



EAST ASIAN – AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP

3F G-Tower, 175 Art center-daero, Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22004 Republic of Korea

Phone: +82 (0)32 458 6501 | Fax: +82 (0)32 458 6508

Email: secretariat@eaaflyway.net | www.eaaflyway.net

EAAFP MoP11 Reporting Template

Dear Partner,

At EAAFP MoP 10 in Hainan, China (2018), the Partnership adopted the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028. The Paper (Decision 1) included the proposed Reporting Template for MoP11. The purpose of the Reporting Template is to assess the achievement of specific actions identified in the [EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028](#).

The “Reporting Questions” are linked to Key Result Areas to enable an assessment of progress with the implementation of each element in the Strategic Plan. Indicators have been provided to facilitate reporting and access our achievements.

The Strategic Plan has the following attributes:

- 5 Objectives (as listed in the Partnership Document),
- 23 Key Result Areas (KRAs),
- 35 Indicators.

The reporting template has headings in three colors: Red (Partnership Objectives), Green (Key Result Areas identified in the Strategic Plan) and Blue (Indicators). The wording of the Objectives, Key Result Areas and Indicators were all accepted at MoP10.

Different Partner Groups, Working Groups, Task Forces, the Technical Sub-Committee and the Secretariat have differing roles and responsibilities. As such, each question identifies the Partner groups that are requested to respond to each question. Please focus on the questions that relate to the Reporting Group you are representing.

While the total number of questions is 53, the number of questions for each Partner Group, and each mechanism of the Partnership, is shown below:

Government	46 Questions (87%)
IGO	30 Questions (57%)
INGO	40 Questions (75%)
Corporate	29 Questions (55%)
Task Forces and Working groups	29 Questions (55%)
Technical sub-Committee	11 Questions (21%)
Secretariat	15 Questions (28%)

This Reporting Template has been sent to the Focal Point of each Partner, the Chair and Vice-Chair of each Working Group and Taskforce, the Chair of the Technical sub-Committee and the Secretariat.

Thank you,

Doug Watkins, Chief Executive, EAAFP Secretariat

The EAAFP Reporting Questions

General Information

1. Name of Reporting Group	United States of America	
2. Reporting Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Governments (Govt) <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-Governmental Organizations (IGO) <input type="checkbox"/> International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) <input type="checkbox"/> International Corporate (Corporate) <input type="checkbox"/> Task Forces and Working Groups (TF/WG) <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Sub-Committee (TsC) <input type="checkbox"/> Secretariat (Sec.) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify:) 	
3-1. Designated EAAFP Focal Point	Name and title	Richard Lanctot, Chair
	Affiliation	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	P.O. Box/Street address	1011 East Tudor Road, MS 201 Anchorage, Alaska 99503 U.S.A.
	Postal Code	99503
	E-mail address	Richard_lanctot@fws.gov
	Telephone	+1 907-440-9733 (cell) +1 907-312-4859 (wk cell)
	Website	
3-2. Additional Designated EAAFP Focal Point (<i>Optional</i>)	Name and title	Robert Kaler
	Affiliation	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	P.O. Box/Street address	1011 East Tudor Road, MS 201 Anchorage, Alaska 99503 U.S.A.
	Postal Code	99503
	E-mail address	Robert_kaler@fws.gov
	Telephone	+1 509-701-7893 (cell)
	Website	:
3-3. Additional Designated EAAFP Focal Point (<i>Optional</i>)	Name and title	Casey Burns
	Affiliation	Bureau of Land Management
	P.O. Box/Street address	222 W. 7 th Ave #13 Anchorage, Alaska, USA
	Postal Code	99513
	E-mail address	ctburns@blm.gov
	Telephone	
	Website	:
4. Report compiler	Name and title	Same as Chair
	Affiliation	:
	P.O. Box/Street address	:
	Postal Code	:
	E-mail address	:
	Telephone	:
	Website	:

Reporting on the implementation of the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2018 – 2022

**Note: In the Reporting Template the term “Partners” includes Government, IGO, INGO, and Corporate Partners.*

Objective 1 Develop the Flyway Network of sites of international importance for the conservation of migratory waterbirds, building on the achievements of the Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy, with the ultimate goal of establishing a sufficient and efficient network of sites with sustainable management. (FNS page: <https://www.eaaflyway.net/the-flyway/flyway-site-network/>)

- Supplementary information: [EAA Flyway Network Sites Overview Report 2013](#), [EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028](#)

KRA 1.1 A comprehensive and coherent Flyway Network of Sites is developed for migratory waterbirds, including sites that are not currently Protected Areas.

Indicator 1.1.1 The Flyway Site Network has expanded to include at least 40 additional strategic internationally important sites for migratory waterbird conservation, some of which may not currently be a national Protected Area.

