



***MOP11 DD5 Proposed amendments to
improve the use of the Flyway Network Site
Information Sheet (FNS SIS)
For further background information and
recommendations see DOC. 13***

***Introduction
TSc Chair***



- MOP10 asked TSc to consider if the Site Information Sheet (SIS) 2017 version could be simplified/streamlined to make it easier and simpler for Partners to fill in – a regularly raised issue.
- In course of doing this review, Secretariat and TSc also identified a number of other oddities and issues which could be valuable fixed to improve ease of SIS use by Partners.
- DD5 provides recommendations on improving a). SIS structure, and b). SIS content and guidance.
- In addition, Meeting Committee at MOP11 has asked for Partners to consider inclusion of text clarifying SIS handling and review processes – from proposals in MOP11 DOC 12.





- **SIS structure**
- Currently (v2017) 30 data & information fields
 - Based on Ramsar Sites Information Sheet (RIS)
 - Fields 1-14 and 30 identified with asterisks as essential (but not very obvious)
 - Other 15 fields *implicitly* optional
- Three options considered:
 1. No change to v2017 structure
 2. Reduce to essential fields 1-14 only
 3. Keep all fields, but make structure into two very clear Sections: *Required* and *Optional*
- ***Recommendation***
- Option 3



- **Other SIS issues to fix – Recommendations:**
- ***Add SIS field for new FNS or SIS update of existing FNS***
- ***SIS Criteria – resolve having two different sets of Criteria formulations in SIS***
 - Currently different in SIS Annex 1 (Annex IV, from Partnership document); and in SIS field 20
 - ***Very confusing for Partners filling in Criteria justifications (field 20)***
 - *Recommend agree a single consistent and harmonized language formulation of 6 Criteria*
 - NB Criterion vi. is a qualitative criterion: is it Useful? Has it been applied in FNS designations?
Needs further consideration
- ***Improve structure of SIS field 10 (Criteria justification)***
 - Currently just a single free-text field
 - Recommend agreeing a more structured approach:
 - For each Criterion, three sub-fields:
 - Criterion applied: Yes/No?
 - Table of recent years' counts/%
 - Free-text box for further information



- **Other SIS issues to fix – Recommendations:**
- ***Prepare guidance for correctly applying designation Criteria***
 - Guidance provided for filling in most SIS fields – **but not for Criteria justification (field 10)!!**
 - **Guidance to cover *inter alia*:**
 - Applying Criteria to only migratory populations*
 - Choosing correct 1% population threshold when more than one population of a species is believed to occur at the site*
 - Applying “appreciable numbers” in Criterion iii. (globally threatened species) – difficult!*
 - Applying terms of “regularly supports”*
 - What waterbird counts to use for assessing qualification under Criterion 1 (>20,000 waterbirds)*



- **Other SIS issue to add to DD5 (as Annex 1):**
- ***Requested by Meeting Committee***
- **From Annex 2 of DOC. 12 “Adjustment of the Review Process of New Flyway Network Sites”**
- Improved clarity on process steps and timelines:
 - **The Secretariat** will forward Flyway Network Site nominations from Government Partners to Science Unit for review and also cc the email to the Chair of the Technical Sub-Committee and the nominating Government Partner within **5 days** of receipt a Flyway Network Site nomination.
 - **Science Unit** conducts a preliminary review of the SIS (**7 days**) and follows-up with the nominating Government Partner if addition information is needed (**7 days**).
 - The Science Unit will seek input from relevant **Working Groups/Task Forces** on the details of the nomination (**14 days**), The Science Unit will prepare a summary of key points.
 - **Technical Sub-Committee** review the SIS and summary of technical comments and make justification of the criteria met, and then conveys to the Science Unit, the CE and Chair of the EAAFP the decision of the Technical Sub-Committee (**14 days**).
 - All comments on the SIS are referred on to the nominating Government Partners who revises the SIS if necessary. This review process continues until all the comments are resolved.