

TWELFTH MEETING OF PARTNERS OF THE EAST ASIAN – AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP
Cebu, Philippines, 8-14 November 2025



Document 4

Minutes of the 11th Meeting of Partners

East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership Eleventh Meeting of Partners (MOP11), Australia, 13-17 March 2023

Report (Minutes)

Table of Contents

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	4
OPENING OF THE MEETING	14
AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING CEREMONY	14
AGENDA ITEM 2: WELCOMING ADDRESS	14
AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES FOR NEW PARTNERS, FLYAWAY NETWORK SITES AND SISTER SITES	15
AGENDA ITEM 4: KEYNOTE PRESENTATION	16
KEYNOTE PRESENTATION: PROF RICHARD FULLER, THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND	16
PROCEDURAL MATTERS	17
AGENDA ITEM 5: ADOPTION OF RULES OF PROCEDURE (Document 1)	17
AGENDA ITEM 6: APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR OF THE MEETING	17
AGENDA ITEM 7: ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Document 2)	17
AGENDA ITEM 8: ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL PROGRAM (Document 3)	18
AGENDA ITEM 9: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 10TH MEETING OF PARTNERS (Document 4)	18
AGENDA ITEM 10: ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (Document 5)	18
AGENDA ITEM 11: REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES	18
AGENDA ITEM 12: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS	20
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MR DUNCAN LANG, ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (ADB), and DR DING Li YONG	22
AGENDA ITEM 13: IMPLEMENTATION OF PARTNERSHIP	23
AGENDA ITEM 14: DECISIONS	26
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: JOE APPIOTT SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY	26
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: ANATIDAE WORKING GROUP UPDATE- MR KATSUMI USHIYAMA (COORDINATOR)	27
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CEPA WORKING GROUP UPDATE – MR CASEY BURNS (CHAIR) (Virtually)	27
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CRANE WORKING GROUP UPDATE – MR SIMBA CHAN (COORDINATOR)	27
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: PROF WILLIAM SUTHERLAND, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	30
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: DR IVAN RAMIREZ HEAD AVIAN SPECIES TEAM CMS	30
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: SEABIRD WORKING GROUP UPDATE, MR SIMBA CHAN (MEMBER)	34
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: SHOREBIRD WORKING GROUP UPDATE, DR RICK LANCTOT, (CHAIR)	34
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: BLACK-FACED SPOONBILL WORKING GROUP UPDATE, MR YAT-TUNG YU (COORDINATOR)	35

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: SPOON-BILLED SANDPIPER TASK FORCE, MR SAYAM CHOUDHURY (ASSISTANT COORDINATOR).....	35
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MASKED FINFOOT – SAYAM CHOWDHURY	35
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: H.E. CLARE FEARNLEY DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO BEIJING FROM AOTEAROA NZ.	37
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MR SUH SEUNG OH, RAMSAR REGIONAL CENTRE – EAST ASIA,	38
Wetlands Link International Asia Oceania: Overview and Strategies	38
AGENDA ITEM 15: APPROVAL OF DECISIONS (DD. 1 – 10).....	39
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: FLYWAYS, THE UNTOLD JOURNEY.	40
AGENDA ITEM 15: APPROVAL OF DECISIONS (DD. 1 – 10) (cont.).....	41
AGENDA ITEM 16: ADOPTION OF SECRETARIAT’S ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET (Document 8)	41
AGENDA ITEM 17: ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS (DD. 1 – 11).....	41
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: <i>ENGAGING YOUTH</i>	42
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CORPORATE CHAMPION PROGRAMME	42
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: BIRGITA HANSEN, AUSTRALASIAN WADER STUDIES GROUP	42
GOLD SPONSOR ‘40+ YEARS OF COMMITMENT TO THE FLYWAY’	42
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MS. MAY-LE NG, FAUNA TECH, BRONZE SPONSOR –	43
AGENDA ITEM 18: DATE AND VENUE OF THE 12 TH MEETING OF PARTNERS (No Document).....	44
SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CONSERVATION STATUS REVIEW PROJECT – DR TAEJ MUNDKUR.....	44
AGENDA ITEM 19: ANY OTHER BUSINESS (No Document)	45
AGENDA ITEM 20: CLOSING CEREMONY (No Document)	45
Closing remarks	46
ACTIONS ARISING:	47

