




Document 4

Approval of Minutes of the 10th Meeting of Partners



© Eugene Cheah/EAAFP

Table of Contents

List of Participants	6
OPENING CEREMONY	13
• Cultural Performances.....	13
• Welcoming Address.....	13
<i>Chair, EAAFP, Management Committee</i>	13
<i>Chinese National Forestry and Grassland Administration</i>	14
<i>Hainan Province</i>	14
<i>ChangJing City.....</i>	14
• Certificates Ceremony and presentation from New Partners - DPRK	14
• Certificates Ceremony and presentation from New Partner – Paulson Institute.....	14
• Certificates Ceremony for new Flyway Network Sites	14
AGENDA ITEM 1: PROCEDURAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	15
The original and final documents are available on MOP10 page (link).....	15
• Agenda Item 1.2: Adoption of the Provisional Program – Document 3	15
• Agenda Item 1.3: Approval of the Provisional Rule of Procedure – Document 1	15
• Agenda Item 1.4: Appointment of Meeting Chair and Vice-Chair for the Meeting – Document 13	15
• Agenda Item 1.5: Adoption of the Minutes of the 9 th Meeting of Partners - Document 4	16
• Agenda Item 1.6: Admission of Observers – Document 11	16
• Agenda Item 1.7: Report from EAAFP Strategic Plan TF about new Strategic Plan 2019-2028	17
• Agenda Item 1.8: Special presentation on improving the effectiveness of WGs and TFs within the EAAF	17
• Agenda Item 2.1: Report of the Management Committee (including election to the Management Committee) - Document 5	17
• Agenda Item 2.2: Report of the Finance Sub Committee (including election to the Finance Sub Committee) - Document 6	17
• AGENDA ITEM 3: REPORTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT	18
• Agenda Item 3.1: Report of the Secretariat Budget and Activities 2017-2018 - Document 7	18
• Agenda Item 3.2: Plan for the Secretariat Budget and Activities 2019-2020 - Document 8.....	18
• Agenda Item 3.3: Implementation of the Partnership - Document 8.....	19
• Agenda Item 3.4: Status of Flyway Network Sites - Document 8.....	20
• Agenda Item 3.5: Implication of substantive agenda items - Document 12	21
• Agenda Item 3.6: CEPA Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021	21

AGENDA ITEM 4: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, THE STATE OF THE WORLD’S WETLANDS: WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?	24
AGENDA ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT DECISIONS	26
• Agenda Item 5.1: Discussion on the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019 – 2028 - Decision. 01	26
• Agenda Item 5.2: Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat– Decision.05	26
• Agenda Item 5.3: Revised Guidelines for the Sponsorship of participants at EAAFP Meetings of Partners- Decision.06	29
• Agenda Item 5.4: Standardized Process and Template for Small Grant Fund Applications for EAAFP WG&TF – Draft Decision. 07	31
• Agenda Item 5.5: Developing Guidelines for National and Site Partnerships – Decision. 08	33
• Agenda Item 5.6: Developing an EAAFP Sister Site Program – Decision. 09	35
• Agenda Item 5.7: Update on the Appointment and Work of the Interim Technical Sub Committee - Decision. 04	37
• Agenda Item 5.8: Standardized Taxonomy for Migratory Waterbirds - Decision. 10	38
• Agenda Item 5.9: Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document - Decision. 11	39
• Agenda Item 5.10: Development of a Conservation Status Review of Migratory Waterbird Populations for the EAAFP - Decision. 12	41
• Agenda Item 5.11: Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region - Draft Decision. 13(cancelled)	45
• Agenda Item 5.12: International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Dalmatian Pelican - Decision. 14	47
AGENDA ITEM 6: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, KEY ACTIVITIES OF WGs/TFs	49
• Agenda Item 6.1: Scaly-sided Merganser TF Presentation (Ms. Diana Solovyeva)	49
• Agenda Item 6.2: Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF Presentation (Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy)	50
• Agenda Item 6.3: Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade (Interim) TF in the EAAFP (Mr. Srey Sunleang)	51
• Agenda Item 6.4: Baer’s Pochard TF (Mr. Richard Hearn)	51
• Agenda Item 6.5: Monitoring TF (Mr. Doug Watkins, Mr. Taej Mundkur)	52
AGENDA ITEM 7: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, Bigger Data and Bigger Conservation in the EAAF engaging Science.	53
AGENDA ITEM 8: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, Initiation of Spoon-billed Sandpiper Project	53
AGENDA ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT DECISIONS (CONT.)	55
• Agenda Item 9.1: Draft Decision. 01 - Draft Decision. 14	55
Decision 11-Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document	55
Document 6-Report from the Chair of the Finance Sub Committee	55
Document 11- Admission of observers-	56

Document 10-The Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites	56
Document 13- Election and Appointment of Management Committee	56
Document 14- Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region	56
Decision. 01- EAAFP Strategic Plan	56
Decision. 02- EAAFP CEPA Strategy	56
Decision. 03- Organizational Structure of the EAAFP	56
Decision. 04-Update on the Appointment of the Interim Technical Sub Committee	57
Decision. 05- Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat	57
Decision. 06- Revised guidelines for participation at MOP	57
Decision. 09- Developing an EAAFP Sister Site Program	59
Decision. 07- Standardized Process for Small Grant Fund Applications for EAAFP Working Groups and Task Forces	59
Decision. 11- Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document	62
Decision. 12- Development of a Conservation Status Review of Migratory Waterbird Populations for the EAAFP	62
Decision. 13- Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region.....	62
AGENDA ITEM 10: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, CORPORATE’S ENGAGEMENT	65
• Agenda Item 10.1: Lotek Wireless Inc.....	65
• Agenda Item 10.2: Sony.....	66
AGENDA ITEM 11: SPECIAL PRESENTATION.....	67
• Agenda Item 11.1: Mud, Glorious Mud	67
• Agenda Item 11.2: Party Secretary of Hengshui Lake in China (important site for critically endangered Baer’s Pochard).....	68
AGENDA ITEM 12: Draft Decision.....	69
• Agenda Item 12.1: Document 14.....	69
• Agenda Item 12.2: Decision. 02.....	69
• Agenda Item 12.3: Decision. 04.....	69
• Agenda Item 12.4: Decision. 05.....	70
• Agenda Item 12.5: Decision. 12.....	70
• Agenda Item 12.6: Decision. 01.....	70
AGENDA ITEM 13: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EAAFP WGs AND TFs	76
AGENDA ITEM 14: REPORT AND APPROVAL OF KEY DECISIONS FROM MOP10	79
• Agenda Item 14.1: Announcement of new MoU with Ministry of Environment -Republic of Korea	79

- **Agenda Item 14.2: Adoption of the Secretariat’s Workplan and Budget for 2019-2020 -Document 8**
.....79
- **Agenda Item 14.3: Election and appointment of Management Committee and Finance Sub
Committee; Election and appointment of new Chair and Vice Chair- Document 13.....80**
Management Committee elections..... 80
Finance Sub Committee elections..... 81
- **Agenda Item 12.4: Date and Venue of the next Meeting of Partners82**
- **Agenda Item 15.1: MoU signing ceremony, EAAFP Secretariat and Beijing Forestry University.....82**

List of Participants

Government Partners

Australia	Mr. Mark James Carey	mark.carey@environment.gov.au
	Mr. Geoffrey Robert Richardson	geoff.richardson@environment.gov.au
	Mr. Jeffrey Thomas Newchurch	jeffreynewchurch@hotmail.com
Bangladesh	Mr. Mollah Rezaul Karim	rezaulbfd@gmail.com
Cambodia	Mr. Srey Sunleang	kampongspeu@yahoo.com
	Mr. Taing Porchhay	porchhay.taing@naturelifecambodia.org, chhay360@gmail.com
	Mr. Hong Chamnan	hong.chamnan@gmail.com
China	Mr. Zhang Yue	citeszhy@vip.126.com
	Prof. Guangchun Lei	guangchun8099@gmail.com; guangchun.lei@foxmail.com
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Mr. Myoung Hyok Ho	guktodae@star-co.net.kp
	Mr. Kyoung Su Ri	guktodae@star-co.net.kp
Indonesia	Ms. Desy satya chandradewi	desysatyac@gmail.com
	Mr. Donal Hutasoit	donalhutasoit66@gmail.com
	Mr. Afan Absori (replaced with Mr. Pratono Purso)	afanabsori@gmail.com
Japan	Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa	TOMOKO_ICHIKAWA@env.go.jp
	Ms. Mika Yasuda	mika.yasuda@birdlife.org
Malaysia	Ms. Sim Lee Kheng	lksim@sarawakforestry.com
	Mr. Oswald Braken Anak Tisen	oswaldtisen@sarawakforestry.com
	Ms. Tinna Wound	tinnaw@sarawakforestry.com
Mongolia	Mr. Sundev Gombobaatar	info@mos.mn; gomboo@num.edu.mn
Myanmar	Ms. Thin Thin Yu	thinnwcd@gmail.com
	Ms. Hsu Sandar Aung	hsusandaraung6988@gmail.com
	Mr. Phae Phyoe Aung	pyaephyoaung@bancamm.org

New Zealand	Mr. Bruce James McKinlay	bmckinlay@doc.govt.nz
Republic of Korea	Ms. Soon Bok Kim	chingo1@korea.kr
	Ms. Jian You	yujian22@korea.kr
	Mr. Jin Young Park	birdkorea@korea.kr
	Mr. Sewon Oh	obear@korea.kr
	Ms. Kyounghee Lee	yai2000@korea.kr
Russian Federation	Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy	ees_jr@yahoo.co.uk
Singapore	Mr. How Choon Beng	how_choon_beng@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. Adrian Loo	adrian_loo@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. David Li	david_li@nparks.gov.sg
	Ms. Yang Shufen	yang_shufen@nparks.gov.sg
Thailand	Ms. Jittinun Ruengverayudh	wetlandthaionep@gmail.com
	Ms. Sukanya Wisan	sukanya4403@gmail.com
	Mr. Sajjaporn Chansrinual	paladkrabi@hotmail.com
	Mr. Wicha Narungsri	wicha@thaiwetlands.org
	Mr. Ayuwat Jearwattanakanok	ayuwat@bcst.or.th
	Mr. Aree Suwanmanee	aree108@hotmail.com
	Mr. Charoenchai Tothaisong	binturongwl27@gmail.com
	Ms. Aujcharaporn Kanmuang	jk.aujchara@gmail.com
	Mr. Parinya Leelahanon	parinya_lee@yahoo.com
	Mr. Wanlop Preechamart	wanloponep@gmail.com
Philippines	Mr. Anson Miguel Tagtag	anson_tagtag@yahoo.com
	Ms. Rosie Pama Pablico	rosiepablico@yahoo.com
	Ms. Angelique Morato Garacellano	tmo@tubbatahareefs.org
	Mr. Ricardo Rodriguez Natividad	nlnpormin@gmail.com
	Mr. Luther Villaver Dejadena	luther_dejadena@yahoo.com
United States of America	Mr. Peter John Probasco (Pete)	pete_probasco@fws.gov
Vietnam	Mr. Dung Nguyen Xuan	xuandungbt@gmail.com

	Mr. Nguyen The Hanh	thehanh61@gmail.com
--	---------------------	---------------------

Inter- Governmental Organisation Partner

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)	Ms. Sheila Gorosin Vergara	sgvergara@aseanbiodiversity.org
	Ms. Kyle Esperanza Rafanan Zuleta	kerzuleta@aseanbiodiversity.org
	Ms. Claudia Bongalonta Binondo	cbbinondo@aseanbiodiversity.org
Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)	Mr. Doug Watkins (Monitoring TF Chair)	doug@caff.is
	Ms. Courtney Price	courtney@caff.is
	Mr. Tom Barry	tom@caff.is
Ramsar Convention	Ms. IITSUKA Reiko	iitsuka@ramsar.org
Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)	Ms. Laura Aguado Clemente	laura.aguado@un.org

International Non-Governmental Organisation Partner

Australasian Wader Studies Group (AWSG)	Ms. Alison Lee Russell-French	alisonrf@iinet.net.au
	Ms. Birgita Dalene Hansen	b.hansen@federation.edu.au
Birdlife International	<u>Mr. Vinayagan Dharmarajah</u>	vinayagan.dharmarajah@birdlife.org
	Mr. Barend van Gernerden	barend.vangernerden@birdlife.org
	Mr. Yong Ding Li	dingli.yong@birdlife.org
Hanns Seidel Foundation	Mr. Bernhard Johannes Seliger	seliger@hss.or.kr
International Crane Foundation (ICF)	Mr. Stephen John Millington (Spike)	spike@savingcranes.org
IUCN	Mr. Zhang Cheng	Cheng.ZHANG@iucn.org,
Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust	Mr. David Alexander Lawrie	lawrie@ps.gen.nz
Wild Bird Society of Japan (WBSJ)	Mr. Minoru Kashiwagi	minoru.kash@gmail.com
	Mr. Seiji Hayama	hayama@wbsj.org
	Mr. Martin Coulson Spray	martin.spray@wwt.org.uk

Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT)	Mr. Terry Desmond Townshend	terry.townshend@gmail.com
Wetlands International	Mr. Eduardus Johannes Maria Hagemeyer, (Ward)	ward.hagemeyer@wetlands.org
	Mr. Xiaohong Zhang	wixhzhang@163.com
	Mr. Taej Arun Mundkur (AI WG, Chair)	taej.mundkur@wetlands.org
Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)	Mr. Jonathan Slaght (TSC members)	jslaght@wcs.org jslaght@gmail.com
WWF Hong Kong	Mr. Wen Xianji	xjwen@wwf.org.hk
	Mr. Peter David Cornthwaite	pcornthwaite@wwf.org.hk
WWF China	Ms. Jieyun Liu	Jyliu@wwfchina.org
Paulson Institute	Mr. Jianbin Shi	jshi@paulsoninstitute.org

Special Partner

Incheon Metropolitan City, ROK	Mr. Byong Hyuck Joe	bhjo3000@korea.kr
	Mr. Muenghwan Choi	cmh1483@korea.kr
	Mr. Minjong Jeon	johnaidi@korea.kr

Working Groups (WGs)

Anatidae	Mr. Masayuki Kurechi	gan.g.kurechi@gmail.com
	Mr. Katsumi Ushiyama	mwwc@dune.ocn.ne.jp
	Ms. Sofya Rozenfeld	rozenfeldbro@mail.ru
Black-faced Spoonbill	Mr. Kisup Lee	larus@daum.net
	Mr. Yu Yat Tung (Seabird WG Coordinator)	bfspoonbill@hkbws.org.hk
	Ms. Hiroko Koike	koikeroko0116@gmail.com
CEPA	Ms. Alexandra June Hails-Downie (Sandra)	shails@bluewin.ch
	Mr. Philip John Straw	philip.straw@birdlife.org.au philip.straw@awsg.org.au

Crane	Mr. Chan Sing Yin Simba	simba.chan@birdlife.org
Seabird	Mr. Robert Stuart Allen Kaler (Robb)	robert_kaler@fws.gov
	Ms. Wai Yan So	ivy_wy_so@afcd.gov.hk
	Mr. Abdulmula Abdumagid Alhadi Hamza	abdhamza@gmail.com
Shorebird	Mr. Richard Benjamin Lanctot	richard_lanctot@fws.gov
	Mr. Mohammad Shamsul Azam	shamsforest@gmail.com
	Mr. Yury Gerasimov	bird@mail.kamchatka.ru
	Mr. Konstantin Klokov	k.b.klokov@gmail.com

Task Forces (TFs)

Baer's Pochard	Prof. DING Changqing	cqding@bjfu.edu.cn
	Mr. Richard David Hearn	richard.hearn@wwt.org.uk
	Ms. MENG Fanjuan	mengfanjuan1986@163.com
	Mr. WU Dayong	dayongwu@hotmail.com
Scaly-sided Merganser	Ms. Diana Solovyeva (Scaly-sided Merganser TF Coordinator)	diana_solovyova@mail.ru
	Mr. Nial Moores	Nial.Moores@birdskorea.org
	Mr. Sergey Vartanyan	diana_solovyova@mail.ru
Spoon-billed Sandpiper	Mr. Sayam Uddin Chowdhury	sayam_uc@yahoo.com
	Ms. Lappo Elena	ellappo@mail.ru
	Mr. Christoph Zoekler	christoph.zoekler@m-h-s.org
Yellow Sea Ecoregion	Mr. Soon Rae Kim	naga2912@hanmail.net

EAAFP Committee

EAAFP Technical-Sub Committee	Mr. Nick Davidson	arenaria.interpres@gmail.com
-------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

Observers

Centurylink, USA	Mr. David Willem Mehlman	dmehlman@centurylink.net
National Geographic Society – Asia	Mr. Jaechol Lee (Jay)	jaylee@ngs.org
Goyang-city, ROK	Ms. Yeonhee Kim	kimyeonhee@korea.kr
Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology	Mr. Soodong Lee	ecoplan.lee@gmail.com
Hainan Birdwatching Society	Ms. Cheng Cheng	cc401@163.com
Hengshui Lake Nature Reserve Management Commission	Ms. Liu Zhenjie Mr. Yuan Bo	
Hengshui Municipal Party Committee	Mr. Wang Jingwu	
Hengshui University	Mr. Wang Shouzhong	
Hong Kong Bird Watching Society	Ms. Lai Nga Yee	info@chinabirdnet.org
Hwaseong City, ROK	Mr. Cheol Mo Seo	cheolmo@hanmail.net
	Mr. Sunghoon Cha	hoonsunng@korea.kr
	Mr. Soonhong Hwang	evahwang@korea.kr
	Mr. Keunseo Park	boxer714@korea.kr
	Ms. Youngsin Yun	jsju8934@korea.kr
	Ms. Eunjoo Hwang	pure715@korea.kr
	Ms. Hye jeong Park	kalaehs@kfem.or.kr
Japan Bird Research Association	Mr. Toshifumi Moriya	moriya@bird-research.jp
Korea Federation for Environmental Movement (KFEM)	Ms. Hija Im	imhj@kfem.or.kr
	Ms. Choony Kim	kimchykorea@gmail.com
Pusan University, ROK	Ms. Jieun Choi	hm1627@pusan.ac.kr
Queensland University	Ms. Micha Jackson	m.jackson@uqconnect.edu.au
Queensland University	Mr. Eduardo Gallo Cajiao	e.gallocajiao@uq.edu.au
Ramsar Regional Center - East Asia	Mr. Guido Kuchelmeister	info@kuchelmeister.com
	Mr. Seung Oh Suh	suhseungoh@gmail.com
	Ms. Seong Bo Kim	rrceaksbo@hotmail.com
The Shenzhen Mangrove Wetlands Conservation Foundation (MCF)	Mr. Li Shen	lishen@mcf.org.cn
	Ms. Yan Baohua	yanbaohua@mcf.org.cn
Wonkwang University, ROK	Mr. Hyun Park	hyunpk@wku.ac.kr
	MS. Seon-Ju Yeo	yeosj@wku.ac.kr
	Mr. Mudsser Azam	azammudsser@gmail.com
United States of America	Ms. Eileen Marie Probasco	pete_probasco@fws.gov
Lao PDR	Mr. Phothitay Chanthone	chanthone2011@hotmail.com

Beijing Forestry University	Mr. Cai Lu	lucai.wetland@foxmail.com
	Ms. Qing Zeng	science@eaaflyway.net
	Ms. Liu Yunzhu	
	Mr. Yifei Jia	jifbaggio@gmail.com
	Prof. Wang Yujie	
	Ms. Wu Lan	
	Ms. Tan Wenzhuo	
	Mr. Tian Haitao	
	Ms. Zhang Chengxiang	

Corporates

Lotek Wireless Inc.	Ms. Catalina Amaya-Perilla	camaya@lotek.com
Sony China	Mr. Guang Ming Yang	Mingyang_guang@126.com
	Mr. Liu Dong Yang	Dong.Yang.Liu@sony.com
	Mr. Kunio Kinoshita	Kunio.Kinoshita@sony.com
	Mr. Shen Wu	wilson.wu@sony.com

EAAFP Secretariat

Chief Executive	Mr. Lew Young	chief@eaaflyway.net
Deputy Chief Executive	Mr. Dong Koo Yun	deputy@eaaflyway.net
External Relations Manager	Ms. Yoonkyung Lee	fundraising@eaaflyway.net
Finance Officer	Ms. Yejin Jung	finance@eaaflyway.net
Programme Officer	Ms. Hyeeseon Do	programme@eaaflyway.net
Communication Officer	Ms. Vivian Fu	communication@eaaflyway.net
Communication Specialist	Ms. Yeonah Ku	yeonah.ku@eaaflyway.net
Programme Consultant	Ms. Minshil Lee	minshil.lee@eaaflyway.net
Programme Assistant	Ms. Sungkyung Kang	sungkyung.kang@eaaflyway.net
Programme Assistant	Ms. Hyeon Hee Do	hyeonhee.do@eaaflyway.net
Programme Assistant	Ms. You Jin Lee	youjin.lee@eaaflyway.net
Photographer (Volunteer)	Mr. Eugene Chaeh Ewe Jin	eugenecheahewejin@yahoo.com

OPENING CEREMONY

Cultural Performances

1. To Celebrate the MOP10, the Li people's performing team demonstrated a traditional dance performance.

Welcoming Address

Chair, EAAFP, Management Committee

2. Mr. Pete Probasco, the Chair of East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP); delighted to participate in the MOP10, expressed his gratitude to the representatives from the relevant departments including the National Natural Forestry, and Grassland Administration ("NFGA") and the host of the 10th Meeting of Partners, the EAAFP. He also thanked meeting organizers; EAAFP Secretariat, Beijing Forest University, Partners for the hard work on the preparation over the past nine months. They made the meeting possible and allowed people to be there. A lot has happened since the last MOP9 in Singapore in January 2017. He highlighted the significant improvement of the works and visualization of the EAAFP in the Flyway and especially the achievement of engagement with the relevant conservation relevant works along the Yellow Sea.
3. He warmly welcomed the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and Paulson Institute as new Partners. He recognised the efforts of the Government of China and the Republic of Korea as they are taking great strides to conserve and restore the tidal flats along the coastal land, and the west Yellow Sea. This includes the new nomination process of the critical habitats, tidal flats as World Heritage sites. The project to restore degraded tidal flats and developing mechanisms such as IUCN Yellow Sea WG to promote the exchange of information and experience of countries around the yellow sea. The efforts of these countries have been supported by this Partnership, Partners, and many other dimensions. In Southeast Asia, the ASEAN Flyway Network also has been officially established under the coordination of ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity and sponsorship by the Government of Japan to raise the awareness about the importance of migratory waterbirds and their habitats in this area. Institutionally, following the MOP9 Decision, the EAAFP Technical Sub Committee was established with eight very experienced members. He recognised the contribution of previous Secretariat's staff member who have recently left; Mr. Spike Millington (Chief Executive), Ms. Minseon Kim (Programme Officer) and Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Communication Officer), and of the hard work of the current staff members and make this happened within the short period under the leadership of the new Chief Executive.
4. He congratulated the designation of 8 new Flyway Network Sites in two years and the largest number of participants including the engagement of Corporates to the MOP. He briefly introduced the rules and important documents of the MOP10 for the next 5 days.

5. **A Tribute to Jim Harris**

Lastly, on behalf of the Partners and colleagues, Mr. Pete Probasco read a letter recognizing the honoured memory and contributions of Jim Harris (letter)

Chinese National Forestry and Grassland Administration

6. Mr. WU Zhimin, the director general of the Chinese national forestry and grassland administration to the podium, welcomed the participants to Hainan for MOP10.

Hainan Province

7. Ms. ZHOU Xumei, the Deputy Director of Forestry Hainan Province, gave a welcome speech.

ChangJing City

8. Mr. CHEN Guobin, the Deputy County Mayor of the ChangJing City government, gave a few words to congratulate our 10th meeting of Partners.

Certificates Ceremony and presentation from New Partners - DPRK

9. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) presented the Partner certificate to the representative of the DPRK.
10. Mr. Myoung Hyok Ho (DPRK) gave a presentation. He thanked the supporters; EAAFP, Ramsar Convention, IUCN, Hanns Seidel Foundation. DPRK mentioned their intention of continuing their efforts to strengthen international exchange and cooperation in the field of conservation for migratory waterbirds.

Certificates Ceremony and presentation from New Partner – Paulson Institute

11. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) gave the certificate to Paulson Institute.
12. Mr. Jianbin Shi (Paulson Institute) delivered a speech on behalf of the Paulson Institute. He also thanked the EAAFP Secretariat and introduced the main works of the Paulson Institute and the future potential cooperative works, such as the Blueprint Project of coastal wetland conservation in China and the project for the establishment of the education center.

Certificates Ceremony for new Flyway Network Sites

13. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) presented the certificates to the representatives of each Partner country.
- Bangladesh (1): EAAF141 Ganguirar Char
 - Korea, DPR (2): EAAF044 Kumya Wetland Reserve, EAAF045 Mundok Wetland Reserve
 - Korea, RO (1): EAAF142 Hwaseong Wetlands
 - Myanmar (2): EAAF139 Nanthar Island and Nayyu Estuaries, EAAF140 Meinmahla Kyun Wildlife Sanctuary

- New Zealand (2): EAAF137 Avon Heathcote Estuary, EAAF138 Awarua Bay-New River Estuary

14. Hwaseong Wetlands selected to give a presentation among the new sites from Mr. Cheol Mo Seo, the Mayor of Hwaseong City, Republic of Korea. They also showed a video about the Hwaseong Wetlands.

Keynote Presentation on Conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats in China

15. Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit) made a presentation on the conservation status of migratory waterbirds and their habitats in China by highlighting the important location of China along the flyway for 300 different species of migratory waterbirds especially 149 species which rely on the Yellow Sea as a breeding habitat. Also, he mentioned that the main existing threats such as illegal hunting, and the importance of the improvement of scientific research data which could be a source of convincing the government. The Chinese government has improved the national wetland conservation programme which ensured the maintenance of 50% of nature wetlands among 700 nature reserves.

AGENDA ITEM 1: PROCEDURAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

The original and final documents are available on MOP10 page ([link](#))

Agenda Item 1.1: Adopt Provisional Agenda – [Document 2](#)

16. The Partners approved the Provisional Agenda without amendments.

Agenda Item 1.2: Adoption of the Provisional Program – [Document 3](#)

17. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) asked for the clarification about the programme of follow-up breakout meetings to be in the Provisional Program.
18. Mr. Lew Young (Chief Executive(CE), EAAFP) answered small meetings have not reflected on the Programme which is on our MOP10 webpage.
19. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) wanted to confirm that Document 13 appears to be the appointment of the Chair on members of Management Committee (“MC”), not the appointment of Chair and Vice Chair of the meeting. He wanted to make sure he was looking at the signed document. Document 13 may need to be added as an agenda item.
20. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) agreed to go through and look at Document 1 after.
21. The Partners approved the Provisional Programme without further amendments.

Agenda Item 1.3: Approval of the Provisional Rule of Procedure – [Document 1](#)

22. The Provisional Rule of Procedure is adopted without amendments.

Agenda Item 1.4: Appointment of Meeting Chair and Vice-Chair for the Meeting – [Document 13](#)

23. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) accounted for the new changes to the document. The Chair is normally selected from a country Partner and the selection of Vice-Chair is flexible, either a country Partner or a non-country Partner. At present, the Chair is from the USA, and the Vice Chair is from Singapore. They were elected at MOP9. According to the TOR of MC, they have provided general policy advice for the operation and the financial matters of the Secretariat concerning the implementation and expansion of the Partnership. The MC currently consists of up to 7 people and they are invited by the last meeting of Partners. At this meeting, we needed to appoint a Chair and Vice Chair. In short, Chair offered 2 processes. One is to keep the current Chair and Vice Chair for running the meeting now, as a meeting Committee. The other way, at the end of the meeting, we will select new MC membership to operate for the next two years.
24. Mr. Martin Spray (Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, WWT) proposed USA and Singapore be appointed as Chair and Vice-Chair for the meeting.
25. Cambodia, Australasian Wader Studies Group (AWSG) supported and was seconded by New Zealand.
26. Partners agreed that the Chair and Mr. Choon Beng How (Singapore, Vice Chair) of the EAAFP would alternate as session Chairs of MOP10.
27. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) asked the Government, IGO, and INGO to come back to the Chair during the meeting with their nominations for members of the Management Committee to take up positions after the MOP.
28. AWSG announced that the INGO meeting will be scheduled for the morning of December 11th, to agree on a delegate for the MC.

Agenda Item 1.5: Adoption of the Minutes of the 9th Meeting of Partners - [Document 4](#)

29. Mr. Tom Barry (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, CAFF) requested an amendment to Paragraph 279. CAFF will support the development of the Taskforce for illegal hunting.
30. The draft minutes of MOP9 were approved by MOP9 with the amendment by CAFF. New Zealand proposed for the Approval of the Minutes of the 9th Meeting of Partners.
31. Mr. Taej Mundkur (Wetland International, WI) proposed to share all the approved Decisions from MOP9. The Secretariat responded; the information is to be uploaded on the website.

Agenda Item 1.6: Admission of Observers – [Document 11](#)

32. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) had a comment about the list of people that were grouped under the international, it said 'laboratory ornithology institute biological problems of the north USA'. He did not think it was the USA. He did not know this organization.
33. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) requested that this be corrected to refer Russia.
34. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) added the comment about Manfred-Hermsen. It is not Russia. He supposed it was a German one.

35. Mr. Wanlop Preechamart (Thailand) would like to change the Wetland Foundation to Thai Wetlands Foundation.
36. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) appreciated these corrections. Document approved.

Agenda Item 1.7: Report from EAAFP Strategic Plan TF about new Strategic Plan 2019-2028

37. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) delivered a presentation on the new EAAFP Strategic Plan for 2019-2028 with a background of the methods involved in developing the plan. He explained the objectives of the Strategic Plan and Key Result Areas.
38. The Chair indicated that these objectives and other details will be discussed during the evening session every day after the official plenary finishes with an open discussion.

Agenda Item 1.8: Special presentation on improving the effectiveness of WGs and TFs within the EAAF

39. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) delivered a special presentation on the effectiveness of the EAAFP WGs and TFs. It was perceived that partners and others think that the TFs and WGs are there just to promote communications. There are some TFs and WGs which are clearly doing things more efficiently. Most of these activities and achievements basically depend on who is running it. Therefore, there will be a meeting to improve interactions between these TF and WG leaders to learn from each other.

AGENDA ITEM 2: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEES

Agenda Item 2.1: Report of the Management Committee (including election to the Management Committee) - [Document 5](#)

40. The Chair presented Document 5, outlining the details and background of the MC.
41. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) asked if the documents are on the website so everyone can access them. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) explained that the website of the EAAFP had crashed recently but the Secretariat is working on it and will probably hire a new IT person next year.

Agenda Item 2.2: Report of the Finance Sub Committee (including election to the Finance Sub Committee) - [Document 6](#)

42. Ms. Alison Russell-French (Finance Sub Committee, AWSG) reported on behalf of the Finance Sub Committee ("FsC"). She presented updates on the following issues: Engaging a Fundraising Manager (Action. No. 4), Encourage Partners to Strengthen their Efforts to Identify Funding Opportunities (Action. No. 2), Voluntary Fee-based Contributions (Action. No 3), Developing Project Concepts, compelling stories, visual presentation for fundraising (Action. No. 8), and Deferred Actions; EAAFP Supporter Program (No 6) which deferred in view of other priorities but will be picked up post MOP 10. Developing EAAFP Offices in other Flyway Countries (No7), Benchmark of Expenditure in the EAAFP, and Decisions Required; Contingency Fund, Voluntary Fee Contribution System, Finance Sub Committee Membership, EAAFP Resourcing Plan.

43. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) asked for details of the Contingency Fund. Ms. Russell-French replied that the Contingency Fund is recommended by the FsC but approved by the MC.
44. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) also asked to provide an example of an emergency for which the fund will be used. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) answered with several examples, such as - if the Republic of Korea decides not to support the EAAFP and the Secretariat needs to pay for an office, or if the website suddenly crashes, then the emergency fund will be needed to rebuild the website. Or, if a staff member suddenly decides to leave the Secretariat.
45. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) supported the Secretariat on how the Secretariat plans to spend the Contingency Fund in case of emergency, it can be also labelled as good governance.
46. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) finally recommended that it should be clearly stated in the Document that the Contingency Fund will be spent based on the recommendations by the FsC, which will require the final approval of the MC.

AGENDA ITEM 3: REPORTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT

Agenda Item 3.1: Report of the Secretariat Budget and Activities 2017-2018 - [Document 7](#)

47. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) presented on the achievements of the EAAFP with a detailed report on the Secretariat's budget and activities in 2017-2018. He mentioned the EAAFP currently has a total of 37 Partners including new Partners such as DPR Korea and Paulson Institute. Also, he introduced new Flyway Network Sites: Bangladesh (1), DPR Korea (2), RO Korea (1), Myanmar (2) and New Zealand (2) and informed that the total number of FNS is now 141.
48. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) also indicated that many sites are designated but there are no indications of FNS/EAAFP at some sites when visited. The Secretariat initiated a scheme to support Partners with around 1,000 USD to produce basic information on the FNS including a leaflet, billboard, entrance signboard.
49. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) congratulated the Secretariat for the good and transparent financial report.
50. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) appreciated the new scheme to support new FNS with small grants.

Agenda Item 3.2: Plan for the Secretariat Budget and Activities 2019-2020 - [Document 8](#)

51. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) carried on and presented the Secretariat's Budget and Activities for 2019-2020. He indicated that the Partner's Funds are likely to increase, as well as Private Donations. He further noted that the Secretariat plans to celebrate 10 years in Songdo, Incheon in May 2019. So, the budget in 2019 is slightly higher but the event will bring some benefits to the flyway. In addition, he noted that some funds are allocated for countries that are not actively involved now such as Mongolia.
52. Mr. Spike Millington (International Crane Foundation, ICF) asked why there is no mention of the proposed Contingency Fund in the new year's plan.

53. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) explained that the Contingency Fund hasn't been approved yet, moreover, the FsC needs to discuss how of much (what percentage) of the total funds should be allocated as a contingency fund. It will be included in the approved Secretariat Budget.

Agenda Item 3.3: Implementation of the Partnership - [Document 8](#)

54. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) reported on the Implementation of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership 2017-2018. He introduced the new online reporting format using SurveyMonkey. The survey results indicated that the most successful (67%) aspect of implementation of the Partnership is being involved in international collaboration including workshops and symposia. Lack of financial support (63%) has been listed as one of the main challenges.
55. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) appreciated the online survey and expressed that it was useful as a summary document. However, he was unclear on how these findings will be used and asked if there is any implementation plan.
56. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) responded that the implementation is already underway.
57. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) recalled that during MOP 9 there were a lot of discussions on communication and how they should be enhanced, yet it was clear that many of the Partners did not know how much information was already available on the website and the opportunities to share stories to improve communication. He further noted that since it is not very clear between the WGs and TFs on who is reporting on what, also the same person may be reporting on the same thing to various WGs and TFs.
58. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) responded that the online survey is a start to keep long-term records, which will help to locate areas to focus for the Partnership.
59. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) mentioned that the benefits of the survey are already clear as it shows in the summary report. The communication issues are probably not being conveyed to the groups who need to act. It requires clear guidelines for Partners who need to act.
60. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) mentioned that the Communication implementation can work in two ways. The Communication Officer shouldn't be running around for news. The Partners should also share their news.
61. Ms. Sandra Hails-Downie (Chair, CEPA WG) noted that in the CEPA Action Plan, there are many easy tasks that can be done to dramatically improve communications, from the governments, to the Secretariat, and to the NGOs.
62. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) commented that there had been a meeting in Manila in Oct 2018 on CEPA and it was recognized there that having a newsletter every month would be a lot of pressure on the Communication Officer, so it was decided to do it every three months. Also, he responded that after each celebration, the site manager or event organizer is asked to provide feedback on the event to assess whether there were any benefits due to the events.

63. Mr. Simba Chan (Chair, Crane WG) noted that the SIS is too long and technical for site managers to edit it. He suggested that we should translate the SIS for local managers and translate it back to English. To keep the site managers motivated we need to organize some activities with site managers regularly.

Agenda Item 3.4: Status of Flyway Network Sites - [Document 8](#)

64. Ms. Hyeseon Do (Programme Officer, EAAFP Secretariat) presented on the Status and Management of the Flyway Network Sites. She outlined the status of the Flyway Network Sites including an overview of the new sites that were approved at MOP10. She then noted the following decisions that need approval during MOP10.
- New Review Process of New Flyway Network Sites as proposed in Annex 3
 - agreement to update the outdated SIS prior to MOP11
 - to provide the updates on the status of FNS at further MOPs
 - to provide small funding to new FNS and giving the permission of the use of the EAAFP logo on products
65. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) noted that there was a real need to speed up the process so that Partners have the latest information on FNS. Information on FNS is being collected during the Asian Waterbird Census via Wetland International, this could be shared with the site managers and other Partners. Secondly, he noted that the suggestion of the use of the EAAFP logo on products is good, but it would be useful to understand if these products are environmental friendly or not.
66. Ms. Hyeseon Do (Programme Officer, EAAFP Secretariat) responded that the Secretariat will encourage the site managers via the governments to update the SIS. The Secretariat also plans to carry out the various workshops with the site managers.
67. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) asked how the Secretariat plans to follow up on these site-based grants.
68. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) noted that it has always been a struggle to get SIS from the Partners.
69. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) commented that due to budget constrains, the site managers workshop could not take place in Japan this year. Amongst the 33 sites in Japan, many of the sites do not hold any information in the SIS because of their early time designation. In many cases, it is just the name of the site and name of the contact person. Site managers sometimes do not want to fill out the SIS as they find it difficult. It is also very important that we update the Waterbird Population Estimate because many of the sites may no longer meet the criteria. In order to encourage the site managers to keep updating the forms, perhaps an appreciation letter would be very useful.
70. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) responded there have been some discussions between the new Science Unit and some of the Partners to jointly update the waterbird population estimate for the flyway. In terms of the SIS, when it was first created, it was modeled on the Ramsar Site Information Sheet and it's a rather simplified version of the RIS. Since then, the RIS has become even more complicated. So, perhaps it is a task that the Technical Sub Committee (TsC) may investigate and understand to what level the SIS should be, so that there is enough information to designate the site and to monitor its status but also not too technical for the site managers fill in.

71. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) noted that we must acknowledge that many of the site managers and decision makers across the flyway do not speak English. Many site managers easily understand and appreciate species conservation concepts but not the FNS concept. Not only because of the language issue but also considering the real-life challenges of these managers. There is a huge gap between site managers and decision makers in the ministry or the international Committees in Russia. We are still struggling to minimize this distance between the two groups. Therefore, we do need to think more carefully and find ways to address this.
72. Ms. Hyeseon Do (Programme Officer, EAAFP Secretariat) responded that we are now trying to identify these gaps and requesting all of you to provide us with feedback.
73. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) replied that in the next two years, we will try to develop different country language pages on the EAAFP website. However, to do this, we will need volunteers from country Partners, WGs and TFs.
74. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) suggested that in many countries including Cambodia, the site managers are not capable of filling out the SIS, they simply do not have the capacity to do it. The NGOs could help filling out the forms and get approval from the governments and national focal point.
75. Mr. Taej Mundkur (Wetland International, WI) noted that we would be looking at the Draft Decision. 08 later national site Partnerships, which might be a mechanism to strengthen site level of activities, this will help organize workshops and review SIS and etc. The proposed new Science Unit could play a key role to implement. It is important that the site managers know why their sites are important, what species are there and etc. These would be useful for them to manage the sites as well.

Special Announcement of voluntary contribution:

Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) announced 4,000 USD to the EAAFP. WWF also announced to contribute 6,000 USD in 2019 and 6,000 USD in 2020. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) also announced to contribute 2,000 USD in 2019 to EAAFP.

Agenda Item 3.5: Implication of substantive agenda items - [Document 12](#)

76. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) presented Document. 12 on the Administrative and financial implications of substantive agenda items.
77. Mr. David Li (Singapore, Shorebird WG) asked if there is any budget allocated for Action Plan for key species.
78. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) replied that we can collect these comments from TFs and WGs and make a list. Then the Secretariat could try to look for resources together with the WGs and TFs.
79. Mr. Ding Li Yong (BirdLife International, BLI) noted that if we could combine these various fundraising attempts to make it more comprehensive.
80. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) replied that Secretariat will be working on a document on fundraising and welcomed Partners and other groups to join the group.

Agenda Item 3.6: CEPA Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021

81. Mr. Sandra Hails-Downie (CEPA WG) presented the CEPA Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021. She also indicated that the CEPA WG will arrange a get together and get comments from the Partners.

Agenda Item 3.7: Organizational Structure of the EAAFP - [Document 3](#)

82. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) presented the Organizational Structure of the EAAFP.
83. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) commented that the Governance Structure does not include consultation with the TFs and WGs. The Science Unit should consult with the WGs and TFs. He agreed to write a text and send it to the Secretariat.
84. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) noted that the TsC is now working on it.
85. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) mentioned that the Science Unit doesn't need to be excluded from the Secretariat. The arrows may not always go in both ways. But the MC should take on the burden to manage the TFs and WGs, this would be huge tasks. He recommended that the TFs and WGs should report to the MOP directly.
86. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetland International) noted that the WGs and TFs may report directly to the TsC. This would reduce the burden on the MC.
87. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) requested to the Secretariat that reporting of the TFs and WGs should be more simplified and less complicated.
88. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) agreed with Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) and noted that the TsC members are volunteers, but the Science Unit works as full time. Therefore, the Science Unit should take more responsibilities on this.
89. Mr. Robert Kaler (Chair of Seabird WG) recalled the MOP9 and expressed that is was proposed by Mr. Geoff Richardson that the TsC may work as a replacement of the Science Officer of the Secretariat and asked for clarification.
90. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) mentioned that he is unclear why the Finance sub-Committee is a sub-Committee of the MC. Why doesn't the FsC is reporting to the MOP directly? The Finance sub-Committee Chair could be a part of the MC.
91. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT, Baer's Pochard TF) noted that the TFs and Science Unit are probably working more on the implementation part and the TsC and WGs and are more focused on the overall policy and approaches. There might be some potential overlap, but we need further discussion on this.
92. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) expressed concerns on TFs and WGs reporting directly at the MOPs and not the MC. She also noted that the MC usually requires a lot of information from these groups, to run the Secretariat effectively.
93. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) indicated that he will discuss this issue with others to find a solution during this MOP.

Agenda Item 3.8: EAAFP Technical Sub Committee

94. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) presented on the EAAFP TsC.
95. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) requested to change Mr. Jonathan Slaughter's country from Russia to the USA in the Interim TsC.
96. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) asked for the clarification on the role of the TsC or SC and relations with other Committees.
97. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) explained details on the role of these Committees.

PRESENTATION FROM Conservation Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)

98. Mr. Tom Barry (CAFF) gave a presentation about the overview of CAFF including its objective and linkages with EAAFP, highlighting CAFF's Arctic Migratory Birds Initiative (AMBI).
99. Some people were not familiar with the Arctic Council. The Arctic Council is the leading intergovernmental forum promoting cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic States, Arctic indigenous communities and other Arctic inhabitants on common Arctic issues, in particular on issues of sustainable development and environmental protection in the Arctic. The Arctic Council is comprised of eight Arctic States (Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the United States), six Permanent Participant organizations representing Arctic indigenous peoples (Aleut International Association, the Arctic Athabaskan Council, Gwich'in Council International, the Inuit Circumpolar Council, Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North and the Saami Council), as well as 13 non-Arctic government Observers (France, Germany, Italian Republic, Japan, The Netherlands, People's Republic of China, Poland, Republic of India, Republic of Korea, Republic of Singapore, Spain, Switzerland United Kingdom), and 13 non-government organizations that contribute to the work of the Council. The Council's activities are conducted in six working groups. The working groups are composed of: representatives at expert level from sectoral ministries, government agencies and researchers. Their work covers a broad field of subjects, from climate change to emergency response. CAFF is the biodiversity Working Group, and their mandate is to address the conservation of Arctic biodiversity and to communicate its findings to the governments and residents of the Arctic, helping to promote practices which ensure the sustainability of the Arctic's living resources. It does so through various monitoring assessment and expert group activities. The Flyway Partnership has a similar structure with Arctic council, as it collaborates with a diverse range of the expertise. Over the past year, CAFF spent time developing and consulting a second work plan for its Arctic Migratory Birds Initiative (AMBI) to cover 2019-2023. Experts have identified key species and conservation issues needed to be addressed globally to conserve Arctic-breeding birds. CAFF emphasized that finding solutions to protect birds in the Arctic means that strong cooperation with Partners in this flyway is needed. Since 2015, CAFF's AMBI has advanced partnership between CAFF and Partners in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway, including the EAAFP. The reason CAFF attended this meeting was continuing to build partnerships to support AMBI and explain and consult on the finalization of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway component of the AMBI Work Plan 2019-2023. They are focussing on addressing illegal hunting and intertidal management and continue to build partnerships to address these common issues.
100. In short, the main message they are conveying is, that CAFF's AMBI would like to engage more broadly with different organizations along the East Asian-Australasian Flyway, make sure their efforts add value, and to address issues of common concern that affect Arctic-breeding migratory birds.

AGENDA ITEM 4: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, THE STATE OF THE WORLD'S WETLANDS: WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?

101. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) delivered a special presentation on the state of the world's wetlands. He discussed what is causing it, and what the EAAFP can do about it. He acknowledged that many delegates participated at the Ramsar COP in Dubai (October 2018) and saw the launch of the first ever Global Wetlands Outlook (GWO), prepared by The Ramsar Convention Secretariat. He commended the report to the delegates and reinforced that it contains many powerful messages about the wise use of wetlands, and stated it was available on the Ramsar website. He outlined that the presentation would summarize key findings from the GWO and present some new findings since Ramsar. He began by summarizing the importance of wetlands to people. He raised the point that forests are at the forefront of peoples' minds because forest campaigners have been very effective at promoting their importance. By contrast, wetlands are also extremely important, but we have been less effective at promoting this to the general public and policymakers.
102. The Millennium Ecosystems Assessment showed that there are many ecosystem services, i.e. benefits to peoples' livelihoods from wetlands, and these are greatly reduced from artificial wetlands. Estimates of the monetary value of wetlands are increasing over time, and there are many additional non-tangible benefits not captured in these estimates. Davidson et al (in press) used wetland area estimates to show a value of \$62 trillion per year for the ecosystem services provided by wetlands (83% of global GDP) – we haven't done enough to get this message into the public sphere. Wetlands also have huge value compared with other ecosystems when considered per unit area – they cover only 4% of the area of the world but 50% of the value. He then summarized the status and trends of wetlands. The GWO pointed out that we are losing wetlands and have been for centuries. The natural area of wetlands may have decreased by 87% since the 1700s and 35% since 1970 – three times faster than the global rate of forest loss. The WET index shows that the rate of loss has doubled in the most recent 20-year period, the rates of loss are accelerating. By contrast, the area of human-wet wetlands is increasing, especially rice paddies and reservoirs. As a result, the species dependent on wetlands are in freefall; Living Planet Index shows that wetland species dependent on inland freshwater wetlands have decreased by 80% since 1970. What the GWO does not include (except water quality) is the state of remaining wetlands.
103. Three new analyses are now in preparation: 1 – national government feedback to Ramsar about wetland trends; 2 – citizen science survey about wetland trends; 3 – a meta-analysis of published wetland assessments. Results from all three analyses are similar. The current state of wetlands – over 75% of wetlands reported were in a Fair or Good state but almost 25% are in Poor state. There are strong regional differences – consistently the best state of wetlands is being reported from North America and Oceania; worst is from Africa, Caribbean, and Latin America; Asia and Europe are intermediate. Wetland conditions were reported as better in East and Southeast Asia than in South Asia. In contrast to the current wetland state, there was considerably more wetland deterioration reported than improvement; in Asia slight deterioration was reported from West, Central and South Asia, a slight improvement in Southeast Asia. If Ramsar designation is effective, Ramsar sites should be in a better state than other wetlands. However, Ramsar sites were reported to be in a slightly worse state than other wetlands. Also, a high proportion of Ramsar wetlands were reported to be undergoing a high level of deterioration; this is a highly worrying result. Size also matters; small wetlands are currently in a good state, but larger wetlands are in worse condition, and deteriorating on a larger scale. This suggests that big (and

important) wetlands are at risk. Also, wetlands currently in good condition are generally not being reported as changing, while wetlands already in poor condition are consistently deteriorating further.

104. National government and citizen science results were broadly similar with both reporting more deterioration than improvement. However, citizen sciences are more optimistic about the trends in the state of all the wetlands, and national governments are more optimistic about Ramsar site trends. Drivers of wetland change are both positive and negative and are increasing. Overall, there is not enough implementation on the Ramsar Strategic Plan, and the range of implementation varies dramatically (30-80%) across the parties of the EAAFP. Overall, the EAAFP parties' implementation is above the global average, but still only 60%. On average, countries with improving wetlands report higher Ramsar Strategic Plan implementation, inversely for deteriorating wetlands. He posed the question whether overarching drivers (eg. population growth, poor governance) supersede local efforts? There is some evidence for this, especially in the case of good governance (i.e. large protected area networks are only effective when coupled with good governance). There are also new emerging studies on what national conditions are necessary for wetland conservation success. Nick concluded by saying that the EAAFP can improve by adhering to the priority responses identified in the GWO; fully implementing the new EAAFP Strategic Plan; undertaking an implementation gap analysis for EAAFP Partners; designating more Flyway Network Sites; doing national wetland inventory and developing wetland ecological character assessments.
105. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) asked if the PowerPoint could be shared. As soon as there is confirmation of acceptance of the unpublished material the PowerPoint can be made available through the EAAFP website.
106. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) noted that a driver which wasn't mentioned in the presentation was development of wetlands and noted that there are examples of this in Australia.
107. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) confirmed that development comes out as a strong proximate driver of wetland loss through conversion of wetlands to agriculture, housing, ports, etc. (i.e., some other land use). Starting to explore pathways from mega drivers to proximate drivers to on-ground implementation but more work is needed on this.
108. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) thanked Mr. Davidson for the presentation and noted that one recommendation was about the designation of Flyway Network Sites, which relates to the effectiveness of TF and WGs. Mr. Chan reminded the group that not all Partners began with EAAFP in 1996 and that in the late 1990s to early 2000s sites were more engaged with species groups, which could be a good pathway to improve site management effectiveness. Further noted that much has been done in Myanmar, with help of Ministry of the Environment of Japan. Furthermore, this type of international cooperation should be strengthened.
109. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) confirmed that declaring more network sites should be a priority, but management of these sites and local community involvement to maintain them is even more important.
110. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) noted that Japan is now translating the GWO into Japanese to make people aware of the necessity of wetland conservation and migratory waterbird conservation.

111. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) re-affirmed that translation of the GWO to local language is a tremendous step and encouraged all Partners to do so where possible.

AGENDA ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT DECISIONS

Agenda Item 5.1: Discussion on the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019 – 2028 - [Decision. 01](#)

112. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) reported that a small group met last night to discuss how to take the EAAFP Draft Strategic Plan forward. Two major issues have been identified to date. He noted that if anyone has any questions, please feel free to join an additional session tonight, otherwise the group that met last night will meet again and report to the MOP later in the week.

Agenda Item 5.2: Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat– [Decision.05](#)

113. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) gave a presentation on Draft Decision. 05 - *Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat*. She recalled that at MOP 9 it was reported that the Science Officer position was discontinued in June 2016 due to lack of funds. To address this gap, China's NFGA and CEAAF (Center for East Asian-Australasian Flyway) of Beijing Forestry University developed a draft MoU, TOR and Work Plan and circulated it to the Partners in May 2018. Based on Partners feedback on the draft, Decision 5 was revised and updated according to the new EAAFP Draft Strategic Plan. She confirmed that the new Science Unit would be a part of the EAAFP Secretariat and take direction from the TOR. This would include maintaining the EAAFP database, coordinating Flyway Network Sites and supporting improved site and waterbird monitoring. The function of the Science Unit will include four parts: 1 - building and maintaining a database for waterbirds, habitats, tracking data, etc. which will be introduced later in the meeting; 2 – flyway site network – including reviewing FNS SISs; 3 – support Partners, TsC, WGs and TFs to improve monitoring along the flyway, including reviewing population estimates; and 4 – communication including article review and CEPA relating to science. She then introduced the team members: Guangchun Lei (supervisor), Cai Lu, Yifei Jia, Qing Zeng, Yunzhu Liu, and Lan Wu. All team members have a background in ecology and biology. The Science Unit will also welcome visiting scientists and interns. Funding of \$0.5 million USD annually for 5 years has been secured already. She then proposed the draft Decision 5 which: 1 - agrees to formally establish the Science Unit; 2 - approve MoU and TOR (Annex 1 and Annex 2), and 3 - endorses the 2019-2020 work plan.
114. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) thanked her for the presentation and sought clarification on how progress on the Science Unit work plan would be reported to the Secretariat, MC or even full MOP. Mr. McKinlay asked whether this is clear enough in the draft work plan of the Science Unit.
115. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) responded that the Science Unit work plan has been circulated to Partners and put on the website and is currently a draft. She clarified that the Science Unit will be glad to work together with Partners to develop a clearer and specific work plan.

116. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested that the Science Unit prepare a report for every MOP with progress on the Work Plan.
117. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) confirmed that this would be a good way forward.
118. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) confirmed that the TsC is delighted with the establishment of the Science Unit. He noted that in the current draft TOR, the interim TsC felt that there wasn't enough reflection on the relationship between the Science Unit and the TsC and reiterated the lack of clarity around reporting of implementation of the work plan. He suggested an additional text in the "Other Duties" section within the TOR in term of the TsC providing advice to the Science Unit for development of work plan and reviewing draft products and outputs through the TsC. He also suggested that a possible additional activity could be added under the 2019-2020 work plan. This would ensure that whatever the Science Unit does complements but does not duplicate Partner efforts, and it could be a valuable early step to review what Partners are already doing, compile this review and make it available to the Partners. Benefits of this would be 1 – Partners can see more clearly what is currently being done 2 – identify gaps 3 – make sure that Science Unit activities will enhance but not duplicate current efforts. He said that draft text to this end has been added to the end of the current draft work plan.
119. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested that he liaise with Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit) about this wording to produce a revision to relevant documents for the website.
120. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) asked for clarification on who to approach within the Secretariat with updated documents.
121. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that these should be given to Ms. Yoonkyung Lee (External Relations Manager, EAAFP Secretariat) once developed.
122. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) thanked the Chair and asked for a point of clarification around the funding figures that were presented and whether these are the same as what is presented in Draft Decision.05.
123. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, Science Unit) clarified that this is the exact number and there are different sources of funding.
124. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) agreed with prior comments about the need to reference and clarify the relationship of the Science Unit with the TsC within the TOR. He also noted that Australia has minor suggestions for text changes in the TOR and Work Plan and requested permission to discuss with Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit). Mr. Richardson further noted that the TOR for the EAAFP Secretariat may need to be changed to reflect the new Science Unit given that this is a big structural change.
125. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) requested text changes to also go to Yoonkyung Lee (External Relations Manager, EAAFP Secretariat) for collation.

126. Ms. Jittinun Ruengverayudh (Thailand) highlighted the importance to support Flyway Network Sites and noted that the Science Unit should work with ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity because they have the capacity to support Flyway Network Sites in this region.
127. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that the request was for the Science Unit to work closely with the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity and Ms. Zeng confirmed willingness to collaborate.
128. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) commented that the establishment of the Science Unit is a very positive development for the EAAFP, as this has been a major gap and reaffirmed that the TsC and Science Unit needs to have a strong working relationship and the need to discuss with Partners about how to improve for example site management utilizing the expertise on the Science Unit.
129. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) reaffirmed support for the creation of the Science Unit. He noted that when it comes to reporting, the Science Unit is a fundamental part of the Secretariat so reporting should be a part of the Secretariat reporting, and this should be made clear. He further noted the need to reinforce that the Science Unit is not separate from the Secretariat. So, for example, the Science Unit reporting should be part of Secretariat reporting at future MOPs.
130. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) commented that the Science Unit could work on Document 10; the review of Flyway Network Sites and that Singapore would be happy to work with the Secretariat on this review.
131. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that earlier comments had been remiss not to applaud and thank China for development of the Science Unit. Requested a clarification around the role of the Science Unit given the wording that its priorities would be migratory birds, habitats, livelihoods. Noted that Australia has a strong interest in seabirds and asked for clarification on whether the scope of the Science Unit is inclusive of all taxonomic groups covered by the EAAFP.
132. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) affirmed that seabirds and all taxonomic groups included in the EAAFP document are included.
133. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) congratulated China on funding the Science Unit and filling a needed gap. He noted gladness that one stated objective of the Science Unit is communication of science. Suggested that this objective should be broadened to include international communication (not just national and regional). The potential to hold flyway type meetings would fall under international communications.
134. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) congratulated China for this significant achievement in funding a strong team over a long time through the creation of the Science Unit. He noted that there is no doubt that the harmonization of the structure will be sorted out and requested a round of applause for China for this initiative.
135. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) congratulated China for the replacement of the Science Officer with an entire team and noted that WI looks forward to working with the Science Unit and identifying areas of collaboration as this aligns well with the work that WI has been doing with the EAAFP in previous years. Also, would like a chance to discuss this in more detail and asked whether some time could be made in

the agenda for a broader discussion about collaboration between Partners and the Science Unit, in particular prioritizing work in the 2019-2020 plan and how these fits in with Partner priorities.

136. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) agreed that this would be important and agreed to look for a time.
137. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) asked delegates to submit any changes to Ms. Yoonkyung Lee (External Relations Manager, EAAFP Secretariat) and for Ms. Qing (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) to organize a session on revisions with interested parties.
138. Mr. Gombobaatar Sundev (Mongolia) thanked China for their presentation and reiterated support for the Science Unit. Mr. Gombobaatar Sundev requested that Partners think about the work plan being more detailed otherwise it's very difficult to evaluate success. He also raised that the flyway colour banding scheme used to be coordinated and that Mongolia happy to help contribute to this.
139. Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit) noted for Partners that there will be another Director General coming to visit the MOP on the final day of the meeting and thanked everyone for the support of the establishment of the Science Unit. He reiterated that domestic approval procedures for establishing the Science Unit have been gone through with strong support and with major funding secured through Qionyu Foundation and Mangrove Conservation Foundation (MCF). The signing ceremony will be tomorrow. He also reinforced that the Science Unit is part of Beijing Forestry University and can maximize the advantages of university facilities for future operations, then reiterated thanks and acknowledged proposal to discuss further details of the work plan in a separate session.
140. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) asked Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) to set a time for the further meeting. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) confirmed that this will be finalized and announced later.

Agenda Item 5.3: Revised Guidelines for the Sponsorship of participants at EAAFP Meetings of Partners-[Decision.06](#)

141. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) gave a presentation on Draft Decision. 06 *Revised Guidelines for Sponsorship of Participants for EAAFP Meetings of Partners*. He noted that at the MOP 5, a set of guidelines were approved for the Secretariat for sponsoring participants to the MOP. These guidelines were useful at the time but given the Secretariat's experiences since then and reflecting growing demand from participants to receive funding, the EAAFP Secretariat felt a need to update the guidelines. In principle there are no major changes, but the wording has been simplified and standardized. He summarized that at this MOP 30 government participants, 13 WG and TF members, 6 intergovernmental organization, 1 TsC, and 1 NGO representative were sponsored. He further noted that the Secretariat put \$54,000 USD towards the MOP with 60% used on participant sponsorship and that MOP success is contingent on key people attending.
142. For transparency, Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified a new proposal for sponsorship decisions and outlined the decision-making process detailed in the draft Decision in a table, which shows that first priority is government Partners, second is non-government Partners, third is potential

government Partners, fourth is NGOs of potential Partner countries, fifth is Chairs of WG/TF and other experts or potential NGO Partners. This was put forward as a structure for decision-making for funding the MOP 11 participants. He then opened the floor for questions.

143. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) noted that this is a significant difference from the MOP 5 guidelines because the earlier document outlined that sponsorship was based on ability to pay.
144. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that Government Partners that are eligible for funding are based on the DAC (UN) listed countries.
145. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) thanked the Secretariat for covering the flight and accommodation to this meeting. Noted that under the new proposed structure, WG and TF members will no longer be eligible for return airfares to be covered. Further noted that many WG and TF members may not have any funding available because this is not their full-time job. Suggested that the provision of return airfare should be judged on a case-by-case basis by the Secretariat.
146. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) said that this should be feasible if Partners were supportive.
147. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) also wanted to clarify why current non-government Partners are not eligible for airfare but potential government partners are. Suggested that this would not be appropriate.
148. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that these guidelines were from the MOP 5 decision. If Partners now think that the Secretariat should have some degree of flexibility over airfare this is feasible.
149. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) suggested that WG and TF members that are relied upon to do work inter-sessionally, who are from DAC countries should be elevated to 3rd priority as these may warrant support.
150. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that return airfare could be revised and listed as “on a needs basis” rather than Yes/No in the guidelines.
151. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) reaffirmed that Government Partners should be given full priority, but it should be kept open.
152. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that currently, requests for funding from WG and TF participants go to the Chair of the WG or TF for endorsement before the Secretariat provides funding.
153. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (WI) asked for clarification on whether the revision to a needs basis for airfare will be applied across all categories.
154. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) confirmed this clarification.
155. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) clarified that economy class round trip airfare is what is meant by “return airfare” in the document.
156. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) confirmed this clarification.

157. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) called a break for tea.

Agenda Item 5.4: Standardized Process and Template for Small Grant Fund Applications for EAAFP WG&TF – [Draft Decision. 07](#)

158. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that the next five papers are led by Australia and that these were circulated earlier this year to all Partners and the Secretariat also provided them to the TsC. He thanked all who provided comments inter-sessionally.

159. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) gave a presentation on *Draft Decision. 07 Small Grants Fund for WGs & TFs*. This draft Decision seeks the support of Partners to adopt an agreed process for allocating funds to support WGs and TFs. It includes an annual call for applications and that WG and TFs use a single template to apply for and justify proposed expenses. This template should ensure transparency and raise information standards. Proposals would be assessed by at least three members of the MC, TsC or outside experts not associated with the proposal. Includes reporting requirements and a call for voluntary contribution to the fund available for WG and TFs. Mr. Richardson then called for draft Decision 7 to be adopted.

160. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) thanked Australia for putting forward the paper and suggested that the grant be expanded to include Flyway Network Sites, which would complement national workshops in ASEAN countries. Also asked if the grant proposal timeframe could be left open in addition to the annual call for proposals.

161. Mr. Jonathan Slaght (Wildlife Conservation Society, Technical Sub Committee) also recommended two calls per year rather than one and suggested that the draft two-month turnaround for grant decision could and should be tightened. Also suggested with regards to assessment criteria that there should be a ranking system. Further noted that under the eligibility checklist, it appears that an applicant must commit to 4 types of reporting (progress, final and website reports, and newsletter article) – this seems excessive for a \$5,000 USD grant and suggested only an interim and final report.

162. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, EAAFP, Shorebird WG) commented that in the current draft the applicant requires TF or WG Chair approval to submit and noted that while it is positive to get help from the Chair, the Chair should not be in a position to refuse applications as this is the job of the group reviewing the proposals. Further noted that some definitions may also need to be added to ensure that people are not excluded from applying. Further noted that Item 5 in the table mentions many species-specific groups and suggested simplifying and broadening this. Also requested clarification on whether the same group would review all annual applications.

163. Mr. Geoff Richard (Australia) responded to several comments. On the comment about opening the grant beyond WG and TFs, suggested that Australia is not necessarily opposed to this idea but noted that this is beyond what was agreed on at the last MOP and is beyond the current scope. On the comment that a single call would be limiting, this approach was taken to limit the workload to the Secretariat. Further, multiple rounds would make it difficult to have just one set of reviewers for all annual applications. One option would be to put out one call and put out a second call with any funds that were not allocated. Mr.

Richardson further noted that Australia is willing to discuss and take on board additional text change suggestions outside the plenary and put up a revised document on the website.

164. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) requested clarification on the idea of expanding beyond the WG and TF.
165. Mr. Abdulmula Hamza (Seabird WG) noted that the application aligns with EAAFP priorities but requested clarification on whether a project that doesn't align with priority species would still be considered.
166. Mr. Geoff Richard (Australia) clarified that revising the wording of the proposal so that the applicant states themselves which priority is being met rather than providing a checklist to choose from would address this issue.
167. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that the present process for the small grants program is that the Secretariat receives applications throughout the year and if those applications are supported by the Chair of the relevant WG, the Secretariat normally accepts this endorsement and funds the project. He feels that this system can be improved.
168. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) supported a singular call for proposals and stated this would be a more efficient use of time for reviewers.
169. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) reinforced the need raised by Singapore to expand support to Flyway Network Sites but acknowledged that the current framework of supporting TFs and WGs was adopted by MOP 9.
170. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) noted that the purpose of the MOPs' is to give Partners the opportunity to change such things as the small grants fund and therefore the scope can be discussed and if need changed.
171. Mr. Srey Sungleang (Cambodia) thanked Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) for the clarification and requested that the group consider that this fund is expanded beyond WGs and TFs to include FNS.
172. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) reiterated that this is a timely issue and noted that one of the criteria for the small grant is to attend meetings and we've seen from experience that many meetings are on short notice, so having a call only once a year to support such meeting attendance might be too restrictive and prevent attendance.
173. Mr. Mark Carey (Australia) clarified that the priorities listed in Table 5 align with the original intent of the document to support WGs and TFs. Further suggested that there are two options: first to open up this grant fund to include FNS/site managers or to establish a second fund that is for FNS/site managers.
174. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) noted that the Secretariat would need to identify funds within the current budget to support a second fund.

175. Ms. Diana Solovyeva (Scaly-sided Merganser TF) noted that many people on the ground are not speaking English and the proposal requires strong English skills and asked if there would be any technical support to support non-English proposals.
176. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) suggested that one solution if the fund remained limited to WGs or TFs, is that it could be a role for the Chair of the TF or WG to help with translating and assisting local groups to submit proposals. If the fund was opened to FSN managers, this would be more challenging and may need to go to country focal point for the EAAFP.
177. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) congratulated Australia on the development of the document and noted the benefits of linking these small grant funds to the FsC, so there is a full picture of expenditure and avoid duplication. Further noted that the EAAFP Strategic Plan is one of the priorities included in the plan and asked whether the relationship with the FsC be made clearer in the document.
178. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT, Baer's Pochard TF) noted that the original thinking was that two calls would be more practical and that if the fund is restricted to one call then the reporting timeline should be more flexible. Recommended a northern hemisphere winter deadline for the applications.
179. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) stated the need for more guidance from Partners to resolve whether there should be one or two calls and whether the fund should be opened to FNS as well as TF and WG, to guide a revised document.
180. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) noted that there is a trial for expenditure on celebrations for new FNS and suggested that these new grant proposals be run as a trial and amended to include FNS at next MOP after a trial if desired by Partners.
181. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that Australia would be comfortable with this arrangement.
182. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) noted that there currently is no date for submission deadline included in the draft document.
183. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that Australia would add a date coinciding with northern winter for the proposal deadline and called for interested parties to approach him within next 24 hours to develop a revised document for the website.
184. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) gave a presentation on *Draft Decision. 08 Developing Guidelines for National and Site Partnerships*.

Agenda Item 5.5: Developing Guidelines for National and Site Partnerships – [Decision. 08](#)

185. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted that the EAAFP encourages the concept of national and site Partnerships but currently there is no underpinning guidance on what national and site Partnerships are and how they might operate. This document, therefore, proposes the development of an overarching framework for establishing and operating effective Partnerships and discussing such issues as governance, responsibilities, case studies, monitoring/evaluation/reporting, and a Terms of Reference.

186. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) requested that the Partners endorse Draft Decision. 08 and further noted that the Secretariat would lead the development of the framework and noted with thanks that this has been costed by the Secretariat.
187. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) asked for a show of hands of how many counties have such Partnerships so Secretariat knows who to approach. Noted that Japan, New Zealand, Malaysia have such Partnerships. Further noted that it may be difficult to come up with concrete guidance or a “one size fits all” and therefore suggested that a useful document could be a collection of case studies and good practices rather than prescriptive guidelines.
188. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) reiterated that this may be a good approach and that the paucity of existing examples reinforces the need for this draft Decision.
189. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) noted that only a few countries may have official Partnerships but noted that Thailand also has a very good scheme for site managers to discuss wetland issues and that widening the scope to consider such examples could help the Secretariat.
190. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) noted that some Partners may not have an EAAFP designated Partnership but would have useful lessons within other frameworks and noted that this would be useful to include within this framework.
191. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust) reminded Partners that within the draft CEPA document there is a section encouraging all Partners to form such Partnerships and if this is adopted this will anyway be a requirement of Partners.
192. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) agreed that Lew’s proposal for the Secretariat to develop a document consisting of case studies and best practice is consistent with the Draft Decision.
193. Mr. Taej Murdkur (WI) noted that the EAAFP will only succeed with such strong Partnerships and that there are many examples of how this can work. Incumbent on Ramsar Parties is the establishment of a Ramsar Committee, and this may be largely complementary to this initiative. It could be a discussion within counties whether Ramsar Committees taking on EAAFP Partners could be effective or whether an additional National Partnership just for EAAFP is needed. Further noted that pooling information on where such Partnerships are working well and documenting case studies in the short term will help Partners to plan future Partnerships, and also that these may not always need to be formal arrangements. Reinforced the need for strategies to varying appropriately according to individual country needs and noted that this is an important part of taking the flyway Partnership down to the local level.
194. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) noted that there was a question in the EAAFP Partners survey monkey about whether they have national Partnerships, and this will be an easy way to identify which Partners have existing initiatives.
195. Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit) noted that in China National Partnership have been discussed for several years but there was hesitation to go further without additional guidance. Noted that the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers and Coastal networks have been going for several years in Partnership with various institutes (e.g., Wetlands International, Paulson Institute). Noted these Partnerships as very

useful and a good platform for communication. Further noted that for site network Partnerships there is a stakeholder Committee for Ramsar sites. Thanked Australia for taking the initiative to draft this decision so that national Partnerships can move forward more clearly.

196. Mr. Oswald Braken Anak Tisen (Malaysia) shared that during the MOP 8 it was decided to have a National Partnership but subsequently decided that this may not work, so last year site managers signed a MoU rather than proceeding with a national Partnerships but there is a lack of clarity on how to link this back to the EAAFP. There are questions from national representatives about what the benefits are from being included in the EAAFP. Something that could be shown as a benefit of being an EAAFP member could be such Partnerships.
197. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) commended Australia on this initiative which is long overdue and noted that there was a discussion about national Partnerships as far back as MOP. One concrete suggestion for starting this process is that among NGOs and intergovernmental organizations, many activities/projects and even Partnerships are already occurring, so an easy first step would be for the Secretariat to document what is already being done. Also reinforced comments from Mr. Taej that there should not be an official or bureaucratic approach. Also reinforced that Partners are focal points, so there is an obligation for information coming through the MOPs to be shared/reported back.
198. Ms. Desy Satya Chandradewi (Indonesia) noted that Indonesia has a National Partnership through the director of biodiversity conservation and is supported by NGOs. Seabird and shorebirds are included. It involves coordination of the Asian Waterbird Census and national reporting to the EAAFP. Next year this National Partnership will be renewed, and it is hoped that other ministries may be included.
199. Ms. Sandra Halis-Downie (Chair, CEPA WG) noted that there is an expectation for government focal points to promote National Partnerships within the proposed CEPA Plan.
200. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) noted that this idea is worth developing further and thanked Australia for initiating it. Noted that the flyway is diverse, and that initiative may therefore be less relevant for some parts of the flyway, e.g. northern breeding grounds. The idea of creating national Partnerships and adding new FNS has not had traction in all countries and there is skepticism about the benefits. Summarized that progress in the northern part of the flyway may be limited in this area, but overall, it's a valuable initiative.
201. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) noted that when Japan financially supported the ASEAN waterbird project, national planning workshops were supported, and these brought together existing FNS managers, national focal points, NGOs, and stakeholders to discuss the importance of FNS. Noted that Singapore may be able to provide the report to support the Secretariat if helpful.
202. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) noted that the general consensus is to accept the proposal, but the specifics of Partnerships may vary according to national and cultural contexts. If no objections proposed that the draft Decision is adopted. Noting no objections, stated that this is the first decision to be adopted by the MOP10.

Agenda Item 5.6: Developing an EAAFP Sister Site Program – [Decision. 09](#)

203. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) gave a presentation on Draft Decision. 09 *Developing an EAAFP Sister Site Program*. He noted that this could be one of the key value-adding aspects of declaring an EAAFP Flyway Network Site. He noted as background that the EAAFP encourages Partners to cooperate and build expertise including through a Sister Site Program and there are currently 8 Sister Sites recognized. The draft Decision seeks to encourage further Sister Site development. Currently, Australia has 3 Sister Sites, all with sites in Japan. Further noted that the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary [EAAF131] seeks an opportunity to engage with other EAAFP FNS and introduced Geoffrey Newchurch from this site.
204. The draft Decision involves acknowledging the current Sister Sites program, encouraging Partners to consider establishing new Sister Sites, and instructing the Secretariat to develop guidelines for the Sister Site Program arrangements for presentation at MOP 11.
205. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) raised a point about existing Sister Site relationships listed on Annex Two and the need to clarify whether these Sister Site relationships are ongoing and going well.
206. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) reaffirmed that as part of this process the Secretariat would review how Sister Sites are operating currently.
207. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) noted that the Sister Sites program is one of the best potential benefits of becoming a Flyway Network Site and noted that this is a great opportunity.
208. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust) noted the signing ceremony in 2004 for a Sister Site which preceded EAAFP membership and reported to Partners that there are great benefits to the Sister Sites program but noted a failed attempt to establish a Sister Site with ROK which failed because of language barriers. Also noted an ongoing initiative to establish a country Partnership with DPRK. Overall, it was noted that benefits can flow but it takes work and signing an agreement is not enough on its own to ensure success.
209. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) further noted existing relationships that precede the EAAFP and provided examples that such cooperation already exists. Also noted that Sister Sites could include a relationship between more than two sites.
210. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) noted that the TsC has some minor proposed wording changes to the document and some suggestions about approaches and issues that the Secretariat might need to take into consideration when developing guidelines.
211. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) reaffirmed Japan's comment about Sister Sites being one of the most concrete benefits of becoming an EAAFP FNS. However also wanted to revisit a point made yesterday that Sister Sites can create an enormous time burden on the Secretariat, so limiting this should be a consideration.
212. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) thanked Australia for preparing the paper and noted the comments made about the need for time and resources to go into Sister Sites but also noted great benefits. Suggested that the draft paper should reflect the balance between work needed and benefits gained from Sister Site establishment. Suggested that paragraphs 8.-10. should be amended from "further instructs" to "invites" so that actions 8.-10. can be based on experience resulting from the review in 7.

213. Mr. Liu Song Tao (Dalai Lake National Reserve, China) noted that there has been more than 20 years' cooperation within Dalai Lake National Nature Reserve between Mongolia and Russia. There are yearly joint activities, and the site is content with the current arrangement. Can share more information with participants if there is interest.
214. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) also gave examples of long-standing Partnerships for example between Russia and Germany in another flyway. Wanted to raise a warning that it is easy to put forward the concept of Sister Sites but there is a need to define what this will mean. Having fewer programs working well is preferable to many sites that are not working effectively. Before going forward, we should understand a clear strategy for advancing Sister Sites. Also raised that language issues are very serious, and in some cases, they make relationships difficult or impossible. Overall, it was noted that there are significant barriers as well as opportunities.
215. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) noted that Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve has several sister relationships for example with Chongming Dongtan. Acknowledged that there have been benefits to these relationships but also agreed that there are a significant time and resourcing needed to advance these Partnerships. Agreed with New Zealand's suggested wording changes. Also noted that an updated Sister Sites report has been given by Singapore to the EAAFP Secretariat which may not be reflected in the current Sister Sites table in the Draft Decision. 09 Annex 2.
216. Mr. Phil Straw (CEPA WG) noted that the Hunter Estuary Sister Site was developed largely through schools, despite multiple languages. Noted that there are many existing models and supported encouragement of developing these sites. Noted the need for EAAFP to be more engaged with schools.
217. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that the intent of the Draft Decision regarding instructions to the Secretariat was to develop the review of current sites because there is a need for Partners to be more informed about the costs and benefits of entering into a Sister Site arrangement and agreed with Russia about the need for development of effective sites not proliferation of sites. The review should inform of this, and this is the intention of the document.
218. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) noted that there are other Sister Site programs throughout the world e.g. Eurosite that could also usefully inform our process.
219. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) supported the wording "instructs" in point 7. and reiterated the need for discussion about the Secretariat's review for the MOP 11 which could be balanced by revising other wording.
220. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) noted that the decision will be suspended until further advice on the draft Decision is provided to the Secretariat and called a break for lunch.
221. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that all comments for documents should be given to Ms. Yoonkyung Lee (External Relations Manager, EAAFP Secretariat) this afternoon so that revised documents can be put on the website.

Agenda Item 5.7: Update on the Appointment and Work of the Interim Technical Sub Committee - [Decision.](#)

[04](#)

222. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) acknowledged the proposal from Partners for a minor amendment to the text in the draft Decision. This will involve an amendment to the text, “draft work plan once prepared, needs to be circulated to Partners for review by the MC”. He proposed this for immediate adoption if there were no further issues.
223. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) – He announced that the Draft Decision. 04 is adopted.

Agenda Item 5.8: Standardized Taxonomy for Migratory Waterbirds - [Decision. 10](#)

224. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) introduced draft Decision 10 proposed by the Australian Government. He stressed that a standardized taxonomy for species names in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway is needed to harmonize species lists across different multilateral agreements, which in turn could strengthen integration in the processes under these agreements. Mr. Richardson pointed out that the proposal to adopt the taxonomy in the Handbook of the Birds of the World (HBW)–BirdLife International Illustrated Checklist is consistent with Resolution 6.1, adopted under African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) which also called for a standardized taxonomy. This proposal is also consistent with the Convention on Migratory Species Resolution 11.9 on Taxonomy and Nomenclature of Birds Listed on the CMS Appendices which was adopted at the 11th which was passed at the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS COP11) in Quito.
225. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) pointed out that bird taxonomy is in a constant state of flux and thus there will be expected changes to the taxonomy over time for the Handbook of the Birds of the World (HBW)-BirdLife Illustrated Checklist. He noted that the current edition of the Illustrated Checklist only captured the taxonomic updates up till 2014 and new revisions could be expected thereafter. He explained the need for Partners to be kept informed on taxonomic updates, especially changes in the species name, as it could cause confusion to various users of the taxonomy. As of now, the taxonomy in the 2014 edition of the Illustrated Checklist can be followed.
226. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) reminded that the Partnership document, besides explaining the purpose of the Partnership, also highlighted a need for a standardized taxonomy to guide its work.
227. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) noted that many taxonomies currently exist for birds. For instance, the IUCN has its own taxonomy, as are other taxonomic authorities. He agreed with earlier comments that there is a need for a standardized taxonomy and that it is acceptable to start with the currently proposed arrangements to use the HBW-BirdLife Illustrated Checklist, noting the need for additional changes in text on the draft Decision as appropriate. With this, he observed that there is necessarily no need for revisions to the decision every 1-2 years.
228. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) pointed out that Australia is already party to several international agreements that use the HBW-BirdLife Illustrated Checklist taxonomy, as well as its national list on threatened species, so as to be consistent with international standards. He noted that taxonomic changes can occur at a high frequency and the Partnership will ultimately have to decide at some point to adopt a standard for consistency.

229. Ms. Laura Aguado (Convention on Migratory Species, CMS) expressed support for a taxonomy that can be harmonized with the existing CMS instruments. She noted that adopting a standardized taxonomy could also contribute to strengthening international collaboration across these different instruments.
230. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) acknowledged the need for a standardized taxonomy in guiding the work of the Partnership. Mr. Mundkur indicated that Wetlands International has updated its taxonomy based on the 2014 edition of the HBW-BirdLife Illustrated Checklist, including the Waterbird Population Estimates (WPE) database and its other relevant work in the EAAFP. He indicated that Wetlands International will support this draft decision but acknowledged that taxonomy is subject to regular changes and updates. The comparatively slower changes in nomenclature and taxonomy under the HBW framework could provide more stability. He suggested that additional text is appended to the draft Decision to acknowledge the state of flux in bird taxonomy. He proposed the addition of 'and subsequent online updates' at the end of the text in the draft Decision to acknowledge the need to remain current with taxonomic revisions, as well as a similar update to the background section of the paper.
231. Mr. Sudev Gombobaatar (Mongolia) agreed with the comments from Mr. Simba Chan and Mr. Taej Mundkur. Mr. Gombobaatar shared experiences in developing national checklists on the birds of Mongolia, which had been subjected to frequent revisions in the past two years due to constant taxonomic updates. He pointed out that because the HBW-BirdLife International Illustrated Checklist taxonomy frequently revises names at the general and species level, online updates (if acknowledged) will be useful for yearly reviews for the work of the EAAFP.
232. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) – Draft Decision. 10 is adopted.

Agenda Item 5.9: Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document - [Decision. 11](#)

233. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) provided background to Draft Decision. 11 and noted that the Partnership document can be amended by consensus where needed. Mr. Richardson observed that the Seabird WG, through earlier consultations, has recommended the inclusion of frigatebirds, gannets, boobies, tropicbirds as well as austral/northern storm petrels to its taxonomic remit, and strongly endorses this proposal for adoption. He indicated that changes proposed under this draft Decision are consistent with the decision from the MOP7 which also called for strengthening transboundary conservation in the flyway. Additionally, the draft Decision complements recent revisions to the Appendices of the Convention on Migratory Species COP12, notably the inclusion of the Christmas Island Frigatebird and other seabirds.
234. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) made several observations that could be taken into consideration for this draft Decision. He noted that the first objective of Partnership is to drive the development of Flyway Network Sites for the conservation of waterbirds, to protect migratory waterbirds throughout their annual cycles. Yet, populations of waterbirds may remain vulnerable to threats elsewhere even if sites important to them are protected. Citing an example, he noted that it may not be feasible to cover illegal activities affecting migratory birds in the high seas (even whilst sites are already protected). Mr. Davidson observed that there is a clear need to demonstrate the added value of this revision of the Partnership document to the Partnership. Additionally, he noted the need to consider

overlaps with other existing international instruments for seabirds. Third, he expressed concern that this draft Decision will increase the sweep of species that the Partnership must deal with, which may not necessarily help the Partnership to achieve meaningful action at the risk of diluting its current work. He proposed more careful consideration of this revision to come from the TsC at this stage.

235. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) noted the fact that migratory species groups proposed under this draft Decision is 'transboundary' in their distribution and thus can help provide the impetus for protecting their breeding areas within the EAAF. He highlighted that many of these (migratory) seabird species breed within Australia's territorial boundaries but move more widely beyond Australia.
236. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) observed that seabirds are not the only groups covered in the Partnership document that have distributions that fall outside the boundaries of the flyway Partnership.
237. Mr. Mark Carey (Australia) highlighted that the amendments proposed under this draft Decision have been discussed and reviewed by the Seabird WG at its pre-MOP meeting. Citing the importance of Christmas Island for breeding seabirds, many which are migratory, Mr. Carey observed that just because the proposal contained a taxonomic group that also move beyond the boundaries of the flyway does not mean that nothing should be done to conserve them under the Partnership. He also emphasized that the Seabird WG is keen to progress work mandated under the decision from the 7th Meeting of the Partners and this proposal complements that.
238. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) observed that some of the existing Flyway Network Sites already support species from the seabird groups under this draft Decision. By this token, the inclusion of the taxonomic groups proposed under this draft Decision could also contribute to strengthening the conservation of such sites. As such, it will be useful to have species from these groups captured under Appendix III of the Partnership document.
239. Mr. Abdulmaula bin Hamza (Seabird WG) pointed out that the majority of countries in Southeast Asia are not a party to the Convention on Migratory Species and agreed with Mr. Millington that inclusion of these seabird taxa could add value to their conservation in countries not Party to CMS.
240. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) thanked the Chair for introducing the background of this draft Decision. He indicated that he would refrain from taking any position on this, and instead will take the recommendations from the Seabird WG. He however, noted that some areas under this draft Decision may render it inappropriate, especially para. 25-26. Para. 26, for instance, seemed like it is aimed directly at the Interim TsC and he noted that the Committee should be aware of the additional tasks that may be involved. He proposed additional revisions to the language in the draft Decision to make the specific actions that need to be taken in relation to these additional taxa very clear. He reiterated that he would leave it to the Seabird WG to decide what needs to be reported at the next meeting of the Partners (MOP11) and noted that adding more species is not an issue if the WG wants it, but to be mindful of the additional issues and work involved.
241. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) thanked Mr. Lanctot for spotting these paragraphs in the draft Decision and the implications it had for the Interim TsC. He agreed with the observations of Mr. Lanctot that under this draft Decision, the TsC is being asked to carry out more activities, including

identifying key sites in the flyway network, hosting workshops and so forth and proposed that it may perhaps be more appropriate for the Seabird WG to lead and organize these activities. At the same time, Mr. Davidson asked the Seabird WG to perhaps, consider collaboration with the Science Unit in implementing these activities.

242. Taking into the consideration from these comments, Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) proposed that new text is added to draft Decision 11 to reflect the input provided from Partners, especially that from the United States.

Agenda Item 5.10: Development of a Conservation Status Review of Migratory Waterbird Populations for the EAAFP - [Decision. 12](#)

243. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) provided the background on the status of migratory waterbird populations in the EAAF in this draft Decision and highlighted that it is also supported by the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT). He explained that this paper contained three annexes. In the presentation, he recognized that there are currently no formal procedures in assessing and listing the conservation status of waterbird populations in the Flyway.

244. He observed that the EAAFP often needed to make conservation decisions on waterbirds at the population level and emphasized that the high standard of information to guide decision-making cycles can only be attained from good quality monitoring. He reiterated that the Partnership needs up-to-date information on the populations of migratory waterbirds for various purposes (including the 1% flyway population estimates to guide the identification of Flyway Network Sites) to prioritize actions for conservation, and to provide a technically sound base for cooperation under the Partnership. Having robust estimates under a new conservation status review proposed under this draft Decision could also allow success to be measured for all species that the Partnership is concerned with. Currently, population information available on waterbird species in the flyway can be accessed from the Waterbird Population Estimates (WPE) portal – launched in 2012 at the Ramsar Conference of the Partners and contains information up to 2012, also known as WPE5. However, since there is currently more new information for many species, for instance, the Black-faced Spoonbill, there is an urgent need for a process to review and update the WPE on a continuous and regular basis.

245. Mr. Mundkur pointed out that the Strategic Plan has already made a specific call for regular updates on waterbird population data, to prioritize action, with the view that this work will be undertaken by Wetlands International, the TsC, and the various WGs. He shared that the conservation status review was also raised at the recent meeting of the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement, with the aim of undertaking a similar process in the Partnership. A secondary action under this draft Decision is the compilation of published information, followed by a thorough species expert review process, which could form the basis for future conservation prioritization. He shared on a recently completed analysis of the current status of duck and geese population status in the EAAF by the Wetlands International team. He noted that the analyses showed that most ducks and geese in the flyway are in decline, consistent with existing knowledge, but also recognized that the best knowledge on the population of many waterbirds is still lacking.

246. Mr. Mundkur noted that a conservation status review coming from this draft Decision will allow us to prioritize species that are at higher risk for conservation action. Additionally, the 8th Conference of the

Parties of the Ramsar Convention has called for a regular update of populations of waterbirds around the world. Mr. Mundkur noted that drawing from the initiative on breeding birds in Europe, the next step here is for the Partnership to have a mechanism in place for a conservation status review so that there will be updates in time for the 13th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Migratory Species, to be held in February 2020 in India.

247. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) emphasized the importance of obtaining good estimates of waterbird populations at regular intervals. He reminded everyone that this is the reason why the Meeting of the Partners in Kushiro, Japan has called for a standardization of waterbird monitoring, after having started some discussions on this issue in 2010-2012. Mr. Chan shared that a survey he has carried out at the Meeting of the Partners in Alaska in 2013 showed that many EAAFP Partners are interested in standardized monitoring. He also noted that in the absence of a scientific officer in the EAAFP to implement these activities, it may be better to transfer work on standardized monitoring to the Beijing Forestry University-coordinated Science Unit to lead this discussion, especially waterbird monitoring.
248. Mr. Chan pointed out that since 1996, there has been an acknowledgement by colleagues that estimates of waterbird populations available were far from satisfactory. He added that in some cases, information was solely available in the English language. Some local ornithologists in the region may not be able to access data. Since the Partnership depended a lot on national contacts in the region to obtain information for waterbirds, he observed that regionally based ornithologists may not reply readily to any call for information on waterbird populations, rendering it difficult to produce a fair assessment of waterbird populations. Mr. Chan noted that the task to compile waterbird estimates for the flyway is large, and since it pertains to the EAAF, the best way forward on this could be to consult the new EAAFP Science Unit to lead with the support of other Partners.
249. Ms. Sukanya Wisan (Thailand) recommended addition to para. 2, “calls on the Partner to secure necessary resources as appropriate within their national circumstances...”, and para 5., “subject to the availability of resources to report on the progress to MOP11...”, to take into consideration the unique context of each Partner in relation to the EAAFP.
250. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) thanked Mr. Mundkur for the comprehensive presentation on a conservation status review under this Draft Decision. Mr. McKinlay noted the need for a balance, highlighting that information on some taxonomic groups can be kept up to date more easily than other groups. He pointed out that one of the issues with the draft Decision is how it will ensure the frequency of updating information on waterbird estimates, given the need for frequent evaluation for re-estimation. He also drew attention to the establishment of the Science Unit, and that there is a need for clarification of the roles of the Wetlands International-led work in relation to the Unit, as well as the decision’s call for the Partnership to secure resources for its implementation.
251. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) proposed some comments on the text to clarify the role of the monitoring TF in developing the guidance for this draft Decision.
252. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) expressed concern with the EAAFP Secretariat being called to secure resources for this draft Decision. He noted that doing so could also compromise time being spent on securing resources on other priorities of the Secretariat and that the issue needs to be looked into quite carefully. He agreed with earlier comments that this work could potentially fall under the remit of the new EAAFP

Science Unit and the Monitoring TF, which in turn could help reduce the burden on the Secretariat. Mr. Millington drew attention to para. 2 of the draft Decision, which called for the Secretariat to secure resources and questioned the implication of what this could mean in relation to budgeting for the Secretariat. He expressed support for the draft Decision but noted the need to consider budgetary implications for the Secretariat and the wider Partnership.

253. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) thanked Mr. Millington for the comments and took note of the concerns raised. He pointed out that the draft Decision would provide a basis for prioritizing action for the Partnership, especially in finding funding to support its work. He noted that the Secretariat as mentioned also took into consideration the Science Unit. He shared that his team has started to engage potential donors to see if there is interest to support this work, noting that the Government of Norway has expressed interest to contribute to this and that they are able to secure the necessary resources to start this discussion.
254. Mr. Mundkur also asked whether it is possible to organize a meeting between the Science Unit and Wetlands International to better define the roles played by each party in contributing to the conservation status review and expressed the desire of Wetlands International to see a strong role played by the Science Unit in relation to this work. This could potentially contribute to bringing the Partners together. Referring to the comments made by Mr. McKinlay; He agreed that different species and taxonomic groups have different generation times, which could then influence the frequency of the conservation status review. He noted that the frequency of the conservation status review could be linked to the rate at which multilateral agreements such as the Ramsar Convention, conducts its decision making. He then acknowledged that new information is needed for many species under the remit of the Partnership, and this could be helped by tapping into the TFs and specialists in the Partnership. He indicated that he would follow-up on earlier comments through consultations with the different WG to determine the best way of conducting this review.
255. Mr. Yifei Jia (EAAFP Science Unit) agreed with Mr. Mundkur's point on the role of Beijing Forestry University as part of the EAAFP Secretariat, as a Science Unit. He noted that having reliable estimates of the populations of waterbirds is the most important starting point for waterbird conservation in the EAAF and welcomed opportunities to support all Partners to collect relevant resources in implementing this review, including reports and papers for the waterbirds.
256. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) noted that the EAAFP is fortunate to have the support of many different groups to implement the conservation status review, and whilst recognizing Wetlands International as the authorities on information on waterbirds, the EAAFP also has its new Science Unit. He pointed out that there must be an elegant and effective way to tap into the different resources and skill bases to carry out a good review. He observed that there is a need to clarify the roles of different players such as Wetlands International, the Science Unit and the WGs, but this could be worked out later, as are the modalities of the processes among these different players.
257. Ms. Diana Solovyeva (Chair, Scaly-sided Merganser TF) shared that there is a recent call from Denmark for national surveys organized by governments to provide a more reliable set of information for waterbirds. She cited the example of Japan's comprehensive national survey for waterbirds and asked if there are other countries that can access national survey data to support the conservation status review.

258. Ms. Micha Jackson (University of Queensland) observed that coming from a research and science perspective, it can be quite challenging to obtain good population and trend estimates for waterbirds and thought it was timely to see this draft Decision being considered. She also raised a point on whether there should be a centralised database to hold national waterbird monitoring data to support the implementation of this proposal.
259. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) agreed with Mr. Davidson's comments that the different WGs will need to work among themselves to see who is best placed to lead work in relation on this draft Decision. He suggested that the Science Unit could also play a more important role, given the large and continuously emerging information on waterbirds in the Chinese language, which often precede updates available elsewhere. Given their capacity to access this new information rapidly, he held the view that the Science Unit is best positioned to provide frequent and regular updates on waterbird population information and trends.
260. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) proposed the deletion in para. 2., 'to secure necessary resources'.
261. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) reminded that the work implicated under this draft Decision would also involve embarking on a process that could have implications in the next decade. He encouraged the Partners to adopt the decision and is open to revisions to the wording to make explicit the need for resource generation, where necessary, with sensible text. Noting that it is important for the Partners to recognize that these reviews will need resources for their implementation, he noted that it is up to the Partners to decide whether there is a mechanism by which Partners that can be called upon to promote and seek for funding when needed.
262. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) highlighted that the Science Unit has an operational budget, but the exact costs and specific budgetary components are not yet known, and it may be better to leave the text just in case.
263. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) noted that it is obviously necessary to secure resources for supporting the work under this draft Decision and thus, this proposed text amendment on 'securing resources' is not necessarily important.
264. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) pointed out that the Partnership is now supported by a fund-raising officer and so the work to secure resources for this draft Decision could also potentially fall under the remit and prioritization of the Secretariat.
265. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) briefly revisited the draft Decision and indicated that he will be available in the afternoon and tomorrow (morning) to continue receiving feedback from Partners on the draft Decision to improve it.
266. Mr. Vinayagan Dharmarajah (BirdLife International) commended Wetlands International for developing this draft Decision. He shared on the work led by BirdLife International in relation to the International Union on the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)'s Red List Assessment for Birds and welcomed opportunities to work together with Wetlands International to bring this draft Decision to a satisfactory conclusion.

267. Mr. Cai Lu (EAAFP Science Unit) observed that waterbird monitoring is growing in the region and has proliferated across many different organizations, which in turn signals increasing capacity. He emphasized that the database developed by the EAAFP Science Unit will not only include waterbird monitoring data, but also other useful datasets. He expressed the intent of the Science Unit to engage with multiple stakeholders, which can be expected to include citizen scientists, national governments, site managers, and professional institutes involved in satellite tracking data. He noted that there may be some overlap in the practice, but these gaps could eventually be resolved.
268. In response to earlier comments, Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (WI) added that discussions are already ongoing as to how to capitalize on capacity within various organizations in the Partnership, including BirdLife International, the EAAFP Science Unit and others. Going forward, this development could contribute to strengthening the Partnership, and is critical to the EAAFP moving forward.
269. Acknowledging the establishment of the Science Unit, Ms. Xiao Hong (China) reiterated that a detailed discussion can be held later.
270. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) observed that opportunities are ripe for various organizations in the Partnership, as are the WGs, TFs, and the Science Unit on how to better scope this opportunity not available before and developing an efficient way of updating the conservation status of bird populations in the flyway. How this may link to strengthening monitoring has not been discussed so far in detail, but the Monitoring TF will report later in the programme today, which will also cover what the Asian Waterbird Census is implementing in the region.

Agenda Item 5.11: Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region - Draft Decision. 13(cancelled)

271. Mr. Ding Li Yong (BirdLife International) presented the *Draft Decision. 13* on behalf of the EAAFP Secretariat and BirdLife International. He thanked collaborators and stakeholders who have contributed so far to the draft resolution. Providing some background to the draft Decision, he noted that effort and resources in the EAAF prioritize globally threatened long-distance migratory waterbirds but that less effort and resources have been dedicated to short-distance or intra-tropical migrants, many of which remain poorly studied. Short-distance migrants typically undertake wet-dry migratory movements in response to seasonal monsoon patterns. Habitat loss and degradation of inland wetlands and hunting pressures are a threat, and many of these species are as threatened as their long-distance migrant cousins. Mr. Yong then presented two relevant case studies for the Draft Decision, including that of the Sarus Crane (eastern migratory population) which has experienced gradual and sustained decline, and the Masked Finfoot (the only regional representative of a family that occurs across the world's tropics) which has since experienced a sharp decline in sightings in recent years but which little information is available. He noted that this species depends on coastal and inland wetlands and that its distribution over a large part of Southeast Asia will benefit from cooperation across range states in. He pointed out a list of similar species with similar circumstances including various storks and rails. He emphasized the need to work together to understand both threats and basic biology/ecology of these listed species and that the draft Decision welcomed additional input from Partners on the current status of this group, besides calling for more collaboration with the ASEAN Flyway Network to implement several specific actions.

272. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) noted that current work on the Cambodian population of the Sarus crane, especially satellite tracking, has demonstrated this population to be migratory, and crossing national borders, but not so for the population in Myanmar. He observed that many bird species showed movements and shifts over the dry and wet seasons, but in many cases, it is often hard to confirm whether these species cross country borders (which is needed under the Convention on Migratory Species' definition¹ of 'migratory'. Mr. Chan suggested that birds which move seasonally, but not necessarily across borders should still be considered under these conservation frameworks and reiterated a need for a more flexible definition of what constitutes 'migratory' to promote cross-border collaboration on conserving these species.
273. Mr. Oswald Braken Anak Tisen (Malaysia) suggested that the species highlighted under this draft Decision will need to be managed at the site level. On this note, he pointed out that perhaps now, it may be premature to put forward a recommendation on single species action plans and more buy-in should first be secured at the ASEAN-level.
274. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) provided some context on the ASEAN Flyway Network and provided some updates of the pre-meeting of the ASEAN Flyway Network with eight member states and Singapore as its current project lead. She thanked Mr. Yong for developing this proposal but agreed with the point from Malaysia that the commitment to work with ASEAN Flyway Network within the draft Decision may not be possible within the timeframe of the Meeting of the Partners. Given this, she proposed that it may be more appropriate to refer to the draft Decision as the "Southeast Asian region" as opposed to the current "ASEAN region". She suggested also making these changes in the appendix attached for consistency.
275. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested a change in the wording of the draft Decision from "collaborates with AFN to" to "encourages the AFN to" and replace "ASEAN" with "Southeast Asia" throughout for consistency.
276. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) reiterated that this draft Decision constituted an important step for conservation and should be adopted but noted that some countries may not necessarily be comfortable with all of the decision text and thus it may take longer to agree on this wording. He pointed out that the ASEAN WG on Biodiversity and Nature Conservation meetings in Laos next year may be an opportunity for BirdLife International and the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership Secretariat to seek further feedback and move this draft Decision forward. He noted that if there is funding for a face-to-face meeting before the next MOP there may be a better outcome towards adoption.
277. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) observed that the comments reflected by the discussions suggested that it may not be viable to proceed with the decision at this time.
278. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) noted that the discussions under this draft Decision centers on a region that historically had capacity gaps in field surveys and monitoring. However, he acknowledged that the ASEAN Flyway Network is now beginning to fill these gaps. Nonetheless, Mr. Mundkur pointed out that the

¹ <https://www.cms.int/en/convention-text>: "Migratory species" means the entire population or any geographically separate part of the population of any species or lower taxon of wild animals, a significant proportion of whose members cyclically and predictably cross one or more national jurisdictional boundaries;

wider Partnership recognizes that some of the species being considered under the draft Decision could face severe threats and welcomes opportunities to facilitate further discussions to see if first steps could be advanced at this Meeting of the Partners, and subsequent steps considered at the next MOP. He noted that these steps should not necessarily be binding or onerous on the ASEAN member states and could build on existing work.

279. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) proposed that the draft Decision be turned into an informational document rather than a decision. This will allow it to retain the background information, but with the operative paragraphs removed. He pointed out that this would allow the EAAFP Secretariat and BirdLife International to formally present the material at the ASEAN meeting highlighted by Mr. Srey Sunleang without the need for it to be recompiled.
280. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) supported Mr. Young's proposal to convert the draft Decision into an informational document and added that the ASEAN WG could work with the EAAFP Secretariat to raise this issue inter-sessional and report back at the next meeting of Partners.
281. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) emphasized that some of the relevant species proposed under the draft Decision are experiencing serious declines. He reiterated that it would be very useful if progress is made on these species before the next ASEAN meeting in 2019. This may include work to propose priority species for single species action plans.
282. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) asked if representatives from the ASEAN member states would be willing to consider this suggestion to convert the draft Decision into an informational document.
283. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) further noted that any follow-up activities on the draft Decision will be taken back to ASEAN Flyway Network.
284. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) recommended reworking this draft Decision into an informational paper and that will eventually be uploaded on the EAAFP website.

Agenda Item 5.12: International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Dalmatian Pelican - [Decision. 14](#)

285. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) introduced draft *Decision 14*, with reference to the present distribution of the Dalmatian Pelican – he noted that it breeds across Asia, east to western Mongolia, with a much larger population occurring in Central Asia, the Mediterranean, and Europe. He also observed that populations of the species in the western part of the range have recovered in recent years, while the population that breeds in western Mongolia and migrating to China has declined steadily. He suggested that this population, taken on its own, may even be more critically threatened than the Spoon-billed Sandpiper as heard from earlier presentations, with less than 150 individuals left. Mr. Mundkur noted that the eastern population of the Dalmatian Pelican has been identified as a high priority by the Seabird WG, which has been especially concerned with the status of the species in the last few years and has agreed to develop a joint action plan across its entire range. He noted that a species action plan could improve the chances of survival of this population, through obtaining new knowledge to plan for critical

conservation efforts for the species at large. Mr. Mundkur emphasized that the focus here is the population that falls within the geographic remit of the EAAFP.

286. He shared that a draft action plan was started in 2017 led by the BirdLife International Partnership and contracted by the AEWA Secretariat, with the focus on the larger part of the population. This action plan has been formally adopted by the European Union and will also be adopted at the Meeting of the Parties of the AEWA. As such, the EAAFP is now invited to adopt the action plan as well. Actions needed at present include the adopting of the international single species action plan for the conservation of the Dalmatian Pelican and establishing an EAAFP Dalmatian Pelican TF. At the same time, the draft Decision urges range states and other stakeholders to implement relevant provisions of the action plan. Implementing this draft Decision will require input from the Partners to provide technical and financial assistance to support activities outlined in the plan while instructing the EAAFP Secretariat to bring the plan to the attention of all range states and relevant stakeholders. Mr. Mundkur noted that the focus is for two range states in the EAAFP, China and Mongolia, to take the lead in setting up this TF, and to invite experts from outside the Partnership to support the implementation of the activities under the mandated TF. After having adopted the action plan, Partners are then encouraged to adopt actions for prioritization for implementation.
287. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) observed that the eastern (EAAF) population of the Dalmatian Pelican has been in decline for a long time. He noted that the species is a conservation concern to workers in Hong Kong and that the individuals that formerly wintered in Hong Kong have entirely disappeared in recent years. He welcomed the call for an action plan for the Dalmatian Pelican but looked forward to more details on the implementation of the plan. Mr. Chan noted that there is an agreement to adopt this action and set up a 'TF' under the Seabird WG, and the interest of the group to continue work of the species and consult colleagues to identify the most appropriate actions by the next Meeting of the Partners. He also observed that the establishment of the 'TF' within the WG would need more resources, as well as greater engagement with experts from China and Mongolia.
288. Mr. Yifei Jia (EAAFP Science Unit) shared that Dalmatian Pelicans, being very large waterbirds, have been well documented by photographers and birdwatchers across China. He observed that there is a good framework to document the pelicans in China and cited the example of the China Coastal Waterbird Census, which brings together many teams to conduct waterbird counts across the country. Mr. Jia cited an instance in 2005 when 20 pelicans appeared at Shanwei Wetlands in Guangdong where it was first missed by volunteer surveyors, but then found the next day by teams in Xiamen, Fujian, and another instance where at least 20 individuals were discovered by volunteers in Datong (Shanxi) during spring. He noted that the Science Unit can contribute to the work of the TF through coordinating surveys and consolidating updated information on the species.
289. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) clarified that since the European Union and AEWA have already approved the international action plan for populations outside their jurisdiction, the logical next step is for the EAAFP to endorse the action plan to cover and fill up gaps for the population in the EAAF. Recognizing this, he emphasized that the key responsibility of the Partnership thus is to work on the population that breeds in Mongolia and winters in China.
290. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) noted that there are already very active groups of researchers and birdwatchers in the ranges state, which in turn provide a strong basis to take forward the work under the action plan.

291. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) suggested that developing an action plan for a local/regional population without considering the context of the global population could be misleading. He cited the case for the Lesser White-fronted Goose and suggested that work on the conservation strategy for this species can offer a very good precedent for the Dalmatian Pelican.
292. Ms. Laura Aguado (CMS) expressed support for the action plan for the Dalmatian Pelican under this draft Decision, an International Single Species Action Plan that had been already adopted by the CMS Standing Committee at its recent 48th meeting, and by MOP7 of AEWA.
293. Mr. Cai Lu (EAAFP Science Unit) expressed support for the draft Decision and encouraged Partners to support this draft Decision.
294. Mr. Sundev Gombobaatar (Mongolia) emphasized that if the action plan under this draft Decision was not adopted, action to conserve the population of the Dalmatian Pelican in the EAAF will be impeded. He noted that Mongolia is happy to be the co-Chair for the proposed TF.
295. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) asked if there might be (undetected) populations of the Dalmatian Pelican in Russian territory. He pointed out a need for better knowledge of the species in Russia to get more involvement from Russia in these discussions.
296. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) indicated that he will follow up by consulting with colleagues to determine the status and population of the Dalmatian Pelican in Russian territory.
297. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) observed that the terms of reference for the TF under this draft Decision will need to be reviewed to see if all members could agree on it. He suggested that the ToR can be discussed and considered for adoption once the TF has been established.
298. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) proposed that the ToR be adopted in the interim until the next reporting at the 11th Meeting of the Partners. He proposed wording on the TF's ToR to be revised to reflect its interim nature.
299. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) – Draft Decision. 14 is adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 6: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, KEY ACTIVITIES OF WGs/TFs

Agenda Item 6.1: Scaly-sided Merganser TF Presentation (Ms. Diana Solovyeva)

300. Ms. Diana Solovyeva (Scaly-sided Merganser TF) presented the work of the Scaly-sided Merganser TF, highlighting updates from field work by TF members in the Russian Far East, as well as citizen science surveys across key sites in China. She then introduced several administrative updates from the recent work on the TF, including, (1) a recent vote to prohibit the use of tracking devices for research on the Scaly-sided Merganser, (2) funding support from EAZA and AZA, and (3) a new grant call for SSME

conservation recently approved by the Chair. She noted that there is good progress on work on the SSME within its range stage. In China, for example, citizen science surveys have involved over 2,000 people working across different sites from 2014-2016. In Russia, the ongoing artificial nest programme currently being implemented in the Kievka basin in Primorye, Russian Far East has contributed to an increase in productivity for SSME. This work is being supported by three active incubators. Ms. Solovyeva concluded her presentation by highlighting the need for best practices in research and field protocols in the EAAF, citing that there is (1) scope to adapt some of the practices from other flyways, and the issue (2) of how democratic approaches in decision-making for conservation may be counter-balanced by bureaucratic prudence. She noted that the TF is proposing for a forum, hosted on the EAAFP website that could be useful for more interactions with the work of the TF.

Agenda Item 6.2: Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF Presentation (Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy)

301. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) presented updates on the work of the TF, including developments arising from the Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF workshop that recently concluded. He noted that a lot of the work carried out under the Partnership is led by the various TFs and WGs, and thus suggested that more time is allocated to WGs to report on their progress in a future meeting of Partners. He highlighted that the SBS TF now contains 42 members from 18 countries, with representation from governments, conservationists, academicians, and non-government organizations. He noted that the TF started as the erstwhile 'Spoon-billed Sandpiper recovery team' in 2003, after which it then became hosted by the EAAFP as the SBS TF. He then updated that the TF has made significant progress, and now publishes its newsletter regularly to update its membership.
302. The TF currently meets once every two years, but many updates mean that it may be useful to meet twice a year. A number of non-government organizations across the range states of the species currently support the TF, and its work is now being further promoted under a number of bilateral agreements (e.g., Japan-Russia Migratory Bird Agreement, China-Russia Migratory Bird Agreement) and the Arctic Council's Arctic Migratory Bird Initiative (AMBI). Mr. Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) emphasized the importance of the work on the species currently being implemented in Chukotka, with reference to monitoring work of the breeding sites and head-starting work. He observed that head-starting has a major impact in stemming the decline of the species by reducing mortality in the breeding grounds, and increasing productivity, with 163 chicks released in seven years. 26% of head-started Spoon-billed Sandpipers have been seen at least once since their release. Genetic work that is being led by Mr. Kondrashov's team in Austria which has involved the sequencing of the genomes of seven individuals of Spoon-billed Sandpipers, which demonstrated that genetic diversity of the species peaked 20,000 years ago and has been on the gradual decline since. Recognizing these declines, he observed that populations of the species in captivity may be needed as insurance for the future. Mr. Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) pointed out that satellite tagging for the species, involving the deployment of 12 transmitters in the past 2.5 years has yielded large amounts of new and important information on the migration of the species, including newly discovered staging and wintering sites, and sites that hold greater importance as previously thought (e.g. south China, Guangdong-Guangxi coast). Future work he noted, would be involving tackle various challenges, including a steady decline observed in the Gulf of Mottama, Myanmar, the monitoring of mist-nets in southern China, new explorative work in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Sumatra, Indonesia.

Agenda Item 6.3: Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade (Interim) TF in the EAAFP (Mr. Srey Sunleang)

303. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) provided an update on the work of the newly established Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade TF, which convened its first-ever meeting during the pre-MOP. He opened his presentation by encouraging other Partners to consider joining this new TF to address the issue of illegal hunting in the region. He noted that there are currently eight Partners as members of the TF, with Cambodia as the Chair, and Australia as the co-Chair. Mr. Srey observed that the issue of illegal hunting is a problem in some parts of the flyway, and whilst the issue is considered sensitive, governments in the region have a role to play to tackle it. Southeast Asia cited the ongoing work led by BirdLife International in conducting a situation analysis of the hunting issue in Southeast Asia, and how this may constitute a first step in helping Partners to better understand the problem in the region, noting that while some parts of the analysis (including a desk review of legislative frameworks in Southeast Asian countries) may be quite straightforward, collecting details of illegal hunting on the ground may be more challenging and requires careful coordination with governments. Noting that two parallel, and mandated TFs (with different taxonomic remits) currently exist for the Convention on Migratory Species and the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership, there is a need for careful coordination between the two, and that there is agreement at present that the EAAFP-mandated TF should take lead on the issue, and report on what the next steps will constitute. He concluded his presentation by reminding Partners to consider joining the TF.

Agenda Item 6.4: Baer's Pochard TF (Mr. Richard Hearn)

304. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT, Baer's Pochard TF) provided updates on the work of the Baer's Pochard TF, and noted that there has been significant progress on its work since the 9th Meeting of the Partners, including a major international workshop held in March 2018 in Hengshui, China. This meeting, one of the key sites for the species, received excellent support from the Hengshui city government and other stakeholders. Moving forward, Mr. Hearn noted that there is a need to identify clear conservation priorities for the next two years and maximize awareness raising on back of the excellent interest from the media in China. The Hengshui Declaration was signed at the international workshop by all participants, making a clear commitment to support Baer's Pochard conservation in the coming years. Alongside these developments in Hengshui, an excellent programme of research and monitoring is currently being led by Beijing Forestry University – this programme hopes to significantly expand effort on field research and surveys in breeding areas, and habitat surveys covering over 50 wetland sites in 12 provinces and municipalities in China soon. A multi-stakeholder action plan for the species at Hengshui Lake is being developed, which will include the removal of illegal fishing nets and boats, and the restriction of access to sensitive areas during the breeding season as among its priorities.
305. Other key actions that have been achieved include the establishment of patrol teams to protect breeding birds, engagement with local communities, and many other local actions that could have a direct impact on conserving the species. In Wuhan, Hubei, work on the Baer's Pochard is gaining momentum, with a lot of interest from stakeholders on its conservation, including Hubei University, WWF, and others. Alongside the work in China, there is also an ongoing survey of the wetlands in Ganukan Wildlife Refuge led by Ms. Marina Babykina, Amur Oblast in the Russian Far East with the hope of locating new sites for the species. Mr. Hearn concluded his presentation by providing a summary of some expected output for

2019, including a fund-raising brochure to be released, site protection and management measures, further engagement of Partners, and the need for work to raise awareness for the Baer's Pochard.

306. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) thanked Mr. Hearn for the presentation and expressed optimism to see the good progress on the conservation of the Baer's Pochard, noting that the species was on the verge of extinction just a couple of years ago.

Agenda Item 6.5: Monitoring TF (Mr. Doug Watkins, Mr. Taej Mundkur)

307. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) presented updates on the work of the monitoring TF, with reference to a recently concluded workshop in Thailand on the Asian Waterbird Census. Mr. Mundkur observed that an objective of the Partnership is to enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, build knowledge and promote the exchange of information on waterbirds and their habitats, and as such, national monitoring systems need to be established and maintained to assess the status of migratory waterbirds. He highlighted the role of the Asian Waterbird Census as a major contributor of information on waterbirds in the region, as well as feeding into the work of many regional initiatives on waterbirds, such as the Central Asian Flyway Action Plan. Mr. Mundkur provided some updates on the development of an online global database which is publicly accessible. He noted that the database aims to bring together the large body of information collected from the AWC, and there is current work ongoing with national coordinators of the AWC to upload these datasets. The recently concluded meeting of AWC coordinators in Thailand provided several outcomes relevant to the discussion on waterbird monitoring. Mr. Mundkur observed that in view of the establishment of the Science Unit, the AWC team will work closely with the unit to build strong connections, while at the same time working with teams in each country to develop national waterbird monitoring plans.
308. In concluding his presentation, he drew attention to several action points that should be further discussed, including how site coverage in the region/country can be prioritized, the need for focus on key count sites at an annual basis and the need for consensus between different stakeholders on how waterbird monitoring should be best carried out. He especially noted the need to collect better information on the status of wetlands during site visits at the AWC, but also recognized that there is often a limit as to how much information can be collected from a single visit.
309. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) emphasized that a standardized approach to waterbird census and monitoring is important, as not doing so would make it difficult to infer trends. He noted that at present, there is good trend information for many waterbird species that migrate to Australia due to the extensive standardized efforts to monitor waterbirds there. This, however, is not the case for waterbirds that do not migrate to Australia, and many of these species (that migrate to various parts of Asia), trend information is lacking. Mr. Chan expressed optimism that the newly established EAAFP Science Unit can play a stronger coordination role in waterbird monitoring to fill in such gaps. He also noted that because many people who take part in these monitoring activities are voluntary and do not receive financial support, reports on monitoring activities and results should be provided to them to keep their interest. This could also contribute feedback to the teams that conduct monitoring.
310. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) noted that many countries in the region have very limited capacity and resources to conduct waterbird monitoring activities, and that Cambodia is very happy to participate and

support this initiative. He observed that the new logo of Cambodia's Ministry of Environment should be used in the future for AWC activities.

311. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) thanked Mr. Srey for his comments and cited Cambodia as a good example where the government takes the lead of waterbird surveys under the Asian Waterbird Census.

312. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) welcomed delegates back to the final session.

AGENDA ITEM 7: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, Bigger Data and Bigger Conservation in the EAAF engaging Science.

313. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) invited Mr. Cai Lu (EAAFP Science Unit) for a Special Presentation, entitled *Bigger Data and Bigger Conservation in the EAAF engaging Science*.

314. Mr. Cai Lu (EAAFP Science Unit) outlined the different scales at which data was required to support science, for different purposes. He outlined the work of the CEAAF around their four priorities, migratory ecology, habitats, monitoring, and international collaboration. Bigger data using waterbirds, as an example, site data, for the wintering population, examples of Scaly-sided Merganser or Baer's Pochard. The case of Lesser White-fronted Geese provided complete information from local movement with geolocators, blood/feathers, and isotopes, connectivity to breeding sites, flyway scale, population scale dynamics.

AGENDA ITEM 8: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, Initiation of Spoon-billed Sandpiper Project

315. Ms. Sun Lili (Shenzhen Mangrove Conservation Foundation, MCF) was invited to provide a special presentation entitled *Mobilize Resources to protect Spoon-billed Sandpiper and the habitat*. Established in 2002, the MCF is the first civil society and charity on education, social participation for nature conservation, dedication to conservation of mangroves and waterbirds, working in China, and now expanding into Vietnam and Thailand. It has a corporate Partners programme, Mangrove family monthly donation programme and Online fundraising scheme. MCF organizes the Night Charity Auction – 10 million RMB raised. The organization was keen on the Spoon-billed Sandpiper and to generate support to save the species, with funds for data collection and monitoring, scientific research, and public participation.

316. A signing ceremony of BFU and MCF was conducted. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) provided a short statement congratulating MCF for its work and in supporting the Partnership through the MOU signed with the BFU. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) also congratulated MCF.

317. Ms. Sun Lili Spike Millington (ICF) was invited to provide information about the upcoming major regional/global events of relevance to the EAAFP. These include that the EAAFP MOP11 will be in early 2021. In advance of this, 2020 will be a big year for biodiversity conservation -these include opportunities for the EAAFP to raise its profile. These include:

1. CBD COP in China, Oct 2020 with a focus to review progress on Aichi Targets presents a real opportunity on how we can contribute to the CBD process. Side events can be organized with CBD Parties.

2. CMS COP13 in India, Feb 2020, relevant to our flyway. The EAAFP participated in the CMS COP12 in 2017 with a five-person delegation in attendance led by Tomoko Ichikawa (CO). They held 1 side event and participated in 4 others and staged an exhibition booth. An important resolution CMS Resolution 12.25 on Promoting Conservation of Critical Intertidal and Other Coastal Habitats for Migratory Species, prepared by the Government of the Philippines was adopted which was relevant to the work of the EAAFP.
3. IUCN Congress in France in June 2020. In the previous two congresses, Jeju in 2012 and Hawaii in 2016, there were resolutions of coastal wetlands in our Flyway, and we got significant funding and need to follow up in the upcoming Congress. IUCN have continued to lead this work with the establishment of the Yellow Sea Intertidal WG and work progressed.
4. INTERCOL 2020 in New Zealand – last INTERCOL in China a session on the Yellow Sea with China, ROK & DPRK.

Partners were invited to think about how to leverage contributions to these meetings, with Parties and Partners and use as opportunities to raise the profile of the EAAFP and our work in these meetings.

318. Mr. Zhang Cheng (IUCN China) recognized that there was a need to think about the sequence of events and how to build on these events.
319. Ms. Laura Aguado (CMS) invited all Partners to participate in CMS COP13 and to contribute to the process of conservation of migratory species.
320. Mr. Yu Xiubo (CAS) informed on a new UNDP GEF project on flyways in China that was going to be developed with ICF and BFU (on birds and database development). The project has been endorsed by GEF CEO last week and the government will start the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) in early 2019. This project will have three major components – mainstreaming (with local and national government sectors to mainstream waterbirds and habitats conservation in main government policy) demonstration (development of best management practice in five Ramsar Sites, including Liaohe Estuary, Yellow River Delta, Chongming Dongtan Sanjiang and Dashenbao), knowledge management (to share knowledge from this project and others, so a window of opportunity for cooperation with EAAFP, lessons learned and development of a manual for the site managers). Four of these five sites are EAAFP Network Sites in China. The project is planned to start in early 2020 and 10 million USD.
321. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) announced that a calendar of events would be posted on the website, especially of internationally and national relevant events. Vivian Fu will follow up with Partners to ensure that it is being kept up to date.
322. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) announced early plans for shorebird national activities workshop (in Russian) in 2019 and 2020 Anatidae Conference near Moscow (in English and Russian). He welcomed the Anatidae WG and others to attend.
323. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) provided a quick update on the EAAFP Strategic Plan development. He mentioned that the work was progressing and that a session was planned around 16:00 to present an updated draft later today.

324. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) provided a table with an update on the status of papers presented at MOP. Several were completed and marked in green. Yellow indicates there were some changes. The pink boxes indicate that there are quite a few issues and need to be resolved (outside plenary). The updated Rev.1 is being uploaded. He proposed a focus on papers in yellow this morning, to sign off. In the afternoon, papers with pink boxes would be worked on by small groups. And later a report back from the papers to inform on the update.
325. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) outlined that Draft Decision. 04 required a minor change and Rev 1 should be posted before it could be adopted on the last day.
326. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) informed that there were difficulties in accessing the EAAFP website and that it was not possible to search files using Google in China and instead Microsoft Edge was needed. The Secretariat was working hard to process the documents, and these would be available in the coming hours.

AGENDA ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT DECISIONS (CONT.)

Agenda Item 9.1: Draft Decision. 01 - Draft Decision. 14

Decision 11-Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document

327. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) informed that a Rev 1 had been submitted and Secretariat had received it. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested that Rev 1 should be uploaded shortly.
328. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) proposed dealing with Draft Decisions in yellow.
329. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) summarized corrections to Doc4b Draft Minutes from COP9 Rev 1-with comments only received from CAFF Secretariat. Chair asked if any suggestions to adopt it. This was adopted.

Document 6-Report from the Chair of the Finance Sub Committee

330. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) highlighted that the decision page had additional text from Australia and New Zealand that was added to the first text, on the contingency fund approval process. Additionally, the paper proposed the re-endorsement of the voluntary fee contribution, noting in the presentation that several Partners had already contributed. Partners are also encouraged to contribute either in cash or in kind if it was difficult to pay in cash. The resource plan will be based on the strategic plan and three points may require some minor adjustment following approval of the strategic plan.
331. Partners interested to join the FsC are invited to contact the Chair, Ms. Yoon Kyung Lee (External Relations Manager, EAAFP Secretariat) or Ms. Alison Russell-French. Since the last MOP, all members have served one term and so may legitimately stand for another term. Membership is really based on expertise rather than formal position. Ms. Alison Russell-French advised that it was possible to adopt the decision now and that the FsC review the outcomes after the MOP. Chair clarified that the FsC invited adoption; no objections and so was adopted by the meeting.

332. Ms. Alison Russell-French proposed a big vote of thanks to Ms. Yoonkyung Lee (External Relations Manager, EAAFP Secretariat) and CE/EAAFP to support the process.

Document 11- Admission of observers-

333. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) outlined that the track change on the admission of observers indicated small changes to country names were made due to inaccuracies. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) highlighted two changes, and these were updated. Ms. Diana Solovyeva proposed the removal of the name of Institute of Geography Russian Academy Sciences, Russia.
334. With no other corrections, Doc 11 was adopted.

Document 10-The Status and Management of Flyway Network Sites

335. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) stated that the Secretariat had drafted the paper and requested a small group to be formed to review it. Ms. Hyeseon Do (Programme Officer, EAAFP Secretariat) was to call a meeting, time to be agreed once the session is over.

Document 13- Election and Appointment of Management Committee

336. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) outlined that MC members to be elected, so status blank for now.

Document 14- Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region

337. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) mentioned that Draft Decision. 14 was to be changed to Info Doc 14 on migratory species of conservation concern for the South-east Asia region and to be produced as an information document instead. It was already emailed to South-east Asian Partners. Rev 1 is to be posted on the website. No comments have been received since.

Decision. 01- EAAFP Strategic Plan

338. An update on the Strategic Plan was provided by Mr. Martin Spray (WWT).

Decision. 02- EAAFP CEPA Strategy

339. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) requested an update on the CEPA strategy. Ms. Sandra Hails clarified it was very close to being finished and was being linked to the Strategic Plan.

Decision. 03- Organizational Structure of the EAAFP

340. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) introduced the Organization Structure of Partnership, Rev 1 paper. There were several meetings with Partners who had comments on the previous day. Changes are to

Partners recognizing that the meetings are one step). Yesterday there was a discussion on the connection between WG/TF. There is already a working relationship between WG/TF to the Technical Sub Committee (TsC) through identification of TSC leads for each WG/TF. CE/EAAFP clarified that the arrows indicated a working relationship and not a reporting line.

341. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) proposed that a two-way arrow was needed between the WG & TF and TsC, the latter group being advisory. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) agreed there are two-way arrows between TsC and FsC. Prof. Nick Davidson – fully supported the above suggestions but raised the point that there was no relationship shown yet between TsC and the Science Unit.
342. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) highlighted the footnote that the Secretariat will support all the bodies in this structure. Prof. Nick Davidson proposed the inclusion of additional text to the footnote to show the strong working relationship to avoid the use of too many arrows. He also suggested elongating size of a box of TsC for a two-directional arrow to the Science Unit. Chair proposed to discuss with Partners. Ms. Alison Russell-French (BirdLife Australia) identified the need to show direct double arrow connection between the WG & TF.
343. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) sought clarification of the word “concept” in FSN. Mr. Young explained that it was to show that the Partners had a Network with less tangible management. Mr. Millington suggested dropping it and it was agreed by Mr. Lew Young.
344. Chair proposed that the document needed further work and would be brought back later to preliminary after discussion with a few members.

Decision. 04-Update on the Appointment of the Interim Technical Sub Committee

345. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) proposed the need to amend the use of the term TsC to TSC throughout Rev 1, once a decision on Draft Decision. 03 is taken. He highlighted that Draft Decision. 04 needed an editorial change in the role of TsC and a need to keep the Finance Sub-Committee updated once Draft Decision. 03 is adopted on organizational structures is adopted.

Decision. 05- Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat

346. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) invited BFU to give an update on the establishment of the Science Unit. The document has been revised but had not been uploaded with track changes. Initially, Ms. Qing read the changes to targets, after which Mr. Young invited the changes to be displayed on the screen. These proposed changes included wording on Target 3 on monitoring, working with TsC and others as well as the need for greater communication, working together, etc.
347. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) mentioned that the TsC had proposed several changes but has not had a chance to discuss them with the Science Unit yet, and sought clarification on how to proceed. The Chair asked Ms. Qing (EAAFP Science Unit) to discuss with TsC and others about the document during the break and bring back a revised document.

Decision. 06- Revised guidelines for participation at MOP

348. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) introduced changes in Rev 1 that aimed to simplify and shorten it, with no changes being made to the introduction. People/organizations proposed to receive support include:

(a) Partners, Government, NGOs, Chairs of TF and WGs with support being provided for hotel and return economy airfare, depending on the request. Where possible, additional funding is available, a second person could be funded from a TF or WG, once the work of the second person has been demonstrated to be related to the work of the Partnership. Funding of Government Partners would follow the DAC List as the guide unless the Partner is not able to receive any funds to attend. In the case of WGs or TFs, the first person would be the Chair or Coordinator, and if they had the funds, another member from the WG/TF could receive support. Funds would be given only after the submission of the group report.

(b) Potential Government and NGO, only one per organization, only for two MOPs to encourage participation.

(c) Sponsorship for others – experts, or NGOs.

If donors were to specify to whom to provide support, then these persons would receive the funds.

349. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) expressed that the current version was a vast improvement from the last document. Proposed that the TsC needed to be added and be inserted as a fourth category, members of the TsC are working in their own capacity. Suggested that they should get support before the second category.

350. Mr. Ward Hagemeijer (WI) mentioned that there was a need for both Tech Committee and MC to provide sponsorship support. For the focal point of each Partner and could be transferred to another member of the organization if funding was available for that person. Mr. Lew agreed that the first funding option is to the focal point, if they have funding, they can transfer the request for support to another person from their organization.

351. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) questioned who would make a decision of priorities in the case of limited funding, such as between existing Partners groups versus Chair of a WG. Is it to be at the discretion of the Chief Executive for earlier categories as someone had to make a choice? Mr. Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) responded that the Secretariat would keep a detailed list of who is receiving funding across different Partner categories, WG & TFs to ensure that at least one person was coming and who is to receive funding. He identified the need to make sure that there is a good balance between the four categories.

352. Mr. Spike Millington (ICF) agreed and proposed text be included to make it explicit that it was at the discretion of the CEO following the guidelines. Mr. Geoff Davidson (Australia) commented that the TsC and FsC are already. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) observed that the FsC is belonging to the category of non-Partners and so may need to consider support and useful to have flexibility.

353. Mr. Ward Hagemeijer (WI) agreed with the point of Australia but as mentioned, the focal point of the organization may be different to the FsC.

354. Chair requested CE, EAAFP Secretariat to clean up the document and bring a Rev.1 to the plenary.

Decision. 09- Developing an EAAFP Sister Site Program

355. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) summarized changes to Draft Decision. 09, including minor editorial changes, the addition of the TsC to participate in the review and reference to the Secretariat. The table of Sister Sites will need to be updated with feedback from Singapore and others by the Secretariat. In the absence of any comments and objections, the Chair announced that the Draft Decision. 09 was adopted with changes.

Decision. 07- Standardized Process for Small Grant Fund Applications for EAAFP Working Groups and Task Forces

356. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) introduced (Rev 1), including a second call if funds remain and tidy up comments with additional text proposed by Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) was not comprehensive, as Baer's Pochard received funding. Based on feedback, no interim report is now proposed. Chair sought to clarify when the calls would be made. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that these are in the template Rev.1.

357. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) said it should provide a definition to who are the members of the TF and WG (as a list of members is not available for all groups) and sought clarification of a tertiary institution. Changes were made to simplify the text to simply refer to the Chair or Coordinator of groups rather than members based on a suggestion by Mr. Richard Hearn.

358. Mr. Abdulmula Hamza (Seabird WG) sought clarification on the process of submission and Mr. Young confirmed that the coordinators/Chair needs to provide an email or letter. Australia agreed to add these words to clarify and provide a revised version later to the meeting.

359. Mr. Rick Lanctot (Chair, Shorebird WG) highlighted that an applicant will work with the WG members to develop a proposal – is the intent. Then it gets a little more difficult, as he did not feel that the Chair should not be able to support all the applicants in a submission round. He proposed that the Chair/Coordinator simply say that they have reviewed it rather than to support it.

360. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) recommended the three-member panel would value the feedback from the Chair of the WGs, of the relative priority against work plan of the proposals, etc.

361. Ms. Diana Solovyeva (Scaly-sided Merganser TF) sought clarification on how the transfers will be made, whether the Secretariat can send funds directly to the institute or from the researcher. The concern was that in Russia an overhead is immediately charged and so only a private bank account.

362. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that even if the project is from the government in the flyway, it is difficult for the funds to go to the government. During the discussion with the proponent, it is made transparent by including the government focal point in the communication.

363. Mr. Jonathan Slaght (WCS) agreed that the opinion of the Chair of the WG or TF is important, but it is useful to support.
364. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT, Baer's Pochard TF) supported the suggestion from Mr. Slaght and considered it was important to clarify it in the document. Australia recommended suggesting deleting #5 if it was acceptable.
365. Ms. Birgita Dalene Hansen (Australasian Wader Studies Group) – mentioned that some organizations need evidence from the granting body that there is no support to institutional support and noted that removing paragraph 5 would cause a problem. Mr. Slaght suggested text changes and it was recognized that appropriate wording was needed.
366. There was a discussion on the dates and months of the calls. Mr. Geoff Richardson sought the advice of the Secretariat.
367. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested 1 Feb as the date for the close of application and 6 months later for the second. Call of the proposal will be 1 January and 6 months later. Announcements of successful projects will be made on 1 March.
368. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) referred to the need to support Site managers which would require wording change in the original decision.
369. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) responded that opening the fund for site managers, no proposed text received and so the Rev.1 does not mention it at this point.
370. Chair – any objection to Mr. Srey's proposal.
371. Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia) mentioned that from the previous day's discussion with the initiative of Singapore, there was a support to the suggestion to make the fund available to site managers. We agreed to review the decision in MOP9 and thereafter there was the opportunity to extend the grant to be open to site managers.
372. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified the need for a decision from Partners to decide as to whether the fund would be a general fund to also include the site managers or focus on WGs and TFs.
373. Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust) reflected that the criteria would be totally different, and aspects would be different, so need to keep them separate and to set up a separate fund.
374. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) highlighted that the fund was only 30K and there are 14 WG and TF, there is not enough funding for each to receive funds, so he proposed a separate fund for site managers. A lot of the CEPA activities are trying to go to site managers that may be funded by the Partnership.
375. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) supported the importance of the site managers. But the current proposal has been consulted on several times and the proposal to extend it has not been considered. He suggested that we need to keep this as a separate piece of work which is needed after the MOP to find

- support for the Flyway site managers. Request for a recorded action for the development of a separate action to ensure support to the FSN managers through a separate fund by MOP11. This was also supported by Japan and Singapore.
376. Ms. Shufen Yang (Singapore) suggested to include it and appreciates the explanation. Agrees that the funds are limited and that in document 8, Objective 1 of the Secretariat work plan, there were some funds to support the FSN. In the long term a new fund should be set up and, in the interim, sought to clarify if there are sites that need help, these funds could be used.
377. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested looking within the budget to separate another budget line if we were to set up a new fund. Can Partners propose that it be 30K a year?
378. Ms. Shufen Yang(Singapore) highlighted a subtotal of 30K for 2019 and 2020 each in Document 8 Annex III, objective 1, activity 1.1 and 1.2. to provide advice and technical support to SIS, organize workshops and consultancies.
379. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested obj 1, activity 1.1. description of the activity could be expanded to cover both technical support and management of sites.
380. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) proposed it was important to keep the two issues separate and come back to it later. He accepted the suggestion of Singapore was sensible and would come back to this later. In conclusion, in the absence of any objections, the meeting agreed that the current small grant fund would remain strictly for the WGs and TF only in the decision document.
381. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) introduced changes to the revised decision paper, with suggested edits to reduce the reporting requirement.
382. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) recommended that the applicant be required to submit a final report, as well as text to the Secretariat to the website/newsletter; so, two reporting requirements.
383. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) suggested a final report should be provided within 3 months of the completion of the project, rather than on a specific date.
384. Mr. Robb Kaler (Chair, Seabird WG Chair) noted it was important to have a timeline.
385. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that a budget table and timetable be included in the contract in which the report is written. Mr. Jonathan Slaght (WCS) suggested a 1-month reporting after the completion of the project. Chair and Australia supported 3 months. Mr. Geoff (Australia) highlighted that in the Box 3, project plan, timeline, and methods which should include clarity on the timeline.
386. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT, Baer's Pochard TF) highlighted that the WG/TF work at a lower level below the EAAFP strategic priorities, so there was a need to consider that these are not covered by the WG/TF. He proposed for text to be added to refer to WG and TF priorities instead.
387. Mr. Abdulmula Hamza (Seabird WG) suggested to simplify the form by removing all details of Chair/TF other than name and email contact, this was agreed by Australia and Chair. He also sought clarification

of what would be required in 7. References. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified these should be scientific references cited in the application with a footnote.

388. Mr. Jonathan Slaght (WCS) noted that guidance needed to review the proposal and technical committee has submitted wording for coding. Mr. Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) – to be re-sent.
389. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT, Baer's Pochard TF) suggested that results be announced on 1 March.
390. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) proposed that scientific references cited in the proposed change to Literature Cited, need to include WG and Chair contact details and that the scheme was not limited that it is \$5000/group, this should be clarified.
391. Mr. Richard (Australia) and Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) clarified that the scheme offered \$5,000 per project and proposals were to be approved on their merit and not limited to one group. Mr. Lew Young proposed the timing should within two months announced. Chair requested Australia to work on a revised document.

Decision. 11- Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document

392. Rev.1 was not up on the website and the Secretariat was awaiting feedback, so discussion was proposed.

Decision. 12- Development of a Conservation Status Review of Migratory Waterbird Populations for the EAAFP

393. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) referred to Rev.1 on the Conservation Status Review which had received comments from Australia and highlighted that only some of the text change and edits had been made to the document. Edits to paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 were read out and included in the document by the Secretariat.
394. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) requested for any comments or objections to accepting Draft Decision. 12. None were heard.

Decision. 13- Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region

395. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) requested feedback on Draft Decision. 13 *Migratory Species of Conservation Concern in the ASEAN Region* from Southeast Asian Partners.
396. Ms. Yang Shufen (Singapore) confirmed that Singapore has provided comments by email and confirmed that these amendments were minor and reflected discussions. In particular, ASEAN was changed to Southeast Asia and the document revised an information paper. Further discussion was suspended until the email could be located.
397. Draft Decision. 13 was revisited by Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) who clarified that the word ASEAN has been changed to Southeast Asia throughout and in general the paper has been changed from a decision to an information paper. The Secretariat will repost this revised document as a Rev.1 for the decision on Friday.

Decision. 01- EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028

398. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) requested an update from the Strategic Plan TF.
399. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) reported that Draft Decision. 01 *EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028* was presented on Monday, reiterated the value of the workshop held in Singapore and reported that three valuable sessions have also been held during this MOP. As a result, many edits and changes have been made including to the wording and emphasis. This document with all amendments will go up on the website today and Mr. Spray encouraged Partners to review this in as much detail as possible before Friday. A clean document will also go on the website, with the intention to have a discussion and ratify the document on Friday. Mr. Spray also clarified with regards to Objective 2 about CEPA that many KRAs have been removed because this was repeating the CEPA Action Plan, so now the CEPA Action Plan will be appended instead. Further clarified that 3.2.2 is still in the document but there is a note that this will be moved to an operational plan which has not been developed.
400. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) and Ding Li Yong (BirdLife International) clarified that the “Key threats” column in Table 1 should be removed.
401. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) confirmed that comments on Draft Decision. 02 *CEPA Strategy and Action Plan 2017-2021* have been received and a Rev.1 will be uploaded.
402. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) revisited Annex 1 EAAFP organizational structure table in Draft Decision. 03 *Organizational Structure of the EAAFP*.

Decision. 03-Organizational Structure of the EAAFP

403. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (WI) reminded Partners that there was a discussion that the Science Unit and Secretariat boxes in Annex 1 should not be separate if the Science Unit is part of the Secretariat.
404. Draft Decision. 03 was adopted with the above amendment.

Decision. 04- Update on the Appointment and Work of the Interim TsC

405. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) requested an update from Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) on Draft Decision. 04 *Update on the Appointment and Work of the Interim TsC*.
406. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) confirmed that the TsC has been replaced with Technical Sub-committee throughout Draft Decision. 04 reflecting the updated organizational structure in Annex 1 of Draft Decision. 03 and that “Secretariat and Science Unit” has been replaced with “Secretariat including Science Unit”. Final Rev.2 document will be presented for adoption on Friday.

Decision .05- Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat

407. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) requested an update on Draft Decision. 05 *Establishment of the Science Unit for EAAFP Secretariat*.

408. Ms. Qing Zeng (Science officer, EAAFP Science Unit) reported revisions to Draft Decision. 05 including clarifying mechanics for cooperation. In the funding section, it has been made clear that the CEEAF will be responsible for fundraising for the Science Unit and clarified that \$1.5 million for 5 years operation has been already secured. The text has been added in additional places to highlight the cooperative relationship with the TsC. Additional “other duties” have also been added, including that scientific outputs will be reviewed by the TsC and by WGs and TFs as needed.
409. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) confirmed that the revised document has not yet been uploaded but will be and this item put forward again for consideration and adoption on Friday.

