plan and enquired on the budget of USD 375,000 for 2018 - on whether this amount has already been committed to the EAAFP, aside from the carry-over funds, and whether this amount includes any additional funding from Partners.

156. CE/EAAFP responded that the budget is based on the funds that we have, including carry-over funds with the assumption that the funds for 2017 and commitments from other partners would remain the same in 2018. He noted that there is a possibility that we may not receive the same amount of funds in 2018; in which case upon the submission of the expenditure report for 2017, the Secretariat would be able to review the budget for 2018 and make the necessary adjustments and report to Partners with the differences explained.

157. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) inquired on the estimated discrepancy if the assumptions of the Secretariat which is based on the contributions of the host Partner and other Partners are not met. CE/EAAFP noted that the shortfall would unlikely be as much as 30%, but would probably be within the range of 10-15%. He encouraged Partners to contribute in whatever ways possible to help minimise the shortfall.

158. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) sought clarification that the Management and Finance Committees would be consulted in the event of any changes to the funds committed. CE/EAAFP confirmed that there would be such consultations.

159. Mr. Borja Heredia (CMS) offered to provide information to Partners on the CMS COP to be held in the Philippines, including information on conducting side events. CE/EAAFP encouraged partners to think about their participation at CMS COP as time was short.

160. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) reiterated that the Work Plan and Budget is important for the development of the Partnership over the next two years, in particular the implementation of activities. He requested the Secretariat to explore potential donors and in-kind funds for activities which would be cost savings for the budget and be used for other important Partnership activities. He noted the need to maintain some flexibility in the budget even though it is endorsed by Partners, for unforeseen events or important activities.

Agenda Item 9.2: National Partnerships (Secretariat)

161. CE/EAAFP noted that some items in the agenda focussed on how we could improve Partner engagement in the EAAFP; and that there is an interactive exercise on mechanisms for increasing engagement for the Partnership at this MOP to inform the Secretariat on how it could better assist Partners on their engagement for the Partnership. He highlighted that one of the mechanisms for engagement is the development of national partnerships. In such partnerships, each Partner focal point needs to facilitate communications. He noted the need to broaden the national partnership to enhance linkages and improve synergies and to include a wide-range of stakeholders such as NGOs and interest groups. There is also a need for a structure/ mechanism to share information on the Partnership's goals and activities. Feedback mechanisms are necessary to learn how to better promote national partnerships. He noted that due to different circumstances of Partner Countries, there are different modalities on how Partners promote and engage in the national partnerships.

162. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) asked if there is an implied inclusion of WGs and TFs in the national partnerships. CE/EAAFP replied that national partnerships is more for Country Partners and WGs and TFs may contribute if there are opportunities to do so.

163. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) asked if there was any country with a full-time focal point for this Partnership. He further suggested that it may be more effective if Partners nominated dedicated focal points to engage with the EAAFP. Mr. Anson M. Tagtag (Philippines) reported that the Philippines has a Biodiversity Management Bureau which serves as the focal point for the CMS and EAAFP. This focal point is responsible for carrying out national activities, building partnerships with conservation organisations, to promote the work of the Flyway including consultations for establishment of FNS. The Bureau works closely with birding groups such as the Haribon Foundation, and the Philippines Biodiversity Foundation. The NFP has memorandum of understandings with these groups to promote the conservation of birds, including Waterbirds. The Bureau also works with the Department of Tourism in Philippines to promote and raise awareness on some of the important migratory bird sites and all FNS as ecotourism destinations.

164. CE/EAAFP acknowledged that Philippines has a good model. He noted that reports and proposal submissions often came from a single agency, usually where the focal point is from and does not reflect the whole range of activities in the country. For example, Ramsar national focal points may not be same as EAAFP national focal points. He called for closer coordination among the relevant national focal points of biodiversity related conventions and initiatives, IGOs and NGOs national focal points to more effectively address issues of mutual interest. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) shared similar views and noted that there is a need to set up mechanisms to enhance the interlinkages among the relevant stakeholders.

165. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) gave a presentation on how national partnerships are managed in Japan. She noted that Japan has a total of 33 FNS, with several more sites to be added in the coming years; and three national networks (developed under the Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy), namely Anatidae, Shorebird, and Crane networks. Each national network has a coordinator; and each FNS belongs to one of the networks. Experts provide technical support to these networks. Each network publishes regular newsletters and conducts workshops for Flyway site managers which involve local

governments and NGOs to promote the sharing of experiences among the FNS. Most participants to the workshops provided positive feedback that the workshops were very informative and useful, but collaborative work between network sites remain a challenge to initiate and maintain. Ms. Tsujita also noted that there is a National Secretariat served by BirdLife International-Japan which coordinates the three networks. A national meeting is held annually to share progress on their activities and discuss issues of common concern. The Ministry of Environment, Japan communicates with the National Secretariat for relevant information.

166. Prof. Lei Guangchun (China) applauded Japan for demonstrating a good model for national partnerships. He noted that China is close to establishing its national partnership which is likely to be established this year after it has successfully engaged with various relevant organisations. China is attempting to bring the various organisations together, some of which have large memberships and as such, social media such as “WeChat” (with a Chinese-English translation function) was a good mechanism to share and exchange information.

167. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) shared that in Alaska, the Alaska Bird Conference is held every two years to share information and knowledge; and updates are presented for example at more specific meetings for shorebird and waterfowl. As the EAAFP focused on migratory waterbirds which is under the purview of the US Fish and Wildlife Service, other land management agencies may not be as actively involved. Therefore, he called for better cohesion and linkages among the relevant agencies which would greatly improve the efficiency of the conservation work.

168. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie (Chair of CEPA WG) commented that she has been trying to find examples of national partnerships that work. She notes that the CEPA WG would like to be involved with such initiatives to facilitate better communication and noted that information would need to flow both ways – top-down as well as bottom-up.

169. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) shared that Wetlands International is working with MOE Japan to support the strengthening of the monitoring of waterbirds at FNS and other potential sites to better understand how it would fit into the national structure and provide a model for other countries. CE/EAAFP noted that there are many approaches to facilitate national partnerships, but they would require effort and willingness to initiate and maintain them. He noted the example of China using “WeChat” which have an English translation function which enables more interested stakeholders to be involved in the conversation.

Agenda Item 9.3: Summary of Partner Work Plans Submitted to the Secretariat

Governments (17)

170. Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russia, Singapore, Thailand, United States of America and Vietnam submitted their work plans and they are available [here](#).

171. Prof. Guangchun Lei (China) highlighted that China's work plan includes the assessment of potential sites as FNS, in particular the assessment of 140 coastal and 200 inland sites. China hopes to designate five more FNS, the submission of three of these sites are ready. He also highlighted that China is in current negotiations with different stakeholders to establish national partnerships; and that monitoring and capacity building activities would continue to be conducted in the next two years.