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Government Partners

Australia (co-host)	Ms. Ilse Kiessling	Division Head, Biodiversity Division, Protected Species and Ecological Communities, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	ilse.kiessling@dcceew.gov.au
	Ms. Narelle Montgomery	Director, Migratory Species Section, Protected Species and Communities Branch, Biodiversity Conservation Division, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	narelle.montgomery@dcceew.gov.au
	Dr. Mark Carey	Migratory Species Section, Protected Species and Communities Branch, Biodiversity Conservation Division, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water /Far Eastern Curlew Task Force Chair	mark.carey@environment.gov.au
	Dr. Kevin Yang	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	kevin.yang@dcceew.gov.au
	Ms. Rebecca Haughey	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	rebecca.haughey@dcceew.gov.au
	Mr. Dylan Jones	Assistant Director, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	dylan.jones@dcceew.gov.au
	Ms. Janine Cullen	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	Janine.cullen@dcceew.gov.au

	Ms. Kathryn Eyle	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	Kathryn.eyles@dcceew.gov.au
Bangladesh	Ms. Fa-Tu-Zo Khaleque Mela	Wildlife and Biodiversity Conservation Office, Wildlife and Nature Conservation Circle, Forest Department	mila_zohra1720@yahoo.com
Cambodia	Dr. Srey Sunleang	Deputy Director General General Directorate of Natural Protected Area, Ministry of Environment /Task Force on Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds Chair	kampongspeu@yahoo.com
	Mr. Porchhay Taing	General Directorate of Natural Protected Area, Ministry of Environment	chhay360@gmail.com
	Ms. Phallis Eang	Ministry of Environment	phalliseang@gmail.com
Hong Kong S.A.R. People's Republic of China	Ms. Joyee Chan	Fauna Conservation Officer, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department	joyee_lk_chan@afcd.gov.hk
Indonesia	Mr. Drajat Dwi Haryono	Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation Species and Genetic, Ministry of Environment and Forestry	drajatdh@gmail.com
	Mr. Yarman Saadunir Kadir	Wasur National Park	yarman73@yahoo.co.id
	Mr. Afan Absori	Berbak and Sembilang National Park	afanabsori@gmail.com
Japan	Ms. Kaoru Sakai	Deputy Director, Wildlife Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment	KAORU_SAKAI@env.go.jp
	Mr. Toshifumi Moriya	Japan Bird Research Association	moriya@bird-research.jp

Malaysia	Ms. Atifa Maryam Binti Norbanan	Assistant Secretary of Biodiversity Management Division, Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Climate Change	maryam@nrecc.gov.my
	Ms. Noraisah Majri	Sarawak Forestry Corporation	noraisahm@sarawakforestry.com
	Mr. Nickson Anak Joseph Robi	Sarawak Forestry Corporation	nick@sarawakforestry.com
	Mr. Muhammad Ezhar Bin Yusuf	Penang State Forestry Department	ezhar@forestry.gov.my
	Ms. Rahmah Binti Ilias	Department of Wildlife and National Parks	rahmah@wildlife.gov.my
	Mr. Ahmad Khusaini bin Mohd Kharip Shah	Department of Wildlife and National Parks	khusaini@wildlife.gov.my
	Mr. Hamden bin Mohammad	Director, Forest Department- Sarawak, Ministry of Natural Resources and Urban Development	Hamden@sarawak.gov.my
	Ms. Hairani Mohamad Ismail	Forest Department -Sarawak, Ministry of Natural Resources and Urban Development	hairanii@sarawak.gov.my
New Zealand	Mr. Bruce McKinlay	Department of Conservation /Yellow Sea Ecoregion Task Force Chair	bmckinlay@doc.govt.nz
Republic of Korea	Ms. Jeonghyon Kwon	Deputy Director Ministry of Environment	jh9612@korea.kr
	Ms. Seulki Lee	Korean-English Interpreter Ministry of Environment	seulki14@korea.kr
	Dr. Hwajung Kim	National Institute of Biological Resources, Ministry of Environment	hwajung@korea.kr
	Mr. Dongwon Kim	National Institute of Biological Resources, Ministry of Environment	foowl@korea.kr
	Ms. Gusung Lee	Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation, Ministry of Ocean and Fisheries	gslee@koem.or.kr

	Ms. Soyeon Lee	Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation, Ministry of Ocean and Fisheries	soyeon@koem.or.kr
Singapore	Ms. Shufen Yang	Director, Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve, National Parks Board	yang_shufen@nparks.gov.sg
	Mr. Zuowei Li (David)	Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve, National Parks Board	david_li@nparks.gov.sg
Thailand	Ms. Nitchanan Thongdej	Biodiversity Management Division, Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	lookhoi273@gmail.com
	Mr. Sajjaporn Chansrinual	Chief Administrator, Krabi Provincial Administrative Organization Division/ Site Manager of Krabi Estuary and Bay (EAAF084)	paladkrabi@hotmail.com
	Mr. Jirut Khamaye	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation	kontamfun@gmail.com
	Ms. Tucksorn Bhummakasikara	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation	bhumma.t@gmail.com
	Mr. Wanlop Preechamart	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning	wanloponep@gmail.com
	Dr. Piyakarn Teartisup	Faculty of Environment and Resource Studies, Mahidol University	tpiyakarn@gmail.com
Philippines	Mr. Anson Tagtag	Chief, Wildlife Management Section, Biodiversity Management Bureau, Department of Environment and Natural Resources	anson_tagtag@yahoo.com

	Mr. John Berhel Doria	Biodiversity Management Bureau, Department of Environment and Natural Resources	johnberhel.doria@bmb.gov.ph
	Ms. Angelique Songco	Protected Area Superintendent, Tubbataha Management Office/ Park Manager / Site Manager of Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park (EAAF123)	tmo@tubbatahareefs.org
United States	Mr. Robert Kaler (Robb)	United States Fish and Wildlife Service	robert_kaler@fws.gov
	Dr. Richard Benjamin Lanctot	United States Fish and Wildlife Service	richard_lanctot@fws.gov
	Dr. Emily J Pindilli	International Technical Assistance Program, US Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior	epindilli@usgs.gov
	Ms. Julia Welch	International Technical Assistance Program, US Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior	julia_welch@ios.doi.gov
	Ms. Barbara Pitkin	United States Department of the Interior	barbara_pitkin@ios.doi.gov
	Mr. Frederic Wurster	United States Department of the Interior	fred_wurster@fws.gov
Vietnam	Dr. Nguyen Van Tai	Director General, Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Agency/ Administrative Head of Ramsar Convention	tainvclcs@gmail.com
	Mr. Dung Nguyen Xuan	Deputy Director, Nature, and Biodiversity Conservation Agency	xuandungbt@gmail.com
	Ms. Quynh Trang	Deputy Director, Nature, and Biodiversity Conservation Agency	quynhtrang.nbca@gmail.com

	Ms. Van Anh Nguyen	Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Agency	nguyenvanh.bca@gmail.com
--	--------------------	---	--------------------------

Inter-Governmental Organisation Partners

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)	Ms. Kyle Esperanza Rafanan Zuleta	Programme Officer, Programme Development, and Implementation Unit	kerzuleta@aseanbiodiversity.org
	Ms. Claudia Bongalonta Binondo	Programme Officer	cbbinondo@aseanbiodiversity.org
	Ms. Pauline Carmel Joy Eje	Knowledge Management Officer	pcjeje@aseanbiodiversity.org
Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)	Dr. Tilman Schneider	Associate Programme Officer	Tilman.Schneider@un.org
	Dr. Iván Ramírez	Head of Avian Team	ivan.ramirez@un.org
Food and Agriculture Organisation, United Nations	Dr. He Li	Natural Resources Officer at Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific	He.li@fao.org

International Non-Governmental Organisation Partners

BirdLife Australia (co-host)	Prof. Martine Maron	President	m.maron@uq.edu.au
	Dr. Grainne Maguire	Program Leader (Coastal and Wetland Birds)	grainne.maguire@birdlife.org.au
	Dr. Marta Ferenczi	Migratory Shorebird Program Manager	marta.ferenczi@birdlife.org.au
	Dr. Lindall Kidd	Migratory Shorebird Program Coordinator	lindall.kidd@birdlife.org.au
	Mr. Andrew Hunter	Conservation Campaigner	andrew.hunter@birdlife.org.au
BirdLife Australia - Australasian Wader Studies Group	Ms. Alison Lee Russell-French	Chair	alisonrf@inet.net.au
	Ms. Birgita Dalene Hansen	Consultant	b.hansen@federation.edu.au
BirdLife International	Mr. Vinayagan Dharmarajah	Regional Director – Asia	vinayagan.dharmarajah@birdlife.org
	Dr. Ding Li Yong	Asia Advocacy and Policy Manager	dingli.yong@birdlife.org
	Dr. Stefano Barchiesi	Ecosystem Services Officer	stefano.barchiesi@birdlife.org
	Ms. Shelby Wee Qi Wei	Flyways Conservation Officer	shelby.wee@birdlife.org

	Ms. Au Nyat Jun	Malaysian Nature Society Kuching Branch (BirdLife Malaysia)	anyatjun@yahoo.com
	Ms. Batrisyia Teepol	Project Officer, Malaysian Nature Society Kuching Branch (BirdLife Malaysia)	batrisyiatpl@gmail.com
	Ms. Nicola Crockford	Principal Policy Officer, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB, Birdlife UK)	nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk
	Mr. Choo Eng Tan	Seberang Perai City Council (MBSP, Birdlife Malaysia)	chooengtan@yahoo.com
Hanns Seidel Foundation	Dr. Bernhard Johannes Seliger	Resident Representative	seliger@hss.or.kr
	Dr. Hyunah Choi	Senior Researcher	choi@hss.de
Hong Kong Bird Watching Society	Mr. Yat-tung Yu	Director /Seabird WG and Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group Coordinator	bfspoonbill@hkbws.org.hk
International Crane Foundation	Mr. Spike Millington	Vice President (Asia region)	spike@savingcranes.org
IUCN	Mr. Glemet Raphael	Senior Programme Officer	raphael.glemet@iucn.org
Mangrove Foundation (MCF)	Ms. Lili Sun	Founder and Board Member	sunlili@mcf.org.cn
	Dr. Baohua Yan	Secretary General	yanbaohua@mcf.org.cn
	Ms. Qing Chen	Conservation Manager	chenqing@mcf.org.cn
Paulson Institute	Dr. Xiaojing Gan	Manager, Conservation – Wetland	xgan@paulsoninstitute.org
Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust	Mr. David Alexander Lawrie	International Liaison	lawrie@ps.gen.nz
Wetlands International	Mr. Ward Hagemeijer	Program Head, Business and Ecosystems	ward.hagemeijer@wetlands.org
	Dr. Taej Mundkur	Senior Advisor /Avian Influenza Working Group Co-Chair	taej.mundkur@wetlands.org
	Mr. Seiji Hayama	Joint Representative	hayama@wbsj.org

Wild Bird Society of Japan	Mr. Hironobu Tajiri	Manager	tajiri@wbsj.org
	Mr. Minoru Kashiwagi	Board Member, Ramsar Network Japan	minoru.kash@gmail.com
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust	Mr. Bena Smith	International Wetland Management Adviser	benasmith@wwt.org.uk
Wildlife Conservation Society	Dr. Jonathan Slaght	Regional Director, Asia Program	jslaght@wcs.org
World Wildlife Fund	Dr. Xianji Wen	Director, Mai Po Nature Reserve and Flyway Programme	xjwen@wwf.org.hk
	Dr. Chan Pui Lok Bosco	Director, Conservation, WWF-Hong Kong	boscochan@wwf.org.hk

EAAFP Committees

Finance Sub-committee	Mr. Martin Spray (Chair)	martincspray@outlook.com
Technical Sub-committee	Prof. Nick Davidson (Chair)	arenaria.interpres@gmail.com
	Mr. David Melville (Vice Chair)	david.melville@xtra.co.nz
	Prof. Richard Fuller (Member)	r.fuller@uq.edu.au
	Dr. Changyong Choi (Member)	sub95@snu.ac.kr

Working Groups and Task Forces

Anatidae Working Group	Dr. Katsumi Ushiyama	mwwc@dune.ocn.ne.jp
Crane Working Group	Mr. Simba Chan	simba2018reborn@gmail.com
Shorebird Working Group	Mr. Phil Straw	philip.straw@aws.org.au
Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group	Dr. Kisup Lee	larus@daum.net
Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force	Mr. Sayam Chowdhury	sayam_uc@yahoo.com
	Ms. Ziyu Yang	ziyou.yang@sbsinchina.com
Baer's Pochard Task Force	Dr. Changqing Ding	cqding@bjfu.edu.cn
Dalmatian Pelican Task Force	Dr. Nyambayar Batbayar	nyambayar@wscc.org.mn

Intergovernmental Task Force to Address Illegal Hunting, Taking, and Trade of Migratory Birds in the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (ITTEA)	Dr. Susan Man Shu Tsang	susan.tsang@un.org
---	-------------------------	--------------------

Observers

Division of Protected Area Management, Department of Forestry (DoF), Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), Thad Dam, Vientiane, Lao PDR	Dr. Teuanchay Phongkhamphanh	teuanchay3184@gmail.com
Asian Development Bank	Mr. Duncan Lang	dlang@adb.org
	Ms. Mary Anne Velas-Suarin	mavelassuarin.consultant@adb.org
JG Solutions Limited	Ms. Jennifer George	jennifer@snapdragon.co.nz
	Mr. Gareth Bodle	gareth.bodle@xtra.co.nz
James Cook University	Dr. Sara Kophamel Orduña	sara.kophamel@my.jcu.edu.au
Cambridge University	Prof. William Sutherland	w.sutherland@zoo.cam.ac.uk
Institute of Geography Russian Acad. Sci.	Dr. Elena Lappo	ellappo@mail.ru
University of Queensland	Ms. Nga Yee Lai	ngayee.lai@uq.net.au
	Ms. Lena Sofie van Swinderen	l.vanswinderen@uq.net.au
	Dr. Micha Victoria Jackson	micha.v.jackson@gmail.com
Queensland Wader Study Group	Dr. Robert Bush	cphcrobert@gmail.com
	Dr. Peter Rothlisberg	Peter.Rothlisberg@csiro.au
	Mr. David Edwards	gouldian6@bigpond.com
Mahidol University	Prof. Prapet Kerdsueb	peat2u@yahoo.com
University of Southampton	Dr. Kelvin Peh	e.pina-covarrubias@soton.ac.uk
AAArchLaaand	Mr. Yufei Ding	yufeiding@outlook.com
Eco Foundation Global	Mr. Zhang Hai (Alex)	xialin.wang@efglobal.org
ECO Korea	Dr. Donguk Han	ecoguideuk@gmail.com

Individual Expert, Former EAAFP CE	Mr. Roger Jaensch	roger.jaensch.bne@gmail.com
Ramsar Regional Center - East Asia	Mr. Seung oh Suh	suhseungoh@gmail.com
	Ms. Sara Ceddia	rrcea.sara@gmail.com
Artist Exhibitors	Ms. Kate Gorrington-Smith	overwinteringproject@gmail.com
	Ms. Catherine Lesley Lane	cathlane1@gmail.com
Wing Threads	Ms. Milly Formby	amellia.formby@wingthreads.com
Tsinghua University, Winner of Youth Think Tank Competition	Ms. Shuyu Hou	housy18@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn
FaunaTechWildlife Acoustics)	Mr. Harry Rust	harry@faunatech.com.au
	Mr. Richard McMillan	richard@faunatech.com.au
	Ms. May-Le Ng	may-le@faunatech.com.au
Hokkaido University	Mr. Takehiko Shimizu	
Rapporteur	Mr. David Mould	

EAAFP Secretariat

Chief Executive	Mr. Doug Watkins	chief@eaaflyway.net
Deputy Chief Executive	Ms. Yeounhee Ahn	deputy@eaaflyway.net
Finance Officer	Ms. Hyojung Yoo	finance@eaaflyway.net
Senior Programme Officer	Ms. Hyeseon Do	programme@eaaflyway.net
Senior Communication Officer	Ms. Vivian Fu	communication@eaaflyway.net
External Relations Specialist	Ms. Yeonah Ku	eaafpproject@eaaflyway.net
Foundation Coordinator	Ms. Jisun Lee	administration@eaaflyway.net
RFI consultant	Ms. Cynthia Layusa	rfi.consultant@eaaflyway.net
Science Unit	Dr. Qing Zeng	science@eaaflyway.net
	Dr. Lu Cai	cai.lu@eaaflyway.net
	Dr. Yifei Jia	yifei.jia@eaaflyway.net

Day One (Monday, 13 May 2023):

OPENING OF THE MEETING

AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING CEREMONY

Welcome to Country

1. To celebrate the MOP11 and open the meeting, a Welcome to Country was provided by *Tribal Experiences* of the Turrbal/Wakka Wakka peoples from the Yuggera Nation, First Peoples of the area of Brisbane, also known as Meeanjin.

AGENDA ITEM 2: WELCOMING ADDRESS

Representative of the Australian Government, Co-Host

2. Dr Ilse Kiessling, Assistant Secretary for the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water of the Government of Australia thanked the Tribal Experiences team for the Welcome to Country acknowledged the Traditional Owners of the Meeanjin people (Brisbane). She opened the 11th Meeting of the Partners (MOP) of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) and thanked all the participants and observers for attending.

Representative of the Birdlife Australia, Co-Host

3. Professor Martine Maron, President of Birdlife Australia, warmly welcomed the participants and acknowledged the Traditional Owners of the land we meet on with respect and gratitude.

Representative of Secretary General of the Convention of on Wetlands, Dr Musonda Mumba.

4. Dr Musonda Mumba via video recording acknowledged the EAAFP as being a very important organisation protecting one of the most significant of the nine known Flyways. She noted that ecosystems are increasingly less suitable for migratory birds, and this highlights the importance of the international and regional cooperation. The EAAFP makes a strong business case on why conservation and restoration of fragile ecosystems are such an important part of the work.

Chair, EAAFP Management Committee, Mr Robb Kaler

5. Mr Robb Kaler, the Chair of the EAAFP, welcomed everyone to the conference. He acknowledged that the last meeting was over 4 years ago due to COVID-19, which has presented many challenges. He expressed special gratitude to the co-hosts and the sponsors.

Memorial Tribute

A Tribute to Dr Lew Young

6. On behalf of the Partners and colleagues, Mr Robb Kaler paid tribute to Dr Lew Young and recognised him as world leader in conservation of wetlands and wetland birds and a great leader in the EAAFP community.

A tribute to Dr Evgeny Syroechkovskyi

7. On behalf of the Partners and colleagues, Ms Elena Lappo paid tribute to Dr Evgeny Syroechkovskyi, recognising his great contributions and leadership to the Arctic Migratory Birds Initiative and the EAAFP. She noted that the best way to remember him is to carry on his work in his honour.
8. The MOP held a minute's silence to honour the passing of Dr Lew Young and Dr Evgeny Syroechkovskyi.

AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES FOR NEW PARTNERS, FLYAWAY NETWORK SITES AND SISTER SITES

Certificates Ceremony and presentation from New Partners

Hong Kong Bird Watching Society

9. Mr Robb Kaler (EAAFP Chair) presented the Partner certificate to Mr. Yat-tung Yu, Director of the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society as a Partner since October 2020.
10. The representative of the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) gave a presentation on the work of the society. The society conducts tracking and monitoring studies of species such as the Black-faced Spoonbill, Great Knot, and Bridled Tern as well as conserving feeding grounds and fishponds for the flyway covering around 600 hectares of fishponds. Black-faced spoonbill numbers have increased to around 6,000.

Mangrove Foundation

11. Mr Robb Kaler (EAAFP Chair) presented the Partner certificate to the representative, Ms Sun Lili, Founder and Vice-Chair of the Mangrove Foundation (MCF) as a Partner since October 2020.
12. Ms Sun Lili of MCF gave a brief presentation on the work of the Foundation. The Foundation employs a social participation model of nature conservation.

Certificates Ceremony for new Flyway Network Sites

13. Mr Robb Kaler, (USA, EAAFP Chair) presented the certificates to the representatives of each new Flyway Network site.

Australia (1)

Southeast Gulf of Carpentaria: Leichardt River to Gore Point (Wenadinga Coast)

Cambodia (1)

Anlung Pring Protected Landscape

Japan (1)

Sarobetsu Wetland

Myanmar ()

Inlay Lake Wildlife Sanctuary

People's Republic of China (1)

Rongcheng Swan National Nature Reserve

Republic of Korea (6)

Janghang Wetlands

Songdo Tidal Flats

Aphaedo Tidal Flats

Daebudo Tidal Flats

Ulsan Tidal Flats

Gochang Getbol Tidal Flats

Certificates Ceremony for new Sister Sites

14. Mr Robb Kaler presented the certificates to the representatives of each Sister Site.

Sister site #10

Incheon Songdo Tidal Flat (Incheon, Republic of Korea) – Mai Po Inner Deep Bay (Hong Kong S.A.R., People's Republic of China)

Sister site #11

Higashiyoka-Higata (Saga, Japan) – Qupaluk (Alaska, U.S.A.)

15. A special gift was presented from the Secretariat to each of the co-hosts of MOP11 as thanks for ongoing support.

AGENDA ITEM 4: KEYNOTE PRESENTATION

KEYNOTE PRESENTATION: PROF RICHARD FULLER, THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

16. Professor Richard Fuller of the University of Queensland made a presentation titled: **'Bending the Curve: Are we saving migratory waterbirds in the EAAF?'**
- 520 mapped shorebird areas with 2488 monitoring sites.
 - Annual decline percentages of species presented.
 - Habitat loss from human coastal development identified as the key driver of species decline.
 - Species depending on the Yellow Sea for migration are declining the fastest.
 - Eastern Curlew migration patterns are much more complex than previously understood. Breeding is taking place in China in much higher numbers than expected.
 - Collaboration across countries protecting sites all along the flyway has seen a change in the monitoring data, including a slowing down or levelling off in the Eastern Curlew decline.
 - Up to 2010 the average annual decline was 5%. For the last ten years the decline has been at 0%.
 - It was noted as important to recognise this data is not indicative of 'recovery' of the species, only of a population stabilisation that can lead to recovery as a future step.
 - The task is now to create recovery – restore habitat, arrest climate change, stop hunting.
 - Conservation actions are starting to show positive results.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

- ※ The original and final documents are available on MOP11 page ([link](#))

AGENDA ITEM 5: ADOPTION OF RULES OF PROCEDURE (Document 1)

17. The Provisional Rule of Procedure is adopted without amendments.
Moved: New Zealand
Seconded: Australia
Carried unanimously

AGENDA ITEM 6: APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR OF THE MEETING

18. Mr Robb Kaler acknowledged the host country had the right to nominate as host country. Australia responded and indicated that it would be happy to put forward a Chair for the meeting and nominated Ms Narelle Montgomery as Chair on behalf of Australia.
19. There being no dissent and no further nominations, Ms. Narelle Montgomery was appointed as Chair of MOP 11.
20. Nominations for Vice-Chair was opened. Australasian Wader Studies Group (AWSG) nominated Mr Robb Kaler as Vice-Chair. Seconded by New Zealand.
21. There being no dissent and no further nominations, Robb Kaler was appointed as Vice-Chair of MOP 11.

AGENDA ITEM 7: ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Document 2)

22. The Chair of the Technical Sub-committee (TSc) noted that item 13.3 relates to a background paper informing that Draft Decision 5 will be covered in other agenda items and so is not necessary. It was proposed to remove this item from the agenda.
23. It was proposed that item 14.1, Draft Decision 1, be deferred to the next day to allow the team to rearrange given the unforeseen absence of a key presenter.
24. The Partners approved the Provisional Agenda with the above amendments.
25. Dr Ilse Kiessling (Australia) noted that the certain proposals for consideration were not submitted to the membership in the timeline according to the rules adopted at MOP 9, being a minimum of 90 days, and requested the Meeting Committee be convened to consider which of the papers (Documents 1-15, Draft Decision 2, Draft Decision 6 and Draft Decision 7) it was reasonable to consider, and which may cause a unfair burden on Partners, without impeding the necessary business of the Partnership. It was further noted that Australia only wished to raise these concerns in the interests of the Partnership, which are best achieved by good governance.
26. The meeting acknowledged the need to ensure procedural fairness and supported the referral to the Meeting Committee with the additional advice that the Meeting Committee take the most flexible approach they felt possible given the extraordinary environmental situation occurring at present and the need for the Partnership to take quick actions, without disadvantaging any partner, especially those for whom English was not the primary language.
27. The Chair acknowledged the advice of the meeting and agreed to call an immediate meeting of the Meeting Committee under rule 23, which provides for such points of order.

2:00 PM The meeting adjourned for the Meeting Committee to consider the proposal.

2:34 PM The meeting reconvened.

28. The Chair advised the meeting that the Meeting Committee took a pragmatic approach to the decision and noted some disappointment that so many submissions were made outside the timeframe outlined in the terms of reference. The Meeting Committee determined:
- Documents 1-7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 15 were accepted as being information only documents and therefore can be discussed in the meeting.
 - Documents requiring decisions or containing decisions within such as Document 8, which is related to the budget, does put the Partners in a difficult position to have such limited time to consider; however, it would put the Partnership and Secretariat in a precarious position if not discussed and therefore was accepted.
 - Document 12 can have decision elements removed so the paper becomes an information document and the TSc can consider the decision elements and return to MOP 12 if necessary.
 - Draft Decisions 6 and 7 were considered key tools for Partners and should not be delayed and so will be accepted for consideration at the meeting.
 - Draft Decision 2 the Resourcing Plan for 2023-2025: It was noted the sub-Committee responsible for drafting this decision is not mandated to submit papers to the MOP on their own behalf. It was felt the limitations in the paper would take a great deal of time and effort to explore and so this paper should be withdrawn and to task the Management Committee, in consultation with the Finance Sub-committee (FSc), to develop an appropriate resourcing plan intersessionally with all Partners and action it intersessionally or to return with a proposal to MOP 12 for decision.
29. It was further proposed that item 13.4 could be considered concurrently with Draft Decision 8.
30. The meeting agreed that the Chair and the Meeting Committee would make minor adjustments to the order of the agenda if and as needed to assist with the discussions.

AGENDA ITEM 8: ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL PROGRAM (Document 3)

31. The meeting adopted the provisional program without amendment.

AGENDA ITEM 9: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 10TH MEETING OF PARTNERS (Document 4)

32. The minutes of the 10th Meeting of the Partners be approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.
Moved: Ms Alison Russell-French (AWSG) proposed the minutes be adopted
Carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 10: ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (Document 5)

33. Document 5 was approved by the Partnership without amendment to allow observers to be admitted to the meeting.
34. The Chief Executive of the EAAFP Secretariat, Mr Doug Watkins noted there was a pleasing number of observers attending; however, as the numbers grow it is noted that the costs and logistics also increase.

AGENDA ITEM 11: REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES

Agenda Item 11.1: Report of Committees (Management Committee, Finance Sub-Committee, and Technical Sub-Committee (Document 6)

Management Committee (Document 16)

35. Chair of the Management Committee(MC), Mr Robb Kaler, presented the Report of Committees. There have been 12 meetings held since February 2019.
36. The Asian Development Bank Flyway Initiative has been a large project and is presently at the stage of developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
37. The Chief Executive of the EAAFP is stepping down at the end of March 2023. A recruitment process is underway to appoint a replacement.
38. The Management Committee Terms-of-Reference document was presented. The positions of Chair, and Vice-Chair were opened for nominations. It was noted that USA and Singapore, as the current Chair and Vice-Chair, were at the expiry of their term at this MOP and that they were not eligible for re-election to these positions under the Terms-of-Reference. Additionally, Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) was not eligible for re-election to the non-government seat on the Management Committee. A non-governmental partner will also be necessary to replace WWT.
39. The Chair clarified that the role of the Chair was to be taken by a government Partner under the Terms-of-Reference, however, the Vice-Chair position was open to any Partner.

Technical Sub-Committee

40. Technical Sub-committee (TSc) Chair, Professor Nicholas Davidson, presented: The TSc was established at MOP 9 as an interim sub-committee. At MOP 10 it was fully approved with updated Terms-of-Reference. Members are appointed for their own expertise and not as representatives of their organisation.
41. Decision 3 of MOP 10 developed a new organisational chart for the various processes, which noted the TScs in fact a *sub*-committee reporting through the Management Committee, not directly to MOP. It was then discovered that the text accompanying the organisational chart is inconsistent with the chart as it requires all sub-Committees and Task Forces to report directly to MOP rather than through the MC .
42. Since MOP 10, the TSc has compiled a complete list of all the things it has been asked to tackle. It was noted the list was over-ambitious for a voluntary Sub-committee with no resourcing to commission substantive work. It was further noted that the TSc should not be commissioning work as it creates a conflict of interest when they must review their own work. The MOP is requested to consider the appropriateness of what they ask of the TSc.
43. Providing advice to the Secretariat by conducting a review of funding requests for the Small Grants Fund for Working Groups and Task Forces has been a main area of work.
44. (Another area of work) Site Information Sheets for new Flyway Network Sites were reviewed to reduce the complexity of the form for Partners. The Sub-committee also conducts a review of completed Site Information Sheets.
45. Involved in guiding and advising on the scope, content, and structure of the 1st Edition of EAAFP Conservation Status Review (CSR) and review of drafts.
46. One of the priorities for the future is to examine the relationship between the Technical Sub-committee and the Working Groups and Task Forces.

Finance Sub-Committee

47. Finance Sub-committee (FSc) Chair, Dr. Martin Spray presented: The FSc meets in advance of the Management Committee. Thanks were given to the members of the sub-committee for their work and

dedication. Thanks were given to those who participated in the Resourcing Plan development workshop in Singapore in 2019.

48. The FSc Chair noted that the current Terms-of-Reference limited the sub-Committee to no more than 7 members. It is open to the sub-Committee to include observers, and this is an avenue the sub-Committee wishes to pursue. The request to the members is to confirm the existing members of the Committee and to appoint observers.
49. An EAAFP Contingency Fund was established in the amount of \$98,000 US.
50. A Sustainable Funding Strategy was developed with the following elements:
 - a. Voluntary Contribution Scheme
 - b. Corporate Engagement
 - c. Establishment of an EAAFP Foundation to provide tax deductible status for contributions.

Discussion and questions

51. The meeting suggested a discussion around the potential, perceived and actual, for conflicts of interest in such cases where member organisations on the Technical, Finance, and Management Committees could benefit from decisions made such as funding for projects. It was emphasised that there was no suggestion of wrongdoing by any of the members. It was recommended the new Management Committee prioritise consideration of a declaration of conflicts of interests as a policy for all Committees including sub-Committees, Working Groups, and Task Forces.
52. Chair noted an agreement for the Management Committee to do this.

3:33 PM The meeting adjourned.

4:06 PM The meeting resumed.

AGENDA ITEM 12: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

Agenda Item 12.1: Report on Secretariat Activities and Budget 2019 – 2022 (Document 7)

53. Mr Doug Watkins presented on the Secretariat activities.
54. Since the EAAFP Strategic Plan for 2019 – 2