Decision. 07- Small Grants Awards Template.

410. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) requested an update on Draft Decision. *07 Small Grants Awards Template.*
411. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) clarified that further changes were made following the morning session, including that that WG or TF Chair should provide a statement about the merit of the application against assessment criteria. Have also added a 1-5 ranking scheme for assessment. To reduce the reporting burden, only a final report and an article is needed for the EAAFP website OR newsletter but not both.
412. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) invited comments.
413. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) suggested that “completion of the project” be changed to “completion of the small grant project” in sections referring to the final report.
414. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) asked if there was a provision in the document to liaise with the country focal points.
415. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) confirmed that this was a new issue being raised so was not currently reflected in the document.
416. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) suggested further discussion.
417. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) asked for clarification on the request relating to the role of country focal points.
418. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) confirmed that there is language around the applicant being required to secure relevant permits etc. and this could be amended to reflect this request.
419. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) clarified that this was being raised in case the project involved any sensitive local issues and to ensure that the country focal point was involved in the discussion and suggested that consultation with country focal point be added to the responsibilities of the lead investigator.

- 420. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) raised the question of whether projects would be feasible to complete within the timeframe if country focal points also needed to be consulted in addition to the grants process.
- 421. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) felt that consultation with a country focal point was less onerous than consultation with country Partners.
- 422. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) agreed that this was clear.
- 423. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) raised that this document could be revised at the next MOP and amended as needed. Further raised that the grant of \$5,000 is very small and should not be overly burdensome to the proponent.
- 424. Ms. Diana Solovyeva (Scaly-sided Merganser TF) agreed that it may be onerous to consult on all projects with the country Partner focal points.
- 425. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) reminded the group that the Secretariat will report back to the next MOP on the progress/success of the small grant's project and that revisions could be made then as needed based on the experience of the applicants and Secretariat.
- 426. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) requested that contact information for country focal points and WG and TF Chairs be amended to the end of the document to assist applicants.
- 427. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) confirmed that WG and TF Chairs are currently on the EAAFP website and there is an intention to add country focal points.
- 428. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) then requested a reference to the correct section of the website on the document.
- 429. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) asked that the decision is approved by the Partners. Seeing no objections Draft Decision. 07 was approved.

Decision 11- Amendment to Appendix III of the Partnership Document

- 430. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) asked for an update on Draft Decision. 11.
- 431. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) reviewed further revisions to the document since Tuesday, which included softening some language relating to the Seabird WG's tasks.
- 432. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) asked for approval for Draft Decision. 11. Seeing no objections, Draft Decision. 11 was approved.

AGENDA ITEM 10: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, CORPORATE'S ENGAGEMENT

Agenda Item 10.1: Lotek Wireless Inc

433. Ms. Catalina Amaya-Perilla (Lotek) gave a presentation on the various tracking technologies that can be used for migratory bird tracking. VHF radio-tagging was the first tracking technology used and is still effective for some projects, and this technology has been used for the release of captive birds and monitoring survival. Another option is light-based geolocators, which are suitable when birds can be recaptured and for long distance information. Pros include small size; cons include inaccuracies and need to recapture. Beijing Swift Project is an example of a project using this technology. GPS is also suitable when birds can be recaptured and has much-improved accuracy compared with light-based geolocators. The smallest unit is 1g, still unsuitably large for some birds, and is energy hungry. Pinpoint Argos is an option that does not require recapture. The smallest is 3.5g and has GPS accuracy. A solar tag with GPS accuracy has been developed but is still quite large. GPS Iridium is even more accurate, but is only suitable for large birds, and has the provision for two-way communication with the tag so that schedules can be changed remotely without bird recapture. GPS Iridium also includes a mortality signal. If recapture is not possible and a 1g tag is too large, VHF: Beeper and Coded is an option. This is best suited for presence/absence studies. Fixed stations log birds carrying VHF: Beeper and Coded tags when they fly past the station. MOTUS Network is an example of a large collaborative project using this technology in the Americas; this has also begun to be rolled out in Australia for bats and finches. This type of technology could be very useful for the EAAFP as it works well when there is a highly cooperative group working over a large area. Has been hugely effective for determining migratory patterns of small birds in other flyways.
434. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) reaffirmed how impressive these technologies are and how fast they are developing. Asked how close a bird needs to get to a VHF: Beeper and Coded base station to be detected.
435. Ms. Catalina Amaya-Perilla (Lotek) clarified that the answer depends on the details of the array and the situation. In some cases, detections can be done over 5km. The higher the antenna is placed, the larger the range, and whether there is canopy cover or not greatly affects the detection range.
436. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) asked if there is any potential to raise an antenna with a drone so that it can be non-static.
437. Ms. Catalina Amaya-Perilla (Lotek) clarified that plane-based technologies are being used but can be challenging and are not generally used with the VHF Coded tags.

Agenda Item 10.2: Sony

438. Mr. Liu Dongyang (Marketing Manager, Sony China) gave a presentation on the advantages of Sony Digital cameras. Different types of cameras are developed for different customers. Interchangeable lenses are most suited to professionals while photo-fixed lenses are most suited to enthusiasts. The biggest differences are the size of the image sensor (larger on interchangeable lenses) and the interchangeability of the lenses. Photo-fixed lenses have the advantage of being more compact.
439. Interchangeable lenses for professionals or high-use hobbyists have had two industry changes: 1 – mirrorless shift (versus DSLR) – Sony is the leading brand in the mirrorless market; 2 – full-frame shift – Sony is also the leading brand in this segment. The first full-frame mirrorless camera was launched in

2013. These are compact and have high resolution, good for wildlife photography, and excellent for image enlargement. Also, can get high sensitivity by having high ISO that doesn't reduce image quality – showed a video to illustrate this. Sony has also led improvements to move from mechanical shutter to electronic shutter to improve shutter speed and reduce noise. Helps to track flying subjects. Also introduced Sony Eye AF which automatically keeps focusing on the nearest eye. Sony achievements are directly linked to their in-house innovation. Full frame cameras are excellent for wildlife and some photos were shown. The video capabilities of the cameras are also excellent. Mr. Dongyang invited all delegates to visit the Sony booth.

AGENDA ITEM 11: SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Agenda Item 11.1: Mud, Glorious Mud

440. Ms. Micha Jackson is a Ph.D. student under Prof. Richard Fuller at Queensland University, Brisbane, Australia. Presentation on behalf of Mr. Nick Murray at the University of New South Wales, Sydney. Work developed by a large team, led by Nick. As we all know, tidal flats are very important habitat; they provide ecosystem services such as cleaning water, air and supporting sustainable fisheries. Tidal flats are also immensely important for migratory shorebirds; most of them get their energy resources for their long migrations from the tidal flats of this region. However, these tidal flats have been under intense pressure from huge human populations along the coast, land reclamation, fisheries etc. Satellite image from Bohai Bay in China in 1976 shows an intact area of tidal flats; compare with the image from 2009 that shows much of tidal flat has been removed; new land has been created. That is why it is hugely welcome news about China's new policy to ban further land reclamation.

Nick Murray's study from 2014 was the first study to map the change in tidal map extent over time; on the slide, the red areas have lost tidal flats between 1950-2000s; we've lost around 66% of tidal flats in this area in the last few decades; but it's not only reclamation that causes loss, other causes are a lack of sedimentation, sea level rise, changes in hydrology. This mudflats map is just a snapshot; what about tidal flats in rest of the world? Comparing the yellow sea with the rest of world, the rate of loss in the Yellow Sea is similar to the loss of tropical rainforest in other areas – severe. A global mud map: main question – what is the global distribution of tidal flats and their status? First step was a global map of tidal flats; and a time series (change over time); then quantifying that change. The Global mud map project requirements: no image-by-image analysis; no tide models; used free data – Google Earth engine; overcome the issue of clouds and tides (satellite images sometimes covered by clouds or sea water at high tide), computational limits; high resolution; time-series for global monitoring; global maps with local relevance.

Project stats: 707,528 images were analysed; that's 30 billion pixels with 56 predictors and 11 time steps; equivalent to 22,000 computers (or 25 years on a single computer); now have 11 global maps at 30m resolution from 1984-2016. Overall result – the map shows hotspots – all the yellow areas have relatively small amounts of tidal flats; only a few regions that have a high volume of tidal flats in coastal zones; Reclamation time series map – every time the colour changes in the animation is one of the time steps; darker colours are older maps and green and yellow are newer; the final map shows 11 time series stacked together – the blue and purple were tidal flats by showing some of examples (Incheon airport, Brisbane, Beach dynamics – Netherlands, Stable tidal flats in Vancouver – Canada, and India)

Overall picture: 17% global decline in 30 years in the world; different rates in different localities. What happens next? The results will be published very soon; a new web APP will be launched where global mud maps and time series will be freely available; New projects: Analysis of mudflat protection and protected area effectiveness; maps for salt marsh and mangroves; automated alert systems for tidal flat change (e.g if area starts to lose mudflats quickly, a system will produce an alert). For more information, see the contact slide – Mr. Nick Murray, Prof. Richard Fuller www.murrayensis.org

441. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) questioned if the mapping includes salt-marshes and mangroves.
442. Ms. Micha Jackson (University of Queensland) believes so but best to email Mr. Nick Murray to make sure; understand that salt marshes are not included.

Agenda Item 11.2: Party Secretary of Hengshui Lake in China (important site for critically endangered Baer's Pochard)

443. Mr. Wang Jingwu (Hengshui Party Secretary) showed his heartfelt appreciation to the Forestry and Grassland Administration; friends of EAAFP; on behalf of the Baer's Pochard TF, he presented about Hengshui Lake which is in eastern Hebei, China. The local government attaches great importance to the preservation of natural resources; we have one lake and nine water sources; the main wetland has both class 1 and class 2 protected birds under the Wildlife Conservation Law. The lake is 163.65 sq. Km in total. Promotion of clean air and water. In 2006, The site was upgraded to a national nature reserve. In this area we have class 1 and class 2 endangered species. In fact, we have observed 324 different species (76 migratory), "49+2" nationally protected species. it is also a very important staging point for migratory birds; in 2016 Hengshui became a Flyway Network Site to protect these birds; in 2016 we observed 308 Baer's Pochards – the largest count observed in recent years; The site is a major habitat for Baer's Pochard and in March 2018 the first meeting of the Baer's Pochard TF was held; 15 countries sent delegates; in that conference the Secretariat of EAAFP designated Hengshui Lake as key site for Baer's Pochard; in 2011, in order to protect the lake, they established a site management committee and currently we have 450 people working on administration and management in this area; they have also expanded the management area to 2.9m square meters; in the Jizhou area, we plan to integrate more; in order to improve the water quality and water level; they have involved more bureaus and institutions; all of this has upgraded the sustainable development of the Lake's ecological environment. They also need to strengthen research on wetland protection and so we are working with the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing Forestry University and Hengshui University; Mr. Wu Dayong has established a local TF and started a research project; our efforts and development of the Lake have attracted the attention of relevant institutions; they have worked with the China research office for wetlands and have co-established observation stations in Hengshui Lake; in 2016 the German government invested 50 million Euro in this area; we have received grants and support and have developed a local action plan for BP at Hengshui; working with international Partners, they have organized several workshops, seminars and academic exchanges; we hope to gain wisdom from different parties; in 2016 regulations and legislation to protect Hengshui Lake were approved; the Hebei National People's Congress approved the protection of water quality in September 2018. They have devoted a lot of attention to the protection of wetlands – we've established real time surveillance, law enforcement stations at the breeding sites, closed 413 polluting enterprises and taken back control of 13,791 acres of artificial aquaculture; villages have been

relocated to minimize disturbance and we are now further promoting education to engage the local community, using the local media to educate local people. Before, many Hengshui Lake villagers were engaged in fishing; now they have moved out of that area and have other jobs; four of the villagers became volunteers and eight schools have joined the protection effort.

444. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) mentioned, that was a very enlightening presentation and the results of his efforts for Baer's Pochard are clear to see.
445. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) also congratulated the tremendous effort the city has made for Baer's Pochard, a critically endangered and high priority species for this Flyway. It is remarkable what he has been achieved and it inspires us all by showing what can be done.
446. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) also congratulated on his work on this species, a priority for the bilateral treaty between Russia and China on migratory birds. This gives us great encouragement to work more and harder to protect this and other species that we share in our Flyway.

AGENDA ITEM 12: Draft Decision

Agenda Item 12.1: [Document 14](#)

447. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) will put the review session of strategic plan to the last.
448. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) Over the last few days, the Secretariat has uploaded all the documents; we can see on this slide whether the document is final or a revised version; nearly all have now been finalized except doc 14 – the information paper on key short-distance migratory species in South East Asia; revision 3 is on website now. Any comments from South East Asian nations?
449. Ms. Shufen Yang (Singapore) requested to change the title from "ASEAN" to "South East Asia" to be consistent with other papers.
450. Amendment made. Document 14 was approved without any further comments.

Agenda Item 12.2: [Decision. 02](#)

451. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan, CEPA WG) questioned if there were some comments on proposed CEPA action plan from Partners.
452. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) responded; no comments were received.
453. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan, CEPA WG) requested to delete the words of "strategy" in the title as It is not a strategy paper, and to change the timeframe to 2019 – 2024.
454. Draft Decision. 02 was approved without any further comments.

Agenda Item 12.3: [Decision. 04](#)

455. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) corrected that the following decision on organizational structure, has changed the word “Committee” to “sub-Committee” throughout the document. Also, one minor editorial change to reflect that the Science Unit is part of the Secretariat.

456. Draft Decision. 04 was approved without any further comments.

Agenda Item 12.4: [Decision. 05](#)

457. Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit) reported the group discussion was very effective; they had some small edits on the structure of the unit, delete the financial elements and also some changes on the administration aspects; on funding, also delete some of the information which they provided to the Secretariat before – one sentence is enough: “CEAAF is responsible for fundraising....” is enough; on “other duties” there are some edits on the general principles.. not necessary to include “other duties”; they made clear that they will not duplicate the work of Partners; this is the final editing and thank you all.

458. Draft Decision. 05 was approved without any further comments.

Agenda Item 12.5: [Decision. 12](#)

459. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) raised that the changes they suggested are not reflected in para 3 – currently the statement says “in consultation with Partners” – they stated last time that it should also include “technical sub-Committee, Science Unit of the Secretariat” before “Partners...”; next point – para 4 – please add words at end of the first sentence “ensure that the output of the periodic” and delete “updates” and change “Review” to “Reviews”. The Partners accepted the change.

460. Draft Decision. 12 is approved without any further comments.

Agenda Item 12.6: [Decision. 01](#)

461. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) thanked the excellent support of the Secretariat and highlighted the importance of the paper which included the direction for the next 10 years, vision, and mission. Through the 18 months of consultations and workshops, they were able to go through page by page.

462. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) introduced the introductory element – the highlighted area in green is not word change, but simply rearranged where they sit; have made some changes to the flow and some minor changes in “Purpose and Goal of the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028”; the structure is still very much that of the original draft; the section on “Evaluation and Review” has some new words to clarify and tighten up of the language; there is a new para requiring Partners to produce reports to MOP; the Resourcing Plan is still the same; the first component has been restructured with some small wording added.

463. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) went through the changes of each objective. On objective 1.1 the word “managed” has been deleted as it is dealt with in Indicator 1.3. Throughout the plan they have decided

to refer to “migratory waterbirds and their habitats” instead of “wetlands”; on 1.3.2 they talk about brand having greater recognition for flyway sites. Objective 1.3.3 talks about international standards. For objective 2, they have taken out all KRAs apart from one – as the CEPA action plan has been ahead of the game and our KRAs were repeating, so they now just refer to that action plan. In objective 3, 3.1 now has an additional Indicator, there is a question mark over whether it’s operational or an Indicator; now they will leave it here; 3.2.1 the word “available” deals with “maintained” – just tightening up wording.

464. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) asked to go back to Objective 3.2. Recognizing conservation review that precedes Partnership with the latest information and where new information is available it’s important that the status reviews are produced periodically. He asked the meaning of “periodically” means that the sentence doesn’t say when these will be produced. In 3.2.2 it’s highlighted as an important Indicator; good to see 3.2.2 is there but they wondered why they knocked it out from the KRA itself.
465. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) explained that “periodically” doesn’t specify a time – a period can be lengthy; it isn’t clear; they don’t have a problem with that word being there but it’s a bit vague.
466. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) suggested changing “produced and updated to KR3.2”. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) and Partners accepted the request.
467. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) went through 3.5.1, 3.5.2. Under Objective 4 - on 4.1.1 the word “skills” was dropped because the feeling was with “skills”, they would require on-site training, but other aspects could be done with documentation. In 4.1.3, a new Indicator is added – an online technical training manual with words of “used by at least 50% of flyway site managers.”
468. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) raised the necessity of the creation of a new training manual as there is the existence of a number of training manuals already, e.g. by AEWA.
469. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) asked the clarification of the meaning of the number “50%” in the objective.
470. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) explained that considering the current ambition and realism, setting almost impossible targets will cause disappointment; “at least 50%” is a good goal and is one that is reasonable throughout the 10 years period.
471. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) questioned, on Indicator 4.1.3, although it fits with KRA 4.1, it might be useful to specify what the scope of the technical training manual, so he suggested the new words - “for flyway sites or Flyway Network Site managers” and asked the exact timeline of the implementation.
472. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) still insisted on keeping it open without changes.
473. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) commented that there is a lot of work already on this subject.
474. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) explained that it’s become obvious that this Indicator seemed odd to be under just one KRA; need a reporting process for all Partners for all activities; so maybe not just here but also in the evaluation and review section to state “reporting by Partners to MOP is an essential

element” so broadening that one Indicator to be applicable across the whole strategic plan. Happy to provide that wording if it’s acceptable.

475. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG): The success of the evaluation document is based on reporting which we all know has issues; not everyone reports and, when they do, not everyone is comprehensive, so our ability to judge how we are doing is incomplete; glad to have this point but would like to challenge the Secretariat to think more about how we evaluate our performance; social science information is available that could enhance what we are doing.
476. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) suggested putting the amendment on the screen after the coffee break.
477. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) added that it’s an all-encompassing statement that sets the scene for the next 10 years. On Objective 5 – 5.1 - “transboundary” is added as this is about flyway-wide.
478. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) asked for the clarification of the “transboundary”.
479. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) explained that it’s more about emphasizing it’s about across countries.
480. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) suggested to remove “transboundary” and add “across national boundaries” at the end.
481. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) accepted the change and reflected.
482. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) opened the question, which countries will be a priority area according to Objective 5.3 priority areas defined.
483. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) said the two priority regional areas will be the Yellow Sea TF and ASEAN and suggest identifying more in future MOPs.
484. Mr. Doug Watkins (CAFF) said it is needed for national government Partners to initiate activities to address cross-border issues; if a body doesn’t have a task to identify what those priorities are, that is fine; but success only comes if Partners are motivated to do so.
485. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) opened the floor to ASEAN region.
486. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) said the wording gives a mandate for the Yellow Sea TF (YS TF) to do critical evaluation of priorities; in YS TF evaluating, how to maintain relevance in a changing situation. The wording here is appropriate as we live in a dynamic world, so trying to be over-prescriptive is not appropriate; up to us to provide the leadership at the right time.
487. Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (WI) said, in 5.2.3, the target is not realistic and suggested setting a deliverable target. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) recommended removing the word “all” not to be explicated and agreed with Mr. Ward Hagemeyer’s opinion. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) agreed.

488. Mr. Ward Hagemeijer (WI) suggested setting a percentage of populations that require a certain status. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) accepted the comments and changed.
489. Mr. Ward Hagemeijer (WI) suggested using official names of organizations (e.g., BirdLife International and Wetlands International).
490. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) suggested that term of national boundaries needs to be reflected elsewhere in Objective 5.1.
491. Mr. Doug Watkins (CAFF) said the reporting template has not been updated but the indicators will be added in detail. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) added the main changes are in the “evaluation and reporting” section.
492. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia) mentioned earlier that the reporting template will need work to be consistent with the new strategic plan, such as the wording that the TF will update the draft report template. He also suggested that under 9 decisions, at the end of the second bullet, after “MOP11.” “updated by the TF in consultation with all Partners and the Technical sub-Committee by December 2019” should be inserted. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) accepted the change. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) suggested to insert “December 2019” after “EAAFP Resourcing Plan.”
493. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand): This document is ready for submission to the MOP; a lot of technical and editorial review; does have several consequential impacts but eventually we have to say, “this is our document, let’s implement it” and leave it to the Partners to implement; cannot wordsmith it to be perfect; there requires a review process.
494. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) requested the clarification of the point raised by Thailand – they probably need a glossary to explain certain terms.
495. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) recognized the efforts of TF members at the end. The strategy was adopted.

Agenda Item: Taskforce and Working Groups report.

496. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) invited all TF and WGs to report back of the discussions during MOP10.
497. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) reported the discussions at CEPA WG meeting and showed the support of the formation of Dalmatian TF at next MOP but as not all major players are here, he said the update to Secretariat will be made further.
498. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand, Chair, Yellow Sea TF) reported that the **YS TF** has met twice at MOP 10; first to receive a few reports on collaborative work going on; realized that the current TOR are now outdated and need to be restructured to take the changes and the amount of work ongoing into account. The identification of 3-4 specific areas where we should focus: supporting specific projects, being a conduit for thus working in Yellow Sea and communications; the drafting of a proposed work programme

is to continue as a TF on behalf of the Partnership; a brief to review Terms of Reference and purpose; to carry on support for specific projects in YS with various leaders.

499. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) asked Partners to endorse the continuation of the TF, TOR, and its Strategic plan and their workplan.
500. Mr. Yu Yat Tung (Black-faced Spoonbill TF) reported on BFS TF; The participants from the Republic of Korea, Japan, and China joined the meeting. The key discussion point was to identify more experts and centralize the database of color banding and develop a concrete species information sheet. He even mentioned broadening the plan for satellite tracking and color banding to DPRK in the future. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) added on TF will lead the identification of new BFS site as new FNS.
501. Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia, illegal Hunting TF) reported on the discussion of Illegal Hunting TF (IHTF); The TF met twice at MOP with more than 50 participants; 9 full members including 56 countries – Cambodia, Australia, Russia, Mongolia, Bangladesh plus CMS, CAFF, WCS and BirdLife International showed interest in joining the membership; Thailand is joining as an observer; meetings were held on the sides of the MOP, including a meetings of CMS Parties where it was discussed how IHTF would work with the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force to Address Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the East-Asian-Australasian Flyway (ITTEA); it was agreed that EAAFP IHTF would lead on waterbirds and that members would engage fully; will use electronic communications between MOPs; Secretariat will be provided with updates.
502. Mr. Srey (Chair, IHTF) will report back to MOPs, Australia was elected Vice-Chair. BirdLife Asia in collaboration with governments will prepare a situation analysis of illegal hunting in SE Asia – this will include an academic review, national legal frameworks and an assessment of taking in SE Asia. It will be contracted from April 2019 to March 2020 and contact with national governments will be via EAAFP focal contact points. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) added comments; Guangdong Province has announced a complete ban on all wild bird hunting (2019-2023); announcement will put in a restriction of sale and use of mist nets in Guangdong; lots of positive moves on tackling illegal hunting; a bit regretful that in AMBI and last MOP on Singapore discussed formation of IHTF but not positively consulted and pushed out without a good regional consultation.
503. Mr. Robert Kaler (Seabird WG) reported on Seabird WG. The plan includes to identify and nominate seabird specific Flyway Network Sites; convene symposium or workshop at the third world seabird conference in Tasmania in Oct 2020; focus on EAAF seabird conservation priorities and knowledge gaps; promote and work with scientific unit and TsC for scheme of colour marking of seabirds within EAAF flyway; identified 5 tern species and developed information sheets – will pass to flyway Secretariat for review and uploaded to website (Aleutian Tern, Chinese Crested Tern, Little Tern etc.); will move on to more species; continue to assess population status and identify trends (see seabird.net); support creation of Dalmatian pelican TF and will assist with designing workshop to develop objectives. Mr. Rob Tailor nominated to continue as Chair and Tom? as coordinator; Ms. Diana Slolovyeva (Scaly-sided Merganser TF) commented that Sea ducks falling through the cracks. My suggestion is to include them in either of the groups. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) said the Sea ducks belong to Anatidae. No objections and it was adopted.