Non-Governmental Organisations (10)

172. WWF, IUCN, BirdLife International, Wild Bird Society of Japan, WWT, Pukorokoro MNT and WCS submitted their work plans and they are available [here](#).

173. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) informed that BirdLife Australia of which the AWSG is a working group, held a workshop on the conservation of migratory shorebirds in December 2016. BirdLife Australia and AWSG would be developing the programme of work for shorebirds. As the programme is still under development, they would only be able to elaborate on how this contributes to the EAAFP in the next few months, and as such AWSG would only be able to inform the EAAFP on its contribution at a later date.

174. Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) highlighted that ICF conducted a number of activities such as the conservation of the Siberian crane and would be focussing on the conservation of their breeding grounds in Siberia and staging areas in Northeast China. ICF would also be conducting wetlands training course for the relevant wetland reserves. They have been working with local communities in Siberia to integrate bird conservation into the management of lakes managed for fish production, as well as working with the photography community on disturbances to the birds. They have a project on white-naped cranes, tracking their movements from breeding grounds in Mongolia across China, as well as ongoing tracking programmes for Siberian cranes, and a project in Southeast Asia on Sarus cranes. They will be conducting many community based conservation projects, including an annual count. They are also developing a global crane conservation strategy as part of the IUCN Crane Specialist Group.

175. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) highlighted that WI's work plan would build on their work with the EAAFP to-date. At the Flyway level, they would work with the Partnership to draft the Strategic Plan, establish the Technical Committee and other bodies. They would also work to strengthen monitoring of waterbirds, building on their work with the Asian Waterbird Census and working with BirdLife International in this area. At the national level, they would be working to incorporate individual sites into larger landscape conservation, in particular in the Yellow Sea area, working with the Yellow Sea Task Force and also species groups in this region. In the Southeast Asian region, they would work through their national offices in Indonesia and Malaysia to establish National Partnerships, as well as conducting training and capacity building. Dr. Mundkur noted that WI as chair of the Avian Influenza WG would continue to contribute to this WG and other WGs and TFs.

He highlighted that WI is constrained by a small staff and as such would need additional resources to effectively contribute their expertise and experience to the Partnership.

Inter-Governmental Organisations (6)

176. The CMS, Ramsar Convention, Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora and the ACB submitted their work plans and they are available [here](#).

177. The Food and Agriculture Organisation and Convention on Biological Diversity were not able to send representatives to the meeting to present their respective work plans.

Private Sector (1)

178. Rio Tinto was not able to send a representative to the meeting to present their work plan.

Special Partner (1)

179. Incheon City Government submitted its work plan and is available [here](#).

Brief Report from Working Groups (7)

180. Anatidae WG, Black-faced Spoonbill WG, Shorebird WG and CEPA WG submitted their work plans and they are available [here](#).

181. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International), Chair of the Avian Influenza WG noted that they had only a short meeting and as such only managed to share information on what has been done by some partners. He noted that going forward, the WG needs to continue to share information and better connect with the national level, in particular important focal points from other sectors such as agriculture. He highlighted that the WG needs to see how they could be more effective in engaging these key stakeholders. Dr. Mundkur noted that the Avian Influenza WG is focused on communications and would like to work with the EAAFP Secretariat to identify priority work. He also introduced an Avian Influenza film that has been recently produced and would like to work with Partners on making the film available in other languages.

182. Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) noted that individual members of the Crane WG have done much work but due to the transition on chairmanship no meeting was held and the WG needs to be reactivated and the WG's objectives reviewed. He highlighted that one of the tasks that the Crane WG could do is to review the activities to-date on key crane sites and to link them internationally. He indicated that the Crane WG hopes to have a workshop in 2018 to plan and initiate activities.

183. Mr. Robert Kaler (USA), Chair of the Seabird WG noted that the WG would maintain a LISTSERV for their electronic communications, and developed a Google Docs based framework for working together. He highlighted that the WG had been working on an ambitious Tern action plan but decided to scale back to focus on six species of the Flyway.

The WG would also be developing Tern information sheets which would identify threats and conservation actions. They would also be developing a coordinated seabird banding protocol to enable reporting in the Flyway and avoid duplication of colour schemes. The WG would also be contributing information from New Zealand, the tropical Pacific and Indonesia to the global colony register of Flyway species, and developing a global database for time series data on seabird colonies to identify species that may be declining, the threats faced and how to mitigate them. They would analyse population trends from the monitoring data and identify knowledge gaps across the Flyway. Mr. Kaler called on Partners to help identify areas with data for seabirds that the WG could follow-up on, and the following Partners expressed interest in contributing: Indonesia, Malaysia, AWSG, BirdLife international, Pukorokoro MNT, WWT, WCS and Wetlands international.

Brief Report from Task Forces (7)

184. Baer's Pochard TF, Far Eastern Curlew TF and Scaly-sided Merganser TF, and the Yellow Sea Region TF submitted their work plans and they are available [here](#).

185. Mr. James Harris (ICF) noted that the Amur-Heilong Basin TF has not concluded its discussion and as such there is nothing to report currently.

186. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG), chair of the Monitoring of Waterbird Populations and Sites TF highlighted the outcomes of their earlier meeting which included four presentations from Japan (in particular Japan's monitoring efforts on 1,000 sites) , WWT (on the use of species data), Wetlands International and BirdLife International (both on waterbird monitoring). He noted that ten Partners have volunteered to develop a programme to strengthen waterbird monitoring and emphasised the need to work quickly on the programme so that it could be considered in the development of the new SP. He further noted that BirdLife International and Wetlands International have agreed to take the lead in the development of the document.

187. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia), Chair of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper (SBS) TF informed the meeting that the TF would be meeting in Myanmar next week to discuss its work plan and noted there is unlikely to be significant changes but rather some work prioritisation. He noted that there is a need to strengthen partnerships with governments and NGOs and enhance cooperation with China as well as with other partners such as CAFF and AMBI; and the new leadership at BirdLife International-Asia. He further noted that there is increasing good support from third countries such as the United Kingdom, Germany, the European Union, Scandinavian countries and the USA. He highlighted that there is sufficient knowledge to identify the breeding grounds in Russia and the TF would focus their work on Jiangsu province in China, as it is a particularly important stopover site for Spoon-billed Sandpipers, as well as specific areas in Myanmar, Bangladesh and Southern China. Dr. Syroechkovskiy noted that with new technologies on satellite tracking, very small transmitters could be placed on the birds, bringing knowledge on potentially new sites. He also informed that the minutes of the SBS TF would be made available via the EAAFP website and invited contributions to the next volume of the SBS Newsletter which is currently at its 16th issue. He added that the SBS Newsletter is produced every six months.