<p>RQ1. (Govt) Do you have a publicly accessible list of internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds in your country? If yes, please provide the web link or the reference in the below box. If not, would you like assistance from other Partners to develop such a list (please let us know your opinion in the box right below)?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
<p>Additional information: National Audubon’s Important Bird Areas (https://www.audubon.org/important-bird-areas) Important shorebird breeding and nonbreeding areas in Alaska (https://alaskashorebirdgroup.com/conservation-plans/#ASCP)</p>	

<p>RQ2. (Govt) Have any additional internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds been identified in your country? (for background, see EAA Flyway Network Sites Overview Report 2013) If yes, please provide details on these sites.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
<p>Additional information:</p>	

<p>RQ3. (Non-Government Partners) Have you documented any additional internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds in the EAAF (see EAA Flyway Network Sites Overview Report 2013)? If yes, please provide details on these sites.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
<p>Additional information:</p>	

<p>RQ4. (Govt) Have high priority candidate sites been identified for potential nomination to join the Flyway Site Network? If yes, please provide details on these sites. If not, would you like assistance from other Partners?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
<p>Additional information: No work has been made to nominate new sites since the Qupaluk site was added.</p>	

RQ5. (Govt) Have any additional sites been nominated for the Flyway Site Network since MoP10 (December 2018)? If yes or planned, please provide the names of these sites.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
Additional information:	

RQ6. (INGO, Corporate) Have you supported Government Partners with their identification of high priority candidate sites for the potential nomination of the new Flyway Site Network? If yes, please provide details of your support and the associated sites.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
Additional information:	

RQ7. (Govt) How many additional Flyway Network Sites do you anticipate there will be in your country by 2025?	1 Site(s)
Additional information: (1) <u>Cape Avinof Shoals</u> (Kikegtek, Pingurbek, Kwigluk Island) in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta. These islands are also administered by AMNWR and in 2019 hosted ~87,000 individuals of a total of ~101,000 of Bar-tailed Godwits (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>), and specifically the count at the shoals had ~70% of the <i>baueri</i> subspecies of Bar-tailed Godwits.	

KRA 1.2 National and Site Partnerships have been developed to coordinate the implementation of the EAAFP at national and local levels.

Indicator 1.2.1 Guidelines for the establishment and operation of national and site partnerships have been developed and agreed.

Indicator 1.2.2 At least 50% of Government Partners have an active National Partnership and site partnerships have been developed for at least 50% of the Flyway Network sites.

Guidelines on National and Site Partnership will be presented for adoption at MoP11. As such reporting on this KRA will start for MOP12.

KRA 1.3 Flyway Network Sites are valued by the community and sustainably managed.

Indicator 1.3.1 At least 50% of Flyway Network Sites have current management plans that address specific objectives for the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats and that are being adequately implemented. Management plans have stakeholder participation and are approved by relevant agencies.

RQ8. (Govt) Which Flyway Network Sites (FNS) in your country have a Management Plan and when is it due to be updated?
Your Response: Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge flyway network site has a Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan. The Qupaluk Flyway network site was part of the formal National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan (IAP) that included a substantial review under the National Environmental Policy Act. The IAP sets forth the conditions under which the land should be managed.

Indicator 1.3.2 At least 50% of Flyway Network Sites recognize the Flyway Site Network as a brand for the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the EAAF.

RQ9. (Govt, INGO, IGO) Please provide examples of how the “Flyway Site Network” brand is being recognized.

Your Response:

Information output about the two sites in Alaska regularly indicate that they are part of the EAAF Partnership’s Flyway Site Network.

Indicator 1.3.3 All Partners are using and complying with International standards ([International Finance Cooperation](#) or equivalent) for development within and adjacent to FNS and other internationally important waterbird sites.

RQ10. (Govt, INGO, IGO) Have any public consultation processes been implemented when a site of international importance for migratory waterbirds could be adversely impacted by a proposed development?

If yes, please provide brief details on the site/s and if the development was approved.

- Yes
- No
- Planned
- Not known

Additional information:

The Qupaluk site in the Teshekpuk Lake Special Area of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska (NPR-A) was part of a renewed Environmental Impact Statement completed in April 2022. There was extensive public review and comment associated with this process. There will be no significant changes to the management of Qupaluk.

RQ11. (Govt, INGO, IGO) Please provide brief details on any sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds that may be adversely impacted by a proposed development and the assessment process that was used or is anticipated to be applied.

Your Response:

There are a number of proposed developments within Alaska that might affect migratory bird habitat. For example, there is a proposed road within the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge. The Willow Project in NPR-A authorized impacts to migratory waterbird nesting habitat related to oil and gas development and would be a new oil field with five drilling sites.

KRA 1.4 Where appropriate, Flyway Network Sites are being sustainably used to support subsistence livelihoods of the local community.

Indicator 1.4.1 Where local communities at Flyway Network Sites depend on the natural resources of the site to support subsistence livelihoods, this is occurring without adverse impacts on migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

RQ12. (Govt, INGO) In your country, are there examples of local communities at Flyway Network sites that are dependent on the sites natural resources to support subsistence livelihoods?

If yes, please provide details on the site/s and the use of natural resources.

- Yes
- No
- Planned
- Not known

Additional information:

Local communities depend upon the subsistence harvest and sport hunting within the two EAAFP network sites within Alaska. The subsistence harvest of birds is managed through the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management Council.

KRA 1.5 Partners and local stakeholders are engaged in responding to activities which may threaten Flyway Network sites.

Indicator 1.5.1 The level of engagement of EAAFP Partners and local communities in responding to threats to Flyway Network Sites is reflected in the number of meetings and events held and the participants attending.

RQ13. (Govt, INGO, Sec.) Are you aware of any Flyway Network Sites or other sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds that are currently under threat? If yes, please provide details.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
Additional information:	

KRA 1.6 The EAAFP Sister Site Programme has expanded.

Indicator 1.6.1 At least five new EAAFP Sister Site relationships have been developed.

Guidelines on Sister Site will be presented for adoption at MoP11. As such reporting on this KRA will start for MOP 12.

KRA 1.7 The membership of the EAAFP has expanded to deliver stronger outcomes for migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

Indicator 1.7.1 Membership has increased.

RQ14. (Sec.) Please provide a list of new Partners since the last MoP (December 2018).
Your Response:

Objective 2 Enhance communication, education, participation and public awareness (CEPA) of the values of migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

KRA 2.1 The achievement of the elements in the EAAFP CEPA Strategy and Action Plan (2019-2024).

Indicator 2.1.1 The CEPA Action Plan has been monitored, reviewed and updated as necessary to inform the EAAFP.

RQ15. (Partners, TF/WG) Does your country/organization have a CEPA Program addressing migratory waterbirds and internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds? If yes, please provide brief details of the program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
Additional information (website links if any):	
<p>The United States has a Steering Committee member that is helping develop the Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative (AMBI), a circumpolar Arctic effort to conserve and manage arctic-breeding waterbirds. The AMBI Steering Committee has worked closely with many parties in the East Asian Flyway to develop a step-down conservation plan for arctic-breeding species that migrate along the EAAF.</p> <p>The US Fish and Wildlife Service and other federal agencies are active participants in meetings where issues on East Asian-Australasian waterbird species are discussed. National and international conferences include the Climate, Conservation, and Community in Alaska and Northwest Canada; the Alaska Bird Conference; the American Ornithological Society meeting; the Pacific Seabird Group Meeting; the World Seabird Union Conference; the International Wader Study Group Meeting; East Asian-Australasian Flyway Shorebird Science Meeting; and others.</p> <p>Migratory waterbird conservation issues are promoted through numerous outreach efforts, including many public events, media news releases, and outdoor activities to improve public knowledge of the value of migratory bird resources. Bird resources in remote areas of Alaska are co-managed between federal, state and tribal stakeholders via the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management Council (AMBCC). The AMBCC engages rural residents to participate in the regulatory process to help conserve bird resources while meeting the needs of native subsistence users living in remote Alaskan villages. Outreach efforts through this process include press releases, public meetings, and distribution of printed regulations to all households in rural Alaska throughout the year to enhance public awareness. Many federal agencies are involved with the conservation planning of migratory birds in Alaska. Within the US Fish and Wildlife Service, conservation framework plans (i.e.. business style plans) are in the process of being generated for high priority species, including the Canada Goose, Black Brant, Greater White-fronted Goose, Steller's Eider, Spectacled Eider, Harlequin Duck, Emperor Goose, Common Eider, Black-legged Kittiwake, Dunlin, Buff-breasted Sandpiper, and Yellow-billed Loon. These conservation frameworks will direct how and where the US Fish and Wildlife Service will allocate funds and</p>	

resources for monitoring, research, and conservation in Alaska.

RQ16. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Has your country/organisation made use of the EAAFP CEPA Action Plan 2019-2024 when planning and implementing the CEPA activities?

- Yes
- No
- Planned

Additional information (any example of how the Action Plan was reflected):

The US follows many of the guidelines identified in this plan. Since the last MOP, the Alaska Shorebird Group-Boreal Partners in Flight Outreach Group (ABOG) has formed and consists of agency and NGO staff interested in coordinating outreach efforts across Alaska. The mission of ABOG is to support efforts to “keep common birds common” and reverse the large declines experienced by many bird species over the past 50 years through impactful outreach and education. ABOG activities support CEPA action plan actions targeting “10. Citizens” and the associated “Preferred Status”.

RQ17. **(Govt, INGO, Corporate)** What CEPA activities have taken place at Flyway Network Sites and with which groups?

If applicable (under a Sister Site agreement), please describe what have you done and who have you worked with.

- Applicable
- Not applicable
- Planned

Additional information (list of events and/or news/report links):

RQ18. **(Partners)** Has your country/organisation developed, and/or been implementing awareness-raising programs, particularly at Flyway Network Sites, with the following groups (check all that apply)?

- National and local governments
- Education Department/Ministry
- Site managers
- General public
- Schools/students
- Local communities
- Native/indigenous communities
- None
- Planned

Additional information (please provide a detailed description of the program(s) including target groups, aims, and major achievements):

We raise awareness of the importance of the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge flyway network site through many channels, especially at the refuge headquarters. The Qupaluk site was recently made a sister site with an EAAFP flyway network site at Saga City, Japan. The process by which Qupaluk became a site and now a sister site is being written up and will be put out on social media by both the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

RQ19. **(Partners)** Has your country/organisation hosted events for World Migratory Bird Day, World Wetlands Day or other international awareness-raising events since the last MOP (December 2018)?

- Yes
- No
- Planned

Additional information (list of events and any news/report links):

We have people that celebrate World Migratory Bird Day and the virtual Arctic National Wildlife Refuge virtual bird festival. We also attended the virtual Arctic Science Summit Week 2021 and presented on international

partnerships. In 2021, with the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, we co-organized a workshop at the 3rd World Seabird Conference titled, “Strengthening and harmonizing seabird researcher’s network for better coordination on seabird conservation in the EAAFP region”. Lastly, during World Seabird Union’s 8th annual Twitter Conference, and the Pacific Seabird Group's Seabird Monitoring Committee we presented information on the EAAFP’s Year of the Tern photo contest to highlight EAAF tern species and conservation concerns.

RQ20. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Has your organisation/group been engaging the public regularly through any media channels, including social media, to promote the conservation of migratory waterbirds and the wetlands they use? If yes, please specify the type of media channels by marking boxes that apply.

- Website of your organization/group
- Newsletter of your organization/group
- Social media (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Weibo, YouTube, and others)
- Contribution to EAAFP eNewsletter
- Other (please specify:)
- No

Additional information (links to media channels of your organization/group, the number of posts, and the number of views): [Federal and state agencies, as well as non-profit and for profit groups have websites that have sections about migratory birds, as well as a variety of social media outlets that release new information regularly.](#)

RQ21. **(Govt, INGO, TF/WG)** Has there been any training or capacity building delivered to stakeholders involved in the conservation of migratory birds and wetlands? If yes, please specify the audience/participants by marking the boxes that apply.

- Site managers
- Government officers
- Educators
- Citizen
- Other (please specify:)
- No

Additional information (please provide the number of events and participants, and describe any materials or other resources about the capacity building):

Migratory bird management occurs throughout Alaska on the 1) US Fish and Wildlife Service’s 16 National Wildlife Refuges (76.7 million acres); 2) National Park Service’s 15 national parks, preserves, monuments and national historic parks (about 54 million acres); Bureau of Land Management units (about 72 million acres); and several forests managed by the U.S Forest Service (21.9 million acres). In addition, the State of Alaska has 31 state wildlife areas totally over 3 million acres. Federal and state personnel are involved in numerous training workshops/courses aimed at bettering conserving and managing areas and the waterbirds that depend on them. Each of the federal and the state agencies conduct some level of outreach to build local capacity.

In addition, there are a number of non-governmental entities involved in migratory bird capacity building including Audubon Alaska, the Wildlife Society, the Wilderness Society, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, Alaska Geographic Association, and others.

RQ22. **(Govt, INGO, TF/WG)** Please add below if your country/organisation has any other information regarding CEPA to report.

Your Response:

Our Qupaluk flyway network site recently became a sister site to the Saga City, Japan site.

Objective 3 Enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, build knowledge and promote exchange of information on waterbirds and their habitats.

KRA 3.1 National monitoring systems to assess the status of migratory waterbirds and their habitats are established, maintained and further enhanced.

Indicator 3.1.1 A standardized monitoring methodology for migratory waterbirds and their habitat is developed and used in nationally coordinated monitoring programmes.

<p>RQ23. (Govt) Is there a program in your country to monitor migratory waterbird numbers? If yes, please provide details on the program, the role of volunteer counters and the monitoring efforts since MoP10 (December 2018).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Planned
<p>Additional information:</p> <p>The US Fish and Wildlife Service and other federal and state agencies conduct surveys at sites important to EAAF migratory birds throughout Alaska. This includes annual aerial surveys of many waterfowl species, boat-based surveys of many marine birds, and ground-based surveys for shorebirds and landbirds. Species-specific studies are also conducted on Yellow-billed and Red-throated Loons, and Dunlin that rely on all or portions of the EAA flyway. These studies focus on migration patterns, demographic vital rates, and factors limiting population size.</p> <p>In spring 2023, a number of entities, including the US Fish and Wildlife Service, will begin conducting ground-based surveys for waterbirds on the Teshekpuk Lake Special Area, including the Qupaluk FNS to determine the distribution and relative abundance of waterbirds. This geographically-broad, land-based survey will be surveyed only for the second time, and information collected will be used to update the Site Information Sheet for this EAAF network site.</p> <p>State and federal biologists within Alaska participate in several broad networks aimed at collecting long-term baseline data, including the Arctic Shorebird Demographics Network, the Program for Regional and International Shorebird Monitoring, and the Alaska Landbird Monitoring Survey, and numerous waterfowl-specific surveys. Furthermore, efforts to develop digital archives of seabird data include the North Pacific Pelagic Seabird Database and the North Pacific Seabird Colony Register, as well as the North Pacific Seabird Diet Database.</p> <p>Knowledge from these monitoring and archival efforts are published in peer-reviewed journals, available on-line, or available from project leaders.</p>	