504. Mr. Phil Straw (CEPA WG): On behalf of the Chair, CEPA has a huge task ahead of us and needs to report back to MOP; CEPA and communications are one of the biggest challenges; need to develop a comprehensive report back.
505. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) reported back on work programme for next two years. Allowing Partners to fit in agenda where most appropriate; fit under 4 categories – 1. supporting verification and monitoring of internationally important shorebird sites; 2. supporting conservation of shorebird species (develop conservation plan for Nordmann’s Greenshank and supporting survey and monitoring of important surveys and work towards developing TF for this species); 3. supporting capacity building for shorebird conservation and management; 4. enhancing comms relating to shorebird conservation. Good discussion about having shorebird science conference between MOPs; heard from quite a few members that it is of interest, working towards identifying a local site to hold the meeting – presentations on research and applied conservation on research issues; anyone who may be able to hold such a meeting? The value in hosting – if held at a particular site, it highlights your specific issue/area/species so has added value in drawing an international crowd in the sites; maybe 2020 will be first meeting. Also establishing Facebook group EAAF Shorebird Conservation Network; other specific items under those 4 items. Also appointed two coordinators –Mr. David Lee (Singapore) focusing on monitoring efforts; Mr. Phil Straw working on CEPA activities; have amended ToR to reflect that; ask meeting to accept that the SWG will continue for two more years, that they accept our 2019-2020 work programme, revised TOR and accept idea that I would continue to Chair group with the two coordinators. Mr. Robert Kaler (Seabird WG): Loons and divers in terms of ref for seabird WG, so not fallen through cracks, but seabirds not included in our group.
506. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) responded that the new contacts will be updated on the website.
507. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) suggested organizing a meeting at the International Ornithological Conference in Melbourne, 2022.
508. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI, Avian Influenza WG); it has not got the attention of Partners in recent past; group communicating through listserv but it appears that no priorities have been identified and based on the report provided to the Secretariat, both coordinators (FAO and WI) have been on since 2006; hope to find fresh blood; so far not found a suitable volunteer; need to discuss with Secretariat a way to continue WG; has been active and now an opportunity to discuss which activities may be required in future; WI is happy to discuss but at the moment no plan forward for the WG.
509. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) highlighted the fact we need to have that WG and sometimes its work is quiet and will have a watching brief and requested the needs to renew Terms of Reference as loathe to lose the WG.
510. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) concluded that the AI TF will continue technically but some works to look at TOR and discuss how best to keep this group’s capacity; that work falls on MC and the Secretariat.
511. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) supported to have this group, even if in waiting mode; the Technical sub-committee is willing and able to help by looking at the TOR; although not always active, we need the group to become active fast if required; will have a contact person in the Technical sub-committee to work with avian influenza group.

512. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) raised the group to get together to discuss effectiveness of WGs and TFs, and proposed Mr. McKinlay to look at it and maybe include as an agenda item after lunch.
513. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee); If no other WGs or TFs, they have identified Technical Sub-committee members to link with the WGs and TFs; once they've submitted revised work plans for the next cycle, make sure Secretariat shares with Technical Sub-committee so they can understand what they are trying to do so we can identify issues and how best to support.
514. Mr. Richard Hearn (WWT) raised the general question about the renewal process of WGs and TFs; BPTF interested to hear from Partners to confirm the go ahead for the BP-TF work programme for the next two years.
515. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP): some groups wanted to report and ask for support.
516. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) said it's appropriate for such groups and TFs to de facto continue their work unless otherwise advised. So, no need to ask for official support to continue. On the flip side, if there is a WG or TF that is inactive, maybe we need a mechanism to establish the issue, with the Technical Sub-committee watching briefs on TFs and WGs. The Technical Sub-committee reviews show us what is happening in each group and identifies if there are any groups that might be in that position so that consultations can be had with the Chairs to discuss ways ahead.

AGENDA ITEM 13: SPECIAL PRESENTATION, EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EAAFP WGs AND TFs

517. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) delivered a special presentation with the following key points and he will have written bulleted report to Secretariat by Jan 2019 and may have decision document by next MOP.
- *What is the difference between WGs and TFs?* TFs focus on specific action items and more short-lived; WGs broader, longer term; four types – species-specific, geographic-based, topic-driven, broader taxon groupings.
 - *What roles are WG and TF playing?* Identifying knowledge gaps and coordinating prioritising and promoting activities related to the WG or TF; obtaining resources to implement action items.
 - *When should a WG or TF form?* Partners and Secretariat thought an issue was important and went to group and ask to form a group; or other cases, individuals about specific species (e.g., Norman;'s Greenshank)
 - *How should they dissolve?* Inactive for 2 MOPs? No active members can be found. When WG or TF objectives achieved.
 - *Roles of Chairs and Coordinators.* Chairs communicate with Secretariat and members; help implement plan (cheerleader, prompting people), reviewing small-grant applications, scheduling and facilitating meetings and preparing notes associate with meetings.
 - *Coordinators* – help Chair and help develop strategy and work plans, take on specific tasks assigned by Chair or members; represent the Chair.

- *Should WGs and TFs interact?* Not necessary but ok if needed, e.g., SBS under Shorebird TF. Not necessary to fit under a hierarchical framework; all WGs and TFs wanted to remain independent of each other; benefit for WGs and TFs to interact.
- *Should the WGs and TFs have work plans?* Variable responses but most thought should have at least a 2-year priority list but longer term plans may be helpful, but some thought issues moving too fast to have a two year plan.
- *How will success be evaluated?* Could go directly to Secretariat or TSC – need to clarify preferred option to avoid multiple reports; appropriate for Chairs to have 5-10 min period at MOP to talk about what they are doing; it's happening a little but maybe should be more structured – Secretariat could ask TFs and WGs in advance.
- *Should WGs and TFs priorities overlap with EAAFP Strategic Plan?* Most said yes.
- *How should WGs and TFs interact with TSC?* Need to clarify who the group's report to – TSC or Secretariat? And how TSC responds to the groups? Can they advise on specific needs? And they can identify issues of concern across the groups.
- *What support do we get from the Secretariat?* Umbrella group with which to associate; communications (website etc.); financial support; motivation, inspiration, and words of wisdom.
- *What do WGs and TFs want from EAAFP Secretariat?* All above plus grant writing assistance/project management; concise relevant and effective reporting requirements and generally to be left alone.
- *How can WGs and TFs be most effective?* Clear goals and objectives; find good, inspirational, and motivated leaders; find good, inspirational, motivated on-the-ground site workers; enable site leaders and site workers with funds; ability to establish collaborations to implement joint activities.
- Future – encourage Chairs, coordinators, and other interested parties to respond to this document by 15 January.

518. Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) showed the appreciation to Rick and others for pulling together this information; heard some opinions but not far enough to make conclusions; as far as is consensus-based process, need key players to be happy with conclusions; for SBS TF the roles of Chairs and coordinators are a different way around, so need to be flexible depending on people involved; an approach that gives freedom and flexibility is the right direction; some WGs started before Partnership and were 'inherited' by the Partnership; evolution of Partnership have lost some networks; efficiency of connectivity between WGs was lost; for a number of sites on the flyway, cooperation was better 20 years ago than now; suggest we should be very careful when restructuring or reorganising groups; agree it's not very systematic but need to be careful when restructuring not to lose things that are working well; a balance to consider; most of TF and WG leaders worried not to have too complicated written reporting; and need more time to report in MOPs to brief Partners; propose having more time for WGs to report, encourage them to prepare presentation and maybe posters, films etc.; activities of the groups very important part of the WGs; can give new impetus to TFs and WGs.
519. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Chair, Shorebird WG) agreed; It's imperative that Partners provide instructions back to our Sub-committees to say – do you want a decision document on any of these subjects or an info doc we give to Secretariat in January? Got the sense that people didn't want this too prescriptive; if Partners want things to be prescribed, please let us know... and if you want it to stay as it is, we can just provide a document to guide them without prescribing.
520. Mr. Simba Chan (Crane WG) wanted to respond to the point of Mr. Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) with the agreement of his point; historical looking at the case of Crane WG,

if we cannot connect site managers to science workers and others just because there is no meeting of Crane WG here, it doesn't mean they are not doing anything. The Crane WG only has meetings outside MOP; therefore, no report. The Crane WG also works on consensus on all flyways, they were the first WG to bring in DPRK to network.

521. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) said this is an important review process led by three colleagues; reflect on how TFs and WGs have been the heart of the work by the Partnership; agreed with Mr. Syroyechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF) – good to give new members, Partners and representatives reports to learn what is being done between MOPs and a chance to report back it would be illustrative of what the Partnership is doing; whether groups should work separately or link-up? Hope that the conservation status review process provides an opportunity for all Partners, the Science Unit and Technical Sub-committee to make sure best information is being generated through the status review process; hope that working with Secretariat in early 2019 they can have a teleconference to work out how to take this forward to ensure timelines of all WGs and TFs can be met in coming up with a first review; on issue of connectivity of network sites, this is important as we are losing sites; we have lost a lot of sites and this is the reason why we now have a single site network for all waterbirds e.g SBSTF has identified sites that should join and hope all WGs and TFs can be active in promoting designation and management of these site networks; should be possible to bring together site managers and networks.
522. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) added that as member of ad-hoc TF on effectiveness of TFs, he thanked Mr. Lanctot for the preparing the presentation. He noted that one of the gaps is we haven't critically evaluated this against the new strategic plan; need to make sure the ideas raised are able to be tested against the strategic plan; need a conversation with the Secretariat to identify how to move forward; we should challenge ourselves as Chairs of TFs and WGs to make sure we are needed and relevant and can add value; pleased that work we've done so far has highlighted so many issues.
523. Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair, Technical Sub Committee) supported what Mr. Mundkur and McKinlay said; TFs clearly technical implementation powerhouses of the Partnership and also mandated to be part of the Partnership and with that comes some responsibility to ensure that what you are doing is known to the Partnership and is in line with the strategic plan; if with the review of each TF and WGs finds an activity that doesn't fit, we need to work out how to deal with that – e.g. does the strategic plan need to be amended? Need to look at streamlining the reporting process; Technical Sub-committee committed to making it work.
524. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) also mentioned that from the feedback that WGs and TFs need a different reporting mechanism for MOP11; can bring together Chairs and Secretariat to work that out; at previous MOPs some feedback that reports were not consistent or structured enough; need to discuss how long each group needs for report back from next MOP.
525. Mr. Peter Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) agreed that the Partnership can do better and the work ahead of us needs a strong WG and TF structure would like endorsement from the Partnership to proceed as Rick outlined; give Secretariat and MC to look at how best to proceed from MOP10; not waiting for MOP11 but implement and review at MOP11 how we are doing.
526. Mr. Richard Lanctot (USA, Shorebird WG Chair) requested the written comments be provided.

527. Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) advised that he could provide a good example of how Partners' work plans can link to the EAAFP Strategic Plan: WWT has a Strategic Plan with nine programme areas, one of which specifically concerns the EAAF, and so this fits well in supporting implementation of the EAAFP Strategic Plan.
528. Mr. Peter Probasco (Chair, USA) reaffirmed the above agreement.
529. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) presented information about two new initiatives which can support the EAAFP Strategic Plan implementation, specifically its Objective 3 and KRAs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 concerning waterbird monitoring and identification of important sites. These are:
- a new *Waterbird Fund* launched in 2017 (website: www.waterbird.fund). This was developed in response to requests from the Ramsar Convention, CMS, CAFF and AEWA in recognition of the need to generate funds for gap-filling and to reach out to corporates and private foundations to seek such funds. Mr. Mundkur invited EAAFP Partners to consider contributing to this fund.
 - the *Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool version 2* (website: www.criticalsites.wetlands.org). The CSN Tool was originally developed for the African-Eurasian region under a GEF project. The CSN version 2.0 was launched at the AEWA MOP7 in Durban in December 2018. It covers 105 African-Eurasian countries and has been designed to support identification and prioritisation of sites at risk because of climate change. Based on climate change water availability modelling it shows regions of higher and lower climate change risk and identified potential change in the status of critical sites. It may also help to identify new areas for wetlands that may become important in the future. The CSN v2.0 currently includes some northern parts of the EAAF and could be further developed for the whole EAAF region in the future.

AGENDA ITEM 14: REPORT AND APPROVAL OF KEY DECISIONS FROM MOP10

Agenda Item 14.1: Announcement of new MoU with Ministry of Environment -Republic of Korea

530. Ms. Soonbok Kim (RO Korea) announced the extension of the MoU for the next 10 years and the progress made on the Sister Site Programme between Hwaseong Wetland (RO Korea) and Adelaide Wetland (Australia). Ms. Kim reaffirmed her strong will to continue to support the EAAFP Secretariat and the Partnership. Incheon City also will continue its financial support at the present level and announced that an event is being planned for May 2019 to celebrate 10 years of its hosting the EAAFP Secretariat. The Chair thanked RO Korea and Incheon City for their continued support and commitment to making the Partnership successful.

Agenda Item 14.2: Adoption of the Secretariat's Workplan and Budget for 2019-2020 -[Document 8](#)

531. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) advised that some further discussion during MOP10 on DOC. 8 concerning work on Flyway Network Sites has led to some changes being suggested to Action 1.1 in the table on financing the Secretariat Workplan. He proposed that this be amended to read "Provide support for the designation of new FNSs and the conservation and management of existing FNSs". Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) agreed with this wording but expressed concern that it might imply a change of

emphasis away from the provision of SIS updates. Mr. Young clarified that such SIS updating is covered by the proposed wording.

532. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) reminded that whilst DOC. 8 had been presented earlier, in the light of the amendments to the new Strategic Plan it will be necessary to review and harmonised the activities in DOC. 8 with the adopted text of the SP and suggested that following MOP10 the Secretariat provides a harmonised text of DOC. 8 for MC approval. This was agreed.
533. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) pointed out that action in relation to Strategic Plan Indicator 4.2.2 (concerning Partners and site managers meeting at least once per year) needs to be added to DOC. 8. and that the Secretariat will need to identify host Partners for such meetings and ensure resourcing. A considerable debate, with interventions from Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Trust), Mr. Doug Watkins (CAFF), Mr. Evgeny Syroechkovskiy (Russia, Chair, Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF), Mr. Geoff Richardson (Australia), Mr. Martin Spray (WWT), Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI), Mr. Ward Hagermeijer (WI), Prof. Guangchun Lei (Head, EAAFP Science Unit), Mr. Srey Sunleang (Cambodia), Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) and Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand), ensued concerning the meaning and intent of Indicator 4.2.2. Two interpretations emerged: one that this Indicator concerned a target of at least one meeting per year of Partner focal points and site managers being held at national level; the other that this concerned a meeting each year of all Partner Focal Points across the flyway. It was concluded that this Indicator concerned national-level meetings of Partner focal points and site managers, and not flyway-level Partner meetings.
534. Mr. Ward Hagermeijer (WI) considered that it is important to provide a cost breakdown for each activity, including separation of staff costs and activity implementation costs. Mr. Young (CE, EAAFP) clarified that the table does not include staff costs, which are provided in a separate table.
535. The Secretariat Workplan and Budget for 2019 - 2020 was approved.

Agenda Item 14.3: Election and appointment of Management Committee and Finance Sub Committee; Election and appointment of new Chair and Vice Chair- [Document 13](#)

Management Committee elections

536. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) introduced the agenda item, noting that although Government Partner member Mongolia was eligible for a second term it did not wish to continue, so a replacement Government Partner needed to be elected to the MC. Japan nominated and Cambodia seconded Thailand. Thailand was elected to the MC.
537. Concerning NGO Partner members, the Wildfowl & Wetland Trust (WWT) is eligible for a second term. WWT (Martin Spray) indicated willingness to continue. WWT was nominated by Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust), seconded by AWSG. WWT was re-elected to the MC.
538. AWSG has served two terms on the MC and so is stepping down. Wetlands International was nominated by AWSG and seconded by WWT. Wetlands international was elected to the MC.

539. Concerning Intergovernmental Partners, the Ramsar Secretariat has served two terms and so another IGO Partner needs to be elected. The Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) Secretariat had expressed interest. The CMS Secretariat was nominated by Wetlands International and seconded by Australia. The CMS Secretariat was elected to become a member to the MC. Mr. Taej Mundkur (WI) read out a statement from CMS Secretariat.
540. Concerning the Chair and Vice Chair of the MC, Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) is eligible to serve a second term as Vice Chair and has indicated willingness to continue. This was seconded by New Zealand. Mr. How Choon Beng (Singapore, EAAFP Vice Chair) was re-elected as Vice Chair.
541. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) has served one term as Chair and has indicated willingness to continue for a second term. This was seconded by WWT and Cambodia. Mr. Probasco was re-elected as Chair.
542. Ms. Jittinun Ruengverayudh (Thailand) thanked the Partnership for its confidence in electing Thailand to the MC.
543. The Secretariat advised that DOC. 6 (Report of the Finance Sub Committee) had been updated to reflect recent information on the status of voluntary contributions (Table 1) and resources mobilised (Table 4).

Finance Sub Committee elections

544. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) introduced the Agenda item and indicated that Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) had indicated willingness to stand as a Chair of FsC. Mr. Spray (WWT) was proposed by AWSG and seconded by Wetlands International. Mr. Spray (WWT) was elected.
545. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) indicated that she was willing to continue on the FsC. She was proposed by Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust) and seconded by Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand). Ms. Russell-French was re-elected to the FsC.
546. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) indicated that Japan is willing to continue on the FsC. The Secretariat clarifies that elections to the FsC are elected on a person basis rather than as a Partner representative. Ms. Tomoko said that she would continue till her successor replaces her and was re-elected to the member of FsC.
547. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) noted that Mr. Jim Harris (ICF) was a core member of the FsC but with his sad passing a replacement member needed to be elected. Mr. Spray (WWT) nominated and Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (WI) seconded Mr. Spike Millington (ICF). Mr. Millington was elected as a member of FsC.
548. Concerning Additional FsC members, Mr. Ward Hagemeyer was eligible for re-election and, nominated by Mr. Spray (WWT) and seconded by Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand), was re-elected.
549. As host of the EAAFP Secretariat, Incheon Metropolitan City is a standing member of the FsC. This continuing role was accepted.

550. Concerning Corporate representatives as additional Members of the FsC it was noted that more than one such member is welcomed. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) noted that candidates for election needed to be in the room to confirm their willingness. Singapore recommended the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity. Mr. Bruce McKinlay (New Zealand) proposed, and Mr. Martin Spray (WWT) seconded Ms. Sheila Vegara (ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity). Ms. Vegara was duly elected to the FsC.
551. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG) advised that the name of a further corporate additional member was likely to become available shortly. She later reported that National Geographic was to serve on the FsC. It's proposed by Ms. Alison Russell-French and seconded by Mr. David Lawrie (Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust), Mr. Jay Lee (National Geographic) was elected to the FsC.

Agenda Item 12.4: Date and Venue of the next Meeting of Partners

552. Mr. Evgeny Syroechvskiy (Russia) reported that there were on-going discussions between the Russian government and the government of the Republic of Yakutia concerning hosting MOP11, but that clarifications on offering to host were unlikely before spring 2019. The Chair indicated that he would contact Evgeny in spring 2019 to check on progress.
553. Mr. Aree Suwanmanee (Thailand) reported that they also are considering hosting MOP11 but are not yet able to confirm an offer.

AGENDA ITEM 15: CLOSING CEREMONY

554. Ms. Hyeseon Do (Programme Officer, EAAFP Secretariat) opened the Closing Ceremony.

Agenda Item 15.1: MoU signing ceremony, EAAFP Secretariat and Beijing Forestry University

555. Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) and Prof. WANG Yujie (Vice-President, Beijing Forestry University) signed their Memorandum of Cooperation, to applause.

Closing remarks

556. Mr. Zhang De Hui, Director General, Protected Areas Department, National Forestry and Grassland Administration, China spoke of the great steps forward made during MOP10 and notably the adoption of the new Strategic Plan, and congratulated the Partnership for its continuing hard work for waterbirds and their conservation, an issue which is becoming increasingly important to China. He explained that China has committed to "ecological conservation" being implemented across all its ministries, and that all work on protected areas has now been combined under the National Forestry and Grassland Administration. The Administration has two departments, the Conservation Department and the Protected Areas Department. The Protected Areas Department now has responsibility *inter alia* for waterbird sites and World Heritage sites and is working to identify additional areas to protect, including for waterbirds. But protected areas alone are not enough for waterbirds and the Department is also looking at broader-scale habitat protection, and it is crucial to have strong science input to inform this. China is encouraging a network of protected areas for waterbirds to be designated as a natural World Heritage site and are aiming to subsequently bring the whole flyway site network under World Heritage designation. He looked forward to future Partnership cooperation on this approach. He congratulated the Partnership on a very successful MOP10 meeting, with very good results. He announced that China

is planning to hold an international workshop on the World Heritage designation in 2019 and hopes that the EAAFP can be a Partner in this workshop.

557. Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) responded that he greatly appreciated China's remarks and its continued support for the Partnership. MOP10 has been a good meeting, with a lot accomplished. He praised the collective efforts of Partners and friends concentrating their essential efforts on waterbirds and their habitats. The Chair recalled that he began working on wetlands and their conservation in 1975 and throughout his decades of work considers that, without a doubt, the EAAFP's efforts across the vast landscape of the flyway are incomparable. He recognized that many countries on the flyway have other issues outside the Flyway Partnership's objectives and stressed the importance and value of the Partnership through which all countries put aside national differences and work collaboratively for the common cause of waterbirds and wetland conservation. He also laid down a challenge to all Partners over the forthcoming two years to MOP11: to not lose focus on their collective efforts, and to keep striving to improve the status of waterbird populations on the Flyway. He closed his remarks by wishing to especially recognise Mr. Lew Young (CE, EAAFP Secretariat) and his leadership which, with his great Secretariat team, has delivered a MOP10 job well done.
558. Ms. Hyeseon Do (Programme Officer, EAAFP Secretariat) declared the close of the Closing Ceremony.
559. Mr. Doug Watkins (CAFF) called a vote of thanks to the local Chinese organisers and their team, for hosting MOP10 in a special venue and for making the MOP run so smoothly.
560. Ms. Tomoko Ichikawa (Japan) raised a concern about the Ramsar COP13 decisions concerning Ramsar Regional Initiatives (of which the EAAFP is one) in the future. She explained that with the next cycle of revising the Operational Guidelines for Regional Initiatives (to be considered by Ramsar COP14 in 2021) there is a risk that the EAAFP might no longer be considered eligible for Regional Initiative status. She requested the Partners to keep an eye on and draw this concern to the relevant departments in the governments in the governments.
561. Ms. Alison Russell-French (AWSG), on behalf of the Partnership, thanked Mr. Pete Probasco (USA, Chair, EAAFP) for his skillful chairing of MOP10, which had been invaluable for achieving the strong outcomes of the MOP.
562. The Chair declared MOP10 closed.