AGENDA ITEM 10: INTERACTIVE SESSION – MECHANISM FOR INCREASING ENGAGEMENT FOR PARTNERSHIP

188. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie, Chair of CEPA WG facilitated the interactive session on mechanism for increasing engagement for the EAAFP.

AGENDA ITEM 11: REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES

Working Groups

Agenda Item 11.1: Anatidae Working Group

189. Mr. Katsumi Ushiyama, Coordinator of the Anatidae WG presented the report of the WG which includes priority tasks and recommendations of the WG, and is available [here](#). The recommendations are as follows:

- (i) Support Anatidae monitoring and research, including the regular assessment of conservation status, and research to address the different conservation statuses of Brent Goose in Russia, USA and Japan, leading to an improved understanding of population delineation.
- (ii) Encourage discussion on the conservation management of Brent Goose in relevant meetings on migratory birds.
- (iii) Accept that the Lesser White-fronted Goose (LWFG) sub-group would be organized to work on developing a proposal for the creation of a LWFG Task Force under the Anatidae WG of EAAFP, aiming to subsequently develop an action plan for the eastern LWFG populations. The Governments of China and Russia would take a leading role to ensure the coordination of the TF with bilateral agreements as well as the AMBI of CAFF.
- (iv) Support regular conferences to be organized by the Anatidae WG
- (v) Improve MOP reporting formats for Working Groups and Task Forces

Agenda Item 11.2: Avian Influenza Working Group

190. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International), Chair of the Avian Influenza WG noted that the WG would develop a plan in the coming weeks and share with the EAAFP in due course.

Agenda Item 11.3: Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group

191. Mr. Yat Tung Yu, Chair of the Black-faced Spoonbill (BFS) WG presented the report and recommendations of the WG which are available [here](#). The recommendations are as follows:

- (i) EAAFP BFS WG will work together with Partners to nominate FNS for the BFS. Partners can contact the BFS WG for information and comments regarding to the BFS.

- (ii) Tainan is the most important wintering site for the BFS. EAAFP is suggested to find out the best arrangement on how to involve local researcher(s) in the BFS WG.
- (iii) Partners can consider using BFS for more CEPA activities because BFS is an iconic bird. Its popularity is already high in many areas (e.g. Incheon) and therefore it can help raise public awareness about the conservation of BFS and the sites, and the EAAFP.
- (iv) Funding for research activities is essential and Partners are encouraged to support long-term monitoring and research programmes of BFS.
- (v) BFS can adapt well when the site is managed with suitable habitats. Partners are encouraged to provide more training on wetland habitat management to site managers
- (vi) Partners are encouraged to support BFS WG regular meetings. Also, Partners are encouraged to initiate and support more cross-border BFS conservation activities to link people in the Flyway.

192. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) added that the focal point of each country should share their country report which would provide information on their current and potential sites. Dr. Jonathan Slaght (WCS) noted that he had no comments on this species in Russia but wanted Partners to be aware of the banding colour code for this species.

193. CE/EAAFP noted that there are 22 countries in the Flyway and sites within those countries are all eligible as FNS. He highlighted that DPRK has two FNS sites although it is not yet a Partner. CE/EAAFP informed that the establishment of WGs and TFs is to facilitate technical cooperation; and although DPRK is not a Partner, technical cooperation with DPRK should be encouraged, for example in sharing of information.

194. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) enquired whether the two sites were nominated by the Government of DPRK. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) explained that the EAAFP was preceded by another framework which had developed initial network of sites and this was brought into the EAAFP with the support of the national governments.

195. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) noted that since there was a previous agreement to accept these initial network sites into the EAAPF, the existing sites would remain as FNS. However, for new sites, he suggested that it should be agreed upon by Partner countries.

Agenda Item 11.4: Crane Working Group

196. Mr. Simba Chan (BirdLife International) informed the meeting that the Crane WG had not met to-date and attempts are underway to reconstruct and reactivate the WG.

Agenda Item 11.5: CEPA Working Group

197. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie, Chair of the CEPA WG shared that the WG reviewed the CEPA Strategy and Action Plan; and given the limited time to discuss the document, the group focused on a few areas of particular interest which generated discussions on in-country management systems for Flyway implementation; value of story-telling to share

conservation messages; and barriers to communication and information-sharing due to language issues. She noted that several participants agreed to provide further inputs for the CEPA Strategy and Action Plan; and noted that the comments could be incorporated in the next iteration of the document. She informed that a more detailed report of the WG's discussion would be shared in due course. Her brief presentation is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 11.6: Seabird Working Group

198. Mr. Robert Kaler (USA), Chair of the Seabird WG noted the value of holding a pre-meeting back-to-back with the MOP as it was very productive. He highlighted that the WG had developed its Work Plan for 2017-2018 which includes developing Tern information sheets and a colour marking protocol and reporting guidelines for seabird; populating the Global Seabird Colony Registry with information from the EAAF; and supporting efforts to assess seabird population status and knowledge gaps in the EAAF. Mr. Kaler's presentation on the WG's Work Plan and recommendations are available [here](#). The recommendations of the WG are as follows:

- (i) The Seabird WG 2017-2018 Work Plan is adopted.
- (ii) The Seabird WG continues to be chaired by Mr. Robert Kaler
- (iii) The Seabird WG continues to be coordinated by Mr. Yat Tung Yu and Dr. Mark Carey

Agenda Item 11.7: Shorebird Working Group

199. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA), Chair of the Shorebird WG highlighted that the WG had a one-day pre-meeting attended by 30 participants and they brainstormed on priority issues to be incorporated into the work programme. The WG would focus on three areas, namely, (i) migration ecology – tracking study throughout the Flyway to identify the work that has been done and which species and areas of the Flyway are lacking information; (ii) inventory and enhance existing shorebird monitoring; and (iii) compile an inventory of best practices of restoration and management of working coastal wetlands and intertidal zones, followed by facilitating information sharing across the Flyway. He also noted that the WG agreed that he should continue to be the Chair of the WG. The report and recommendation are available [here](#).

200. CE/EAAFP noted that the proposed work around coastal wetlands and restoration may go beyond shorebirds and as such calls for the WG to work with other relevant WGs and TFs.

Task Forces

Agenda Item 11.8: Amur-Heilong Basin Task Force

201. CE/EEAFP noted that there is no report from this TF and there are discussions on whether to reconstitute this TF after the MOP.