<p>RQ24. (INGO) In what countries is your organisation involved in migratory waterbird and/or site monitoring (select all that apply)? Please provide details on the monitoring program(s) and monitoring efforts since MoP10 (December 2018).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Australia <input type="checkbox"/> Indonesia <input type="checkbox"/> Japan <input type="checkbox"/> Philippines <input type="checkbox"/> Republic of Korea <input type="checkbox"/> Democratic People's Republic of Korea <input type="checkbox"/> Russia <input type="checkbox"/> Singapore <input type="checkbox"/> United States of America	<input type="checkbox"/> Cambodia <input type="checkbox"/> China <input type="checkbox"/> Bangladesh <input type="checkbox"/> Thailand <input type="checkbox"/> Mongolia <input type="checkbox"/> New Zealand <input type="checkbox"/> Malaysia <input type="checkbox"/> Myanmar <input type="checkbox"/> Viet Nam <input type="checkbox"/> None
<p>Additional information:</p>		

Indicator 3.1.2 All country partners have nationally-coordinated monitoring programs in place.

KRA 3.2 Conservation status reviews for waterbird populations are produced and updated to set and adapt priorities for action.

Indicator 3.2.1 Data describing waterbird population estimates, trends and distributions are available to the Partnership.

RQ25. **(Govt, INGO, TF/WG, Sec.)** Please report briefly on data management in relation to migratory waterbird population estimates, trends and distributions.

Your Response:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff have implemented detailed data management to archive migratory bird survey data. Similarly, the U.S. Geological Survey and several other federal and state partners also conduct data management. The Asian Seabird Colony Register was launched in partnership with the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's International Program; this register will be added to the Global Seabird Colony Register (seabirds.net)

Indicator 3.2.2 Two updates of waterbird population estimates have been produced and published.

RQ26. **(Partners, TF/WG, Sec.)** Please report on your contribution to the migratory waterbird Conservation Status Review.

Your Response: Members of the Seabird and Shorebird Working Group, as well as other residents living in Alaska, provided information on the status and distribution of species.

KRA 3.3 Updated list of sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds for conservation management and prioritization.

Indicator 3.3.1 An updated list of sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds for conservation management and prioritization will be maintained by the Partnership.

RQ27. **(Partners, Monitoring TF, Sec.)** If you are aware of significant new information on internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds, please provide brief details.

Your Response:

Survey data were recently obtained from waterbird breeding areas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge since the last MoP.

KRA 3.4 A stronger understanding is developed on the anticipated impacts of climate change on waterbirds and their habitats and this is informing planning and site management.

Indicator 3.4.1 Improved knowledge about threats, including climate change impacts, on waterbirds and their habitats is shared and appropriate action taken where possible.

RQ28. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG)** Please provide details on key research on climate change impacts on migratory waterbirds and wetlands in the EAAF, published since MoP 10 (December 2018).

Your Response (please provide the web links if available online or reference for relevant publications):

There are a large number of climate change studies published or underway within Alaska by public and private entities. These studies relate to how habitat and the food of the birds is changing and how the birds are responding to these changes. We provided information on publications as part of the Shorebird Working Group report. Seabird related publications include:

Tracking of causes of seabird die-offs in the Bering Sea are ongoing with limited or no information from Russian partners [Bodenstein, B. L., R. J. Dusek, M. M. Smith, C. R. Van Hemert, and R. S. A. Kaler, 2022: USGS National Wildlife Health Center necropsy results to determine cause of illness/death for seabirds collected in Alaska from January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2021: U.S. Geological Survey data release,

<https://doi.org/10.5066/P9XHBX75>].

Unusual mortality event of puffins was documented at the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea [Jones, T., and Coauthors, 2019: Unusual mortality of Tufted puffins (*Fratercula cirrhata*) in the eastern Bering Sea. PLoS ONE, 14, e0216532, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216532>].

Since 2017, seabird die-off have been reported annually in the Bering and Chukchi seas, Alaska [Kaler et al. 2022, Partnering in Search of Answers: Seabird Die-offs in the Bering and Chukchi Seas DOI: 10.25923/h002-4w87]

Following a marine heat wave in 2018 and 2019 in the northern Bering Sea, many fish-eating seabird either did not attempt to nest or experience complete breeding failure [Romano, M., and Coauthors, 2020: Die-offs, reproductive failure, and changing at-sea abundance of murre in the Bering and Chukchi Seas in 2018. Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II, 181-182, 104877, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2020.104877>].

Following a marine heat wave in 2018 and 2019 in the northern Bering Sea, many fish-eating seabird either did not attempt to nest or experience complete breeding failure [Will, A., and Coauthors, 2020a: Investigation of the 2018 thick-billed murre (*Uria lomvia*) die-off on St. Lawrence Island rules out food shortage as the cause. Deep-Sea Res., Pt. II, 181, 104879, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2020.104879>.]

Following a marine heat wave in 2018 and 2019 in the northern Bering Sea, many fish eating and plankton-eating seabird (auklets) either did not attempt to nest or experience complete breeding failure [Will, A., and Coauthors, 2020b: The breeding seabird community reveals that recent sea ice loss in the Pacific Arctic does not benefit piscivores and is detrimental to planktivores. Deep-Sea Res., Pt. II, 181-182, 104902, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2020.104902>].

KRA 3.5 Collaborative research programs are established to provide effective support for conservation and sustainable management efforts, particularly the sustainable use of resources for local livelihoods benefits.

Indicator 3.5.1 Research programs on improving conservation and sustainable management outcomes have increased.

RQ29. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG)** Please provide brief information on areas of research programs since the last MoP (2018) about improving conservation and sustainable management outcomes at internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds.

Your Response:

There is an extensive collaborative effort among biologists studying migratory birds throughout Alaska. The focus of these studies shifts through time but right now is focused strongly on climate change impacts and adapting, resisting, and accepting effects on migratory birds. There continues to be a large effort to track migratory birds, especially smaller species where transmitters are only recently available.

Indicator 3.5.2 Knowledge generated is being applied in at least 50% of internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds.

RQ30. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG)** Please give examples of how knowledge generated through research programs on improving conservation and sustainable management outcomes is being applied at internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds.

Your Response:

We are collating shorebird tracking data from researchers across North America and using this information to focus where and when to conduct on the ground conservation. This work is combined as part of the Shorebird Science and Conservation Collective ([here](#)); this approach could be a good model for the EAAF.

KRA 3.6 Best practice guidelines for waterbird and habitat conservation programs, including the incorporation of traditional knowledge, are developed and made available.

Indicator 3.6.1 Best practice guidelines are available on the EAAFP website.

RQ31. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG)** Please provide brief details on the development and application of best practice guidelines for waterbird and habitat conservation, including the application of traditional knowledge, published/made available since MoP10 (December 2018)?

Your Response:

Iglecia, M. and B. Winn. 2021. A shorebird management manual. Massachusetts, USA: Manomet.

We have shared other documents related to minimizing threats to shorebirds that reside in coastal areas via the EAAF shorebird listserv.

RQ32. **(Sec.)** What are the best practice guidelines that are available on the EAAFP website?

Your Response:

Objective 4 Build the habitat and waterbird management capacity of natural resource managers, decision makers and local stakeholders.

KRA 4.1 EAAFP promotes the use of the range of available training tools and provides assistance to address challenges at Flyway Network Sites.

Indicator 4.1.1 All Partners and Secretariat have mechanisms for capacity building in place to facilitate the sharing of knowledge, tools and experience.

RQ33. **(Sec.)** Please provide updates on identifying/developing internet-based approaches for capacity building for migratory waterbird conservation.

Your Response:

RQ34. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Have you been involved in identifying/developing capacity building materials and opportunities?

If yes, please provide some details.

Yes

No

Planned

Additional information:

See RQ 21. [People at Manomet Inc and National Audubon funded by Environment and Climate Change Canada developed a Shorebird Curriculum that is available in English, Spanish and French \(<https://whsrn.org/discover-shorebirds/>\).](#)

RQ35. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Have you implemented activities to share skills building, tools and experience?

If yes, please provide some details.

Yes

No

Planned

Additional information:

Each year many people are educated about migratory birds during festivals, studies, and conservation efforts.

RQ36. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Please provide feedback on the use you have made of capacity building materials and activities for migratory waterbirds and the management of their habitat?

Your Response:

Same as RQ35.

Indicator 4.1.2 Partners and the Secretariat include capacity building assessment in project proposals.

RQ37. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Have you considered a training needs assessment in projects you have developed, funded, and/or implemented since MoP10 (December 2018)?

If yes, please provide some additional information.

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Planned

Additional information:

Indicator 4.1.3 The EAAFP online technical training manual for Flyway Site management is supported and used by at least 50% of Flyway Site Managers.

RQ38. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Have you used the [EAAFP online technical training materials](#) for Flyway Site management? Please provide some additional information on the usefulness of materials.

- Yes
- No
- Planned

Additional information: Management of Quplauk is directed by the NPR-A Integrated Activity Plan.

KRA 4.2 Capacity of Partner Focal Points and site managers to pursue the EAAFP objectives has increased.

Indicator 4.2.1 The EAAFP implementation manual for Focal Points is produced and distributed, providing a set of resource materials for EAAFP implementation and awareness.

Indicator 4.2.2 At least one meeting of Partner Focal Points, including site managers, is held per annum.

RQ39. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Have you been able to participate in any Meetings of Partner Focal Points?

If yes, have any new collaborations with other Partners been developed from the meeting/s? Please provide details.

- Yes
- No
- Planned

Additional information: Information from the MoP is shared with others in federal and state agencies. This process led to new collaborations between Natives in western Alaska and those in New Zealand focused on Bar-tailed Godwit conservation as one example.

Indicator 4.2.3 All Partner Focal Points are submitting their Partner reports prior to each MoP.

RQ40. **(Partners, TsC, TF/WG, Sec.)** Have you been able to prepare your Partner report for the MoP? Have you found any difficulties in producing your report?

Your Response: Yes, but it is difficult to fill in because there are so many things happening in Alaska that it is next to impossible to report on all activities. We are also not aware of what is happening in other federal and state agencies, as well as for-profit and not-profit groups.

KRA 4.3 Corporates with operations impacting on migratory waterbirds are engaged in delivering better outcomes for the conservation of waterbirds and their habitats.

Indicator 4.3.1 An increased number of internationally important sites and programmes, in which Corporates are contributing to positive outcomes for migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

RQ41. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Please provide details you have on corporate engagement at internationally important sites and in programs to develop positive outcomes for migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

Your Response:

We have engaged with companies conducting oil and gas development/extraction on the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. All proposed developments within Alaska go through a detailed review process that leads to interactions with corporations proposing the development and results in measures to avoid or minimize impacts to birds and habitat.

Objective 5 Develop, especially for priority species and habitats, flyway wide approaches to enhance the conservation status of migratory waterbirds.

KRA 5.1 Partners are actively collaborating to develop approaches to conserve migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the EAAF across national boundaries.

Indicator 5.1.1 At least 50% of Partners are collaborating across national boundaries initiatives for the conservation of migratory waterbirds, particularly for threatened migratory waterbirds.

RQ42. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Please provide brief details on your transboundary involvement in international collaborative initiatives for threatened migratory waterbirds.

Your Response: The U.S. is involved in many bi-lateral and multi-lateral efforts to conserve migratory birds that transcend our boundaries. Alaska alone has five flyways that emanate from its geography that reach through Asia, South America, and Europe. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species Division regularly interacts with Japan, Russian Federation (prior to Ukrainian war), and other countries where our threatened migratory birds travel. The U.S. is a leader in CAFF Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program-Terrestrial Group, CAFF Seabird Expert Working Group, and AMBI.

RQ43. **(Partners, TF/WG)** What do you consider to be the key innovative and/or improved approaches to the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats since MoP10 (December 2018)?

Your Response:

We continue to expand our connections to biologists in other countries and to refocus our energies into conducting activities that achieve conservation outcomes.

KRA 5.2 Threatened migratory waterbirds are protected from threats and populations are stable or increasing.

Indicator 5.2.1 The Partnership, with leadership from IUCN, BirdLife International & Wetlands International, is updating and maintaining a list of threatened migratory waterbird populations and encouraging Government Partners to protect these threatened populations under national legislation.

RQ44. **(INGO, TF/WG, Sec.)** Please provide information on the development of a list of threatened migratory waterbird populations in the EAAF in which you have been involved.

Your Response:

RQ45. **(Govt)** Which populations of threatened migratory waterbirds are protected under legislation in your country?

Your Response:

Short-tailed albatross, Steller's and Spectacled eiders; there are other species but they don't migrate down the EAAF.

RQ46. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Has your organization been involved in taking actions to reduce direct threats to migratory waterbirds?

If yes, please provide some examples.

Yes

No

Planned

Your response: There are a number of federal and state agencies that have divisions focused entirely on reducing threats to migratory birds when development is proposed in an area.

Indicator 5.2.2 Single Species Action Plans are developed and implemented for threatened migratory waterbird species in the EAAF.

RQ47. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Please outline the contribution you have made to the development and implementation of Threatened Species Action Plans.

Your Response:

All threatened species have action plans, and these plans involve many different public and private organizations. The Short-tailed Albatross Recovery Team remains active with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration working closely with Japanese colleagues. The next 5-year review is scheduled for 2024.

Indicator 5.2.3 Populations of threatened migratory waterbirds are either stable or increasing.

RQ48. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Has your organization been involved in any program(s) to assess changes in the status of populations of threatened waterbirds?

If yes, please provide details.

Yes

No

Planned

Additional information:

The US Fish and Wildlife Service monitors threatened Steller's and Spectacled Eiders. In collaboration with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, bycatch of marine birds, and specifically Short-tailed albatross is closely monitored. In 2021 and 2022, a pair of Short-tailed albatross were reported breeding at Midway Island in the western portion of the Hawaiian Archipelago and the species is apparently increasing.

KRA 5.3 Regional Action Plans are developed and implemented for priority geographic regions of the EAAF.

Indicator 5.3.1 Development and implementation of Regional Action Plans for geographical regions with common critical threats in the EAAF.

RQ49. **(Partners, TF/WG)** What has been your involvement in the development and implementation of Regional Action Plans?

Your Response: There are regional action plans focused on landbirds, seabirds, shorebirds, and waterfowl species.

KRA 5.4 Measures to reduce and, as far as possible eliminate, illegal hunting, take and trade of migratory waterbirds are developed and implemented.

Indicator 5.4.1 All Government Partners have mechanisms in place to reduce and, as far as possible, eliminate, illegal hunting, take and trade of migratory waterbirds.

RQ50. **(Govt, TF on Task Force on Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Waterbirds)** What mechanisms are in place to reduce and, as far as possible, eliminate, illegal hunting, take and trade of migratory waterbirds?

Your Response:

We have a very detailed regulatory process and active law enforcement program, although illegal take may still be occurring at low levels in remote locations.

KRA 5.5 The conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats is mainstreamed into national legislation and/or policy instruments including adaptation to the impacts of climate changes.

Indicator 5.5.1 All Government Partners have relevant national legislation and/or policy instruments include provisions on the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

RQ51. **(Govt)** In your country, what are the current key national legislation and policy instruments that have provisions that cover the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats?

Your Response:

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703–718)

This act established Federal responsibility for the protection of migratory birds and gave effect to treaties in Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. The act is basic to protecting populations and habitats of migratory birds, managing their distribution, ecological diversity, introduction and restoration, and guiding research programs. Regulations in Volume 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations implement this act and other legislation pertaining to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service responsibilities.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661–667[C])

This act provides a means for protecting fish and wildlife habitats. The act requires water resource agencies to consult with the Service regarding the effect of proposed Federal projects on fish and wildlife resources, and it requires that measures to mitigate losses be included in projects.

National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668jj) and National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–57)

The first constitutes an “organic act” for the National Wildlife Refuge System and, together with the second act, ensures that the National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs) are managed as a national system of related lands, waters, and interests for the protection and conservation of our Nation’s national wildlife resources.

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531–1544)

This act provides for the protection of plants and animals in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their range and the conservation of ecosystems upon which they depend. The ESA implements the United States’ commitment to several international treaties and conventions including: the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere; and the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. The Short-tailed albatross was listed as endangered under the ESA in 1970.

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (94 STAT. 2371–2551, 16 U.S.C. 668dd)

This act established new wildlife refuges in Alaska and expanded some existing national wildlife refuges. It also defined the purpose of these refuges. Most refuges in the system were established to conserve high-quality habitat for migratory birds, including seabirds. All 16 refuges in Alaska were established, in part, to conserve migratory birds. Most were also established to provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses of some species.

Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980, as amended in 1988 (16 U.S.C. 2901– 2912) This act recognized the value of nongame migratory species and the need to plan for and manage nongame resources. It provided for financial assistance to States for developing nongame conservation plans and programs and instructed all federal agencies to conserve nongame fish and wildlife and their habitats. In November 1988, this act was amended to

include among its purposes the monitoring of all nongame migratory bird populations and identification of effects of environmental changes and human activities on nongame migratory birds.

Driftnet Impact Monitoring, Assessment and Control Act of 1987 (P.L. 100–220, Title IV, Driftnet Act (16 U.S.C. 1822) This driftnet impact act stipulated that the United States would pursue agreements with Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan to establish an observer program to document the mortality of marine mammals, seabirds, and other marine resources in high-seas squid driftnet fisheries. This was the first legislation expressing the United States' concern for mortality of birds in fishing gear, and the recognition that the mortality should be monitored.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, amended numerous times until reorganized and expanded in 1972 This act implements and enforces other maritime contaminant issues.

Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act of 1996, originally passed as the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976
This act regulates federal commercial and sport fisheries.

National Petroleum Reserves Production Act (1976):

Designate lands “containing any **significant** subsistence, recreational, fish and **wildlife**, or historical or scenic **value**,” and requires that in these lands, activities, “shall be conducted in a manner which will assure the **maximum protection of such surface values** to the extent consistent with the requirements of this Act,” for exploration and production activities.

NPR-A IAP (2013):

The purpose of the Teshekpuk Lake Special Area is expanded to include the protection of important caribou and **shorebird habitat** while continuing to protect **waterbird habitat**...

Presidential Executive Order 13186:

Responsibilities of Federal Agencies To Protect Migratory Birds (2000):
Section 3 (e) (13) - promote migratory bird conservation in international activities and with other countries and international partners

BLM-FWS Mig Bird Memorandum of Understanding: https://www.blm.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2022-04/IB2022-036_att1.pdf

Work collaboratively to identify and address issues that affect species of concern, such as migratory bird species listed in the Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) and FWS’s Focal Species initiative. Potential activities could include monitoring abundance of birds and the creation, conservation, and protection of habitats important to these species.

KRA 5.6 The conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats is integrated into relevant multilateral and bilateral agreements and other regional mechanisms.

Indicator 5.6.1 Relevant environmental agreements recognise the EAAFP as an effective regional framework to conserve migratory waterbirds and their habitats.

RQ52. **(Govt)** In your country, what are the current multilateral regional and bilateral agreements and other regional mechanisms that include provisions on the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats?

Your Response:

Migratory Bird Treaty Act: involves Mexico, United States, Canada, Japan, and Russia

Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Protection Act

Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act

North American Wetlands Conservation Act

Bi-lateral agreements between USA and China

Country participant to the EAAF Partnership

RQ53. **(Partners, TF/WG)** Please provide any suggestions you have on how existing multilateral regional and bilateral agreements, and other regional mechanisms, could be strengthened to deliver better outcomes for migratory waterbirds.

Your Response: I would suggest talking with Ed Gallo-Cajiao or Francis Commercon who have studied this issue along the flyway.