Agenda Item 11.9: Baer's Pochard Task Force

202. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT), Coordinator of the Baer's Pochard TF presented the TF's recommendations and the new actions to be taken by the TF. [They](#) are as follows:

Recommendations

- (i) Protect and appropriately manage all known sites, particularly breeding sites in China and Russia.
- (ii) Develop and implement national action plans by MOP10, particularly in China.
- (iii) Ensure spring hunting around Khasan (Russia) does not impact Baer's Pochard.
- (iv) Financially support the key survey and research needs identified in the SSAP.
- (v) Finalise and implement the new upgraded legal status of Baer's Pochard in China (1st class protection) before the 2017 breeding season.

New actions

- (i) Enhance survey efforts and coordination, particularly during the breeding season and including collaboration with bird watchers.
- (ii) Compile information on key stakeholders and policies in order to enhance the development of a conservation response.
- (iii) Undertake a feasibility study for the potential to reinforce the population through the release of captive-reared birds.
- (iv) Provide information and guidance on surveys, identification and other monitoring issues to researchers in the Rason area (and at other potential sites in DPRK).

203. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) enquired on what first class protection entails in recommendation (v) and whether it is a commonly used term in China. Prof. Guangchun Lei explained it is a commonly used term and that first class protection is the highest level of protection afforded which provides full protection to the species. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy reminded the WG to check with the relevant countries concerned especially if the actions proposed are related to hunting before the recommendations are put forward.

Agenda Item 11.10: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force

204. Dr. Mark Carey (USA), Chair of the Far Eastern Curlew TF presented the report and recommendations of the TF which are available [here](#). The recommendations of the TF are:

- (i) That Partners adopt the amended Single Species Action Plan for Far Eastern Curlew and agree to adopt the TOR (refer to MOP9 Agenda Document 1.7.7).
- (ii) That Partners appoint Australia as Chair of the Far Eastern Curlew Task Force.
- (iii) That Partners appoint BirdLife Australia as Coordinator of the Far Eastern Curlew Task Force.

205. The Far Eastern Curlew's Work Plan for 2017-2018 is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 11.11: Monitoring of Waterbird Populations and Sites Task Force

206. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) noted that there were about 40 participants in an hour long meeting of the TF held at MOP9. The key issues identified included generating

knowledge for species assessment, monitoring needs of single species action plans, data sharing, developing an inventory of monitoring activities across the Flyway, use of social media, citizen science approaches and capacity building, among others. The meeting nominated Mr. Watkins to continue to chair the Monitoring TF. The brief report of the meeting and recommendations are available [here](#). The recommendation of the TF is for Partners to endorse the proposed TF's Work Plan for 2017-2019 which includes:

- (i) Develop a cooperative programme that builds on the existing monitoring activities, to strengthen and enhance waterbird and site monitoring across the Flyway. BirdLife International and Wetlands International have agreed to lead the on its development in consultation with the TF and other Partners.
- (ii) It is proposed that the programme be developed in 2017 to enable rollout in January 2018.
- (iii) A workshop of the TF is proposed in mid/late 2017 to finalise the programme. A request from the Monitoring TF for financial support for the workshop is anticipated

Agenda Item 11.12: Scaly-sided Merganser Task Force

207. Dr. Diana Solovyeva, Coordinator the Scaly-sided Merganser TF presented the TF's work on the International Action Plan for the Conservation of the Scaly-sided Merganser for 2016-2025 and requested Partners to endorse the Plan. The brief presentation and the Action Plan are available [here](#). She outlined the goal of the plan is to remove the Scaly-sided Merganser from the threatened category of the IUCN Red List; and the objective is to maintain the world population of the species at its current level of about 5,000 birds. She noted that ten result areas with a total of 41 actions have been identified.

Agenda Item 11.13: Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force

208. Mr. Minoru Kashiwagi, a member of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF informed that the TF would be meeting next week in Myanmar to discuss its Work Plan which would be shared subsequently with the EAAFP Secretariat. He highlighted that the TF met during the break-out session at MOP9 to discuss some of the challenges and opportunities on the conservation of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper. This included the loss of habitat by reclamation and how to engage local communities in conservation efforts for which an example from Thailand on salt flats was shared. The report of the TF is available [here](#).

Agenda Item 11.14: Yellow Sea Ecoregion Task Force

209. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand), Chair of the Yellow Sea Ecoregion TF noted that the TF met at a break-out session primarily to discuss TF's Work Plan for 2017-2018. He further noted that the TF agreed to continue its work until MOP10 and support his continuation as Chair of the TF. The report and recommendations of the TF, including its Work Plan for 2017-2018 are available [here](#). The recommendations of the TF are that the TF's Work Plan for 2017-2018 is adopted and that Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) continues his chairmanship of the TF.

Agenda Item 11.15: Southeast Asia Network

210. Dr. Pham Anh Cuong (Vietnam) presented the discussions of the break-out session on the Southeast Asia Network which took place during MOP9. The report of the break-out session and the brief presentation are available [here](#). He noted that the meeting agreed to establish the ASEAN (South East Asia) Network and that there is a concept proposal which is being prepared for funding support under the ASEAN Framework. The meeting agreed to provide comments on the proposal by mid-February to facilitate the first level consideration by an ASEAN body by mid-March 2017. He highlighted that BirdLife International and Wetlands International expressed interest to support the work of the ASEAN Network.

211. The Philippines which was not able to attend the meeting strongly supported the establishment of the ASEAN Network and noted that this network could contribute significantly to Flyway-wide activities in ASEAN countries. CE/EAAFP noted that the break-out meeting was very productive and it was appropriate to push through the Network under the ASEAN framework. He said that this group had to act fairly quickly to enable the proposal to be considered by an ASEAN body in mid-March 2017 for a first-level approval. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) added that it is an important proposal and expressed interests of Wetlands International to find ways to support the development of this project. He noted that this proposal would support the Monitoring TF in strengthening monitoring in the Southeast Asian region.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

212. CE/EAAFP noted that the current role of the Management Committee is to support the Secretariat in its work. The Management Committee met at MOP9 and highlighted some of the key issues discussed:

- (i) Amending the TOR of the Secretariat to include a requirement of ROK law to report on income and expenditure and to enable EAAFP to receive private donations.
- (ii) From the Partnership document, clarifying the criteria for FNS nomination; and providing further guidance on the application of potential partners to join the EAAFP, in particular INGOs.
- (iii) Deciding whether to include Partner reports and work plans as agenda items for future MOPs as the reporting format may change according to the new Strategic Plan, which will have outcomes and targets.
- (iv) Size of Partner delegations at MOPs – the Secretariat requested for some guidance on the size of delegations as this would help the Secretariat and the host country in the preparation and administration for MOPs. CE/EAAFP encouraged Partners to provide early confirmation of their attendance and to avoid last minute changes as it would be difficult for the Secretariat and the host country to accommodate these changes.

213. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) noted that on any cost savings from the Independent Review, the Management Committee agreed that the funds would go towards implementing the SP. Mr. Probasco requested for the Management Committee to develop and clarify the Rules of Procedure in the case of disagreement by a Partner/s on the application of a potential partner to the EAAFP. He noted the need to develop a proposal on

this issue in a timely manner for consideration and adoption intersessionally. He also tasked the Management Committee to also discuss potential future situations which may arise when there are disagreements on matters that require Partnership approvals.

214. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) sought clarification on the reporting format for MOP10 as the current Implementation Strategy would be extended for another two years and the new SP would only be adopted at MOP10. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) clarified that it would depend on the progress of work of the SP and if it is completed early and there is agreement by Partners, then there could be a new reporting format for MOP10.

215. Dr. Lanctot also sought clarification on the admission of new Partners; and enquired whether there is a process in which the Partners have an opportunity to review the proposal of the Management Committee before the Committee takes a final decision. Mr Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) confirmed that there would be a consultative process before a final decision is made.

216. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) sought the approval of the Partners to task the Management Committee to address the issues highlighted. The Partners approved the request. The report is [here](#).

AGENDA ITEM 13: REPORT AND APPROVAL OF KEY DECISIONS FROM MOP9

Agenda Item 13.1: Election and Appointment of New Chair and Vice Chair

Agenda Item 13.2: Election and Appointment of Management Committee

217. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) in consultation with the current Management Committee, announced the following appointments as new members of the Management Committee:

Chair of the Partnership:	USA
Vice Chair of the Partnership:	Singapore
Host Government Partner:	Republic of Korea
Government Partner (1):	Mongolia
Intergovernmental Partner (1):	Ramsar Convention
Non-government Partners (2):	Australasian Wader Studies Group Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust

218. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) expressed his appreciation to the retiring members of the Committee and the EAAFP Secretariat for their work and contribution to the Partnership. He noted New Zealand's continued support to the Management Committee and reiterated its commitment to the Partnership. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) echoed the views of New Zealand and thanked in particular the retiring chairperson, Dr. Dehui Zhang for his Chairmanship. He further expressed Australia's support to the new Management Committee, especially to its Chair and Vice Chair.

219. Dr. Dehui Zhang (China, Chair) thanked the Partners for their support during his Chairmanship and expressed that the new Management Committee would do an excellent job. He noted that China would continue to support the Partnership as a Partner.

Agenda Item 13.3: Secretariat's Work Plan and Budget for 2017-2018

220. CE/EAAFP noted that there are no changes to the Secretariat's Work Plan and Budget for 2017-2018 as presented in [Document 9.1](#) and sought the approval of the Partners. The Partners adopted the Work Plan and Budget for 2017-2018.

Agenda Item 13.4: Development of New EAAFP Strategic Plan (AWSG)

221. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) requested for the Partners to agree to:

- (i) extend the EAAFP Implementation Strategy (2012-2016) for another two years until MOP10 in January 2019; and
- (ii) establish an EAAFP Strategic Plan Task Force (SPTF) to review the Implementation Strategy (2012-2016) and to develop a new framework to guide Partner delivery of the Partnership's goal and objectives.

222. He further outlined the revised proposed timeline of work where actions have been identified for Partners, Secretariat and SPTF. The revised proposal is attached [here](#).

223. Mr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) expressed that Wetlands International is keen to engage and support the process. He noted that in the revised proposed timeline of work, that MOP10 is tentatively scheduled in January 2019 which coincides with the Asian Waterbird Census and suggested that the dates of MOP10 could be adjusted to avoid the Census.

224. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) complimented Mr. Watkins on the work and effort put into the revised proposed timeline; and suggested to involve Partners in developing key components of the proposal (e.g. defining objectives).

225. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) highlighted that the SPTF would review at least three different models for a strategic framework and would consult Partners before making a decision on the model to adopt. He anticipated that the SPTF would draw on the existing Partnership Documents for example for the objectives of the SP.

226. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) expressed his appreciation on the effort that has gone into the revised proposed timeline; and suggested for Mr. Watkins to involve Partners through in developing TOR of the SP, its objectives and the composition of the SP.

227. CE/EAAFP sought clarification on Item 4 of the revised proposed timeline on whether the questionnaire survey was intended only to review the existing Implementation Strategy or whether the questionnaire would solicit suggestions for the new SP. CE/EAAFP noted that the Independent Review suggested that an evaluation be conducted on the effectiveness of the Implementation Strategy and the value in carrying out such an evaluation to inform the development of the SP. He also highlighted that it was important that the development of the SP to be a participatory process to build ownership and the questionnaire is a good way to invite Partners to participate in the process.

228. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) informed the Partners that the SPTF has yet to meet and highlighted that the revised proposed timeline only outlines indicative tasks and that the SPTF would need to work out the details. On Item 6 on the composition of the TF, he noted that although the proposal is for a six-member TF, it provided for the TF to invite individual experts as observers to the SPTF meetings. Mr. Watkins indicated that it was a challenge to determine the optimal number of TF members taking into consideration, geographical representation, gender, skills and age.

229. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) sought further clarification on Item 6 on allowing the TF to invite individual experts as observers to the SPTF meetings. Mr. Watkins asked if this would allow individuals not representing Partners to be invited to contribute based on their expertise so that the SPTF could be sure to have the best available inputs for the development of the SP.

230. Mr. Watkins noted that many Partners expressed interest to be part of the SPTF and there was consensus from Partners to increase the number of members of the TF. Based on the expressed interest of 14 Partners, all Partners agreed to amend Item 6 of the TOR of the SPTF to reflect a composition of “not more than 14 EAAFP Partners” for the TF. They are as follows: Australia, China, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Singapore, Thailand, Ramsar, AWSG, BirdLife International, ICF, Wetlands International, WWT and WWF.

Agenda Item 13.5: Finance Committee Proposals (USA)

231. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) recalled the goal of the Finance Committee was to achieve a more sustainable and equitable funding approach for the EAAFP to support the Partnership’s goal and objectives. The Finance Committee has put forward the following four recommendations for the consideration of Partners.

Recommendation I: Agree to maintain a Finance Committee and approve its TOR

232. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) highlighted that there is a proposed change to the composition of the Finance Committee from four to seven members (Item 10 on the [TOR of the EAAFP Finance Committee](#)); and to ensure continuity, it is recommended that the current four members (Mr. Peter Probasco (USA), Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan), Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) and Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) continue to serve on the Committee and for Partners to nominate three additional members.

233. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) sought clarification on the membership of the Committee after MOP10. Mr. James Harris (ICF) suggested that we could add an additional clause, Item 10(d) to note that the composition of the Finance Committee would be reconstituted at each MOP.

234. Dr. Mark Carey (Australia) recommended deleting the names of the current Finance Committee from the TOR, as individuals should not be identified in Terms of Reference.

235. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) enquired whether the Fundraising Officer would be an ex-officio member of the Finance Committee representing the EAAFP Secretariat. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) clarified that the Fundraising Officer is not a member of the Finance Committee but assisting the Committee. Mr. McKinlay suggested revising Item 10(c) as it is confusing vis-à-vis the membership status of the Fundraising Officer and suggested that the role of the Fundraising could be incorporated in Items 8 or 11. As there were differing views on where the role of the Fundraising Officer should be reflected vis-à-vis the Finance Committee, Mr. Probasco noted the intent of the comments and assured the Partners that he would amend the TOR accordingly on the role of the Fundraising Officer.

236. Mr. Probasco noted that the Partners had no further comments and agreed to maintain the Finance Committee and adopt its TOR as amended.

Recommendation II: Through a Partner survey, establish the “current baseline” of funds being spent by Partners to achieve national and international Flyway priority actions

237. The Partners adopted Recommendation II.

Recommendation III: Hire a Fundraising Officer

238. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) outlined the [TOR of the Fundraising Officer](#) and sought the approval of Partners to hire the Officer subject to the availability of funding. The Partners adopted the recommendation to hire a Fundraising Officer subject to the availability of funding.

239. Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) noted that the EAAFP Secretariat should still be represented at the Finance Committee even if the EAAFP Secretariat is unable to hire the Fundraising Officer. Mr Geoff Richardson (Australia) offered a suggestion from the establishment of the Technical Committee, that the EAAFP Secretariat could provide secretariat services to the Fundraising Committee.

240. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) suggested that the TOR could be made more flexible to allow for example secondment to the EAAFP Secretariat of a Fundraising Officer. He also noted the requirement to be fluent in Korean in Item 5 of the TOR which may limit the number of potential candidates for the position. CE/EAAFP explained that the position could be either part-time or full-time and since the position is based in ROK and perhaps initially targeting Korean sources of funding, being fluent in Korean would be required. However, he recognised that the Finance Committee could change the language requirement. Mr. Hagemeyer expressed preference to amend the requirement to broaden the scope for recruitment.

Recommendation IV: Implement the “voluntary” fee-based contribution system

241. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) brought the attention of Partners to Table 1 of the [Proposal for Voluntary Contribution Fee to EAAFP](#). Table 1 provides an indicative level

of voluntary fee payment for Country Partners; whereas Table 2 applies to non-country Partners. He noted that tables presented are proposals for consideration.

242. Mr. Borja Heredia (CMS) envisaged that there may be some issues if the voluntary contribution is applied to non-country Partners. Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) noted that it was important to have some kind of framework for contributions and emphasised that the table is evolving and the contribution is voluntary. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia) noted that he had consulted his relevant international and finance departments on the voluntary contributions and was advised by the international department to be clear on the mechanism for the voluntary contribution as the EAAFP is not a legally binding entity and no current mechanism for voluntary donations exists.

243. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) noted that while it may be helpful that the USD 150,000 reflects the relative contributions of each Partner, he enquired whether the amount would be sufficient to sustain the Secretariat and would like to seek more information on the basis of the proposed amount of USD 150,000. Mr. Hagemeyer sought clarification on non-partners contribution and its purpose. Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) noted that the budget presented by the Secretariat encompasses both staff and activities and as such the perceived USD 150,000 deficit covers both staff and activities.

244. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) shared that she managed to secure project funds of about USD 36,000 for 2017 as a direct contribution to the EAAFP Secretariat after two years of intensive negotiations and on the condition that the voluntary fee-based system would be adopted at this MOP. She further emphasised that for Japan, the adoption of the voluntary fee-based system is necessary for Japan to continue to contribute to the EAAFP. As such, she urged Partners to adopt the recommendation.

245. Mr. Robert Kaler (USA) noted that Partners require information on how the funds would be utilised as this would be useful to justify the proposed contribution. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) expressed his appreciation to the Finance Committee for its work and reminded Partners not to lose sight of the benchmark study which would be useful to see how much Partners are currently contributing to the Partnership. He added that, like Russia, Australia requires information on the mechanism for contribution. Prof. Guangchun Lei (China) shared similar views as Russia and Australia on the mechanism for contribution since this is a non-binding Partnership. He also enquired whether in-kind contributions could also be taken into consideration, for example, the scientific work of their institutions. He noted that it would be the role of the Fundraising Officer to raise the amount of funds required.

246. CE/EAAFP clarified that the role of the Fundraising Officer is to source funds external to the Partnership, for example from corporate donors. Prof. Lei enquired how much is the Fundraising Officer expected to raise. CE/EAAFP noted that it is difficult to answer the question and it would largely be dependent on the Fundraising Officer. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) highlighted that no matter how experienced the Fundraising Officer is, it would take some time for the Fundraising Officer to raise the funds. He added that eventually the Fundraising Officer should be expected to bring in three times the costs of his/her position.

247. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) tasked the Finance Committee to develop a more diversified portfolio in sourcing funds and highlighted the need to capture current and future funds that could be utilised by the Partnership. Mr. Probasco noted that he would take

the comments of the Partners into consideration and requested Partners to share their experience if they were successful in obtaining funds for this non-binding Partnership.

248. Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) noted that Partners may wish to consider other modalities for supporting the Partnership and some suggestions include additional EAAFP officers, in-country support and in-kind financial support.

249. The Partners adopted in-principle a voluntary fee based system but recognised that there needs to be clarity on the mechanism for contribution.

Agenda Item 13.6: Monitoring the Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites (Ramsar)

250. CE/EAAFP informed that there is no formal report on this agenda item. He urged Partners to submit the SIS for all their FNS to enable the Secretariat to analyse the information and report on the status of the FSN at MOP10.

Agenda Item 13.7: New Rules of Procedure for MOPs (Australia)

251. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) highlighted the revisions made to the resolution on the [New Rules of Procedure for MOPs](#) in response to feedback at MOP9:

- (i) Rule 3: revised to encourage Partners that have not hosted to consider hosting
- (ii) Rule 7.1: removed for clarity
- (iii) Rule 7.2: element requiring one-third of partners objecting was removed
- (iv) Rule 16: the number of delegates is now limited to four delegates per partner

252. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) requested clarification on potential observers notifying the Secretariat about their intention to participate, and if confirmation about participation is provided at the meeting or before the meeting. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that the approval would be provided at the meeting.

253. Dr. Mundkur highlighted that Rule 6.2 outlines how such observers may participate without the right to vote, unless at least a third of the partners present at the meeting object, and requested a clarification if this was intended to mean that if a third of the meeting objects then they would not be allowed to attend as observers. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that the earlier discussion on observers was with regards to Rule 7, not Rule 6. Rule 6 is intended to specifically address range states only, whereas Rule 7 is about non-Partners that are also not range states. He recognised that there were similar elements in both rules that were inconsistent, and he would rectify this. Dr. Mundkur also highlighted that both rules state general terms, and it is not very clear which entities fall under which rule, and he suggested further elaboration on which entities are covered under each of the rules. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) emphasized that Rule 6 requires the EAAFP Secretariat to actively engage range states and IGOs on migratory waterbirds to attend a meeting, whereas Rule 7 is for anyone else approaching the Secretariat seeking to attend meetings.

254. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) sought clarification on Rule 32.1 which proposed an amendment of the “Partnership document”, and enquired what this “Partnership document”

was in reference to. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that this was the proper title of the document establishing the EAAFP.

255. The Partners adopted the recommendations as presented

Agenda Item 13.8: New Terms of Reference for Management Committee (Australia)

256. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) highlighted the following changes and clarified comments made to this resolution:

- (i) Item 11 on representation, attendance, and composition of the Management Committee is consistent with the current TOR for the Management Committee, which also states membership of not more than seven Partners. The rationale is to avoid having two members in the Management Committee come from a single Partner if the host country for the meeting is elected as Chair.
- (ii) Item 13 on the roles of the Management Committee vis-à-vis the EAAFP Secretariat – the first item on circulating correspondence was deleted as the role is more appropriate for the Secretariat.
- (iii) Item 17 on continuity of membership – as it was difficult to incorporate a strict rule regarding turnover that would provide sufficient flexibility to the membership of the Management Committee, an aspirational statement was included to encourage Partners to consider the issue of continuity and not replace the entire Management Committee at the same time in the selection of Management Committee members.
- (iv) Item 23 on the conduct of a ballot if there are two members receiving equal votes in the process of selecting Management Committee members was revised to include drawing lots to break an impasse.

257. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) enquired if there was a clause regarding the Vice Chair becoming Chair, which is the current practice norm. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that this practice is not included in the ROP for MOPs or the TOR of the Management Committee.

258. The Partners adopted the recommendations as presented

Agenda Item 13.9: Technical Committee (Australia)

259. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) highlighted that the original proposal was to agree to establish a Technical Committee at MOP9 and for the Management Committee and EAAFP Secretariat to develop the criteria and process for nominations to the Technical Committee to be considered and adopted at MOP10. However, feedback during MOP9 favoured the Technical Committee being established immediately so that it could start its work during the intersessional period.

260. He highlighted that as a compromise, Item 4 of the [Draft Resolution on the Establishment of the Technical Committee of the Flyway](#) has been amended as follows, “Instructs the Secretariat and the Management Committee, in consultation with Partners, to develop a selection process, seek nominations of qualified experts and appoint, on an interim basis, a Technical Committee as soon as practicable following the 9th Meeting of

Partners”. Mr. Richardson noted that the intent of the amendment was to establish an interim Technical Committee with a view for formal appointment at MOP10. He added the process to establish an interim Technical Committee may take six to twelve months instead of two years if it was to be established under the original proposal.

261. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro MNT) sought clarification on what is meant by “in consultation with Partners” in Item 4; which Mr. Richardson clarified that this would allow for Partners to be consulted on the selection criteria and the process of appointment of members.

262. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) outlined the following changes to the [TOR of the EAAFP Technical Committee](#):

- (i) On Item 6(e) on the functions of the Technical Committee, the role on “coordinating research” has been removed and replaced with “making recommendations” on Flyway research.
- (ii) The original Item 6(k) was divided into two different items for greater clarity, namely, the amended Item 6(k) notes that the Technical Committee would liaise with WGs and TFs, to identify issues of common concern among these bodies and distil lessons for wider dissemination; and Item 6(l) for the Technical Committee to provide upon request, advice on scientific and technical proposals from WGs and TFs.
- (iii) On Item 10 on the composition of the Technical Committee, the reference to the EAAFP Science Officer was deleted as there is no current plan to recruit a Science Officer.

263. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) highlighted that the only change on the [ROP for the Technical Committee](#) was an amendment to Rule 11 noting that if in an election no clear candidate emerges, a ballot would be taken. Rules 12 and 13 were also removed to ensure the election process of the Technical Committee is consistent with the Management Committee. Mr. Richardson also noted that the editorial suggestions by Japan (clarity that the Chair and Vice Chair are to be elected among the Committee members) and CMS (removal of a redundant “meeting” in the sentence) have been taken into consideration on Rule 8.

264. Dr. Richard Lanctot (USA) sought clarification on how the Technical Committee fits within the overall structure of the Partnership, and its relationship with the other bodies of the Partnership. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) responded that the Partnership Document allows for the formation of WGs, TFs and other Committees but does not stipulate how these bodies relate to each other in the Partnership. CE/EAAFP confirmed that there was no fixed structure, and as currently proposed they are autonomous bodies.

265. Mr. Robert Kaler (USA, Chair of the Seabird Working Group) requested clarification on whether an earlier discussion on improving coordination among the WGs and TFs was taken into consideration. He noted that a Science Officer could possibly facilitate the coordination among WGs and TFs and enquired whether the Technical Committee could play this role in the absence of a Science Officer for the Partnership. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) responded that while an earlier suggestion was to have the Chairs of the WGs

and TFs as members of the Technical Committee, subsequent discussions encouraged consideration a wider pool of candidates. He provided further background, stating that the establishment of the Technical Committee was in response to the recommendations of the Independent Review, and as such was not intended to take up the functions of the Science Officer at the EAAFP Secretariat.

266. Some other suggestions for improving communications between WGs and TFs were proposed by various Partners, including sharing of minutes of WGs meetings (Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair), or having collaborative meetings via online platforms (Dr. Taej Mundkur, Wetlands International).

267. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) asked what the proposed term was for members of the Technical Committee, as Rule 5 indicates that the term is “reviewed” every 2 years, and emphasised the need to clarify how long members of the Technical Committee are expected to serve. Mr. Watkins also noted that there is a need to address continuity, member turnovers and the process of stepping down from the Technical Committee. Dr. Martin Spray (WWT) supported the establishment of the Technical Committee without a fixed term, highlighting that if the Partnership required different types of expertise then the review is an appropriate way to initiate changes in the membership of the Technical Committee.

268. The Partners adopted the recommendations as presented.

Agenda Item 13.10: Far Eastern Curlew Task Force (Australia)

269. Dr. Mark Carey (Australia), Chair of the Far Eastern Curlew TF presented the revised resolution to adopt the International Single Species Action Plan which incorporated comments from ROK, Russia and Wetlands International. CE/EAAFP enquired on the role of the Secretariat under this plan which Dr. Carey responded that the Task Force would monitor the implementation of the Plan, and report to the EAAFP Secretariat for their information and further action if necessary. The Partners adopted the recommendations as [presented](#).

270. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) made an announcement to the Partnership that conservation of the Far Eastern Curlew is a high priority for Australian government, and that a key information requirement for conservation action of this species was identifying high-quality intertidal habitats and roost sites across the Flyway. He announced the approval of AUD 500,000 for a three-year project on advancing knowledge on this species. Aside from directly benefiting the Far Eastern Curlew, the project would have cross-cutting benefits for migratory shorebirds in general, and would inform management actions, including the creation of protected areas and management of artificial habitats and artificial roost sites. The results of the project would be shared with the Partnership through the Far Eastern Curlew Task Force

Agenda Item 13.11: Southeast Asia Network (Cambodia/ ACB)

271. Ms. Clarissa Arida (ACB) presented on behalf of Cambodia. She reiterated that the Partnership had expressed a preference for the Southeast Asia Network to be established

under the ASEAN framework. She highlighted that Singapore would take the lead in the establishment of the Network and would submit the proposal to the ASEAN Working Group on Nature Conservation and Biodiversity in March 2017. She noted that that all eight ASEAN Member State Partners of the EAAFP have expressed strong support to this proposal. The two non-Partner ASEAN Member States, Lao PDR and Brunei Darussalam would be engaged to take part in the project. BirdLife International and Wetlands International have also expressed strong support for the ASEAN Network, and ACB will work with them and the EAAFP Secretariat in the implementation of this network.

Agenda Item 13.12: Standardised Waterbird Monitoring (BirdLife International and Wetlands International)

272. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) highlighted that the Work Plan builds on existing monitoring programmes and requested Partners to endorse the 2017-2018 Work Plan. He also highlighted that the TF may request financial support, and the details would be worked out at a later date.

273. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) enquired to whom the TF would be submitting the financial support request. Mr. Doug Watkins (AWSG) responded that in order to conduct some of the planned activities, the Task Force would need to approach the EAAFP Secretariat or Partners who are able to support.

274. The Partners adopted the recommendations as [presented](#) in Agenda Item 11.11.

Agenda Item 13.13: Definition of Migratory Populations (Japan)

275. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) highlighted that no changes were made on the recommendation based on the discussions. The Partners adopted the recommendations on the definition of migratory populations as [presented](#).

276. Ms. Kaori Tsujita (Japan) noted that with the adoption of the recommendations, the TF established to discuss this issue would now be dissolved as it has accomplished the task set. She suggested the Secretariat could to maintain oversight of some of the issues highlighted in the paper. Dr. Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International) concurred with the views of Ms. Tsujita noting that some of the follow-up issues may fall under the purview of the Technical Committee.

Agenda Item 13.14: Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 (CEPA Working Group)

277. Dr. Sandra Hails-Downie (Chair of the CEPA WG) reiterated that the CEPA Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021 in its current form is ready to be used. However, the WG received some feedback at MOP9 which would require the WG to re-structure the document but with no major substantive changes to the document. She noted that the CEPA Strategy and Action Plan would be posted on the CEPA website and would be updated in due course taking into consideration the comments received.

Agenda Item 13.15: Recommendations from Working Groups and Task Forces

278. The Partners adopted all the [recommendations](#) by the relevant WGs and TFs as presented under Agenda Item 11.

279. Following a recommendation from the AMBI meeting held immediately prior to MOP9, CAFF proposed the formation of an interim Task Force on Illegal Hunting, Taking and trade of migratory waterbirds. CAFF agreed to facilitate the establishment of the Task Force and to serve as interim vice-Chair and work with partners to find a Chair.. A TOR was presented. The proposal was approved by the MOP.

AGENDA ITEM 14: NEXT MEETING – ANNOUNCEMENT OF MOP10

280. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) highlighted that there was a potential clash in dates between MOP10 and the proposed period for the Asian Waterbird Census in 2019. CE/EAAFP highlighted that MOPs are typically held early in the year so that the Partnership could develop work plans and submit reports that follow the calendar year while trying to avoid the holiday periods such as the Western New Year and Chinese New Year (5 February 2019) as well as avoiding summer time which is field work time for many partners. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia) highlighted that the Russian New Year is celebrated from 1-9 January each year, for consideration in planning the dates.

281. CE/EAAFP highlighted that aside from the dates of MOP10, there was still a need to identify a potential host country, and he added that in informal consultations with Partners, they had requested for more information on what is involved in hosting a MOP, such as financial implications. The EAAFP Secretariat would draft an information document on what is typically involved in terms of costs and time commitment to help Partners decide. He emphasised the need to firm up a host country within the next few months and start the process for organising MOP10.

AGENDA ITEM 15: CLOSURE OF MEETING

282. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro MNT) thanked the EAAFP Secretariat for their work in organising MOP9, as well as their work during the intersessional period between MOPs. Dr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia) thanked the Chair and Vice Chair for their hard work at MOP9. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Vice Chair) thanked Singapore for hosting the meeting.

283. The meeting closed at approximately 3.20 pm on 15 January 2017.

ANNEX: ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACB	ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
AMBI	Arctic Migratory Birds Initiative
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AUD	Australian Dollars
AWSG	Australasian Wader Studies Group-BirdLife Australia
CAFF	Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna Working Group

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEPA	Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness
CE/EAAFP	Chief Executive of the EAAFP Secretariat
Chair	Chair of the EAAFP
China	People's Republic of China
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
EAAF	the East Asian-Australasian Flyway
EAAFP	the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership
EBSAs	Ecologically and Biologically Significant Marine Areas
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FNS	Flyway Network Sites
FSN	Flyway Site Network
HSF	Hanns Seidel Foundation
ICF	International Crane Foundation
IGO	Inter-Governmental Organisations
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MNT	Miranda Naturalists Trust
MOP	Meeting of Partners
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisations
Ramsar	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance
ROK	Republic of Korea
ROP	Rules of Procedure
Secretariat	the Secretariat of the EAAFP
SIS	Site Information Sheet
SP	Strategic Plan
SPTF	Strategic Plan Task Force
TF	a Task Force of the EAAFP
TOR	Terms of Reference
USD	United States Dollars
Vice Chair	Vice Chair of the EAAFP
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WG	a Working Group of the EAAFP
WI	Wetlands International
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WWT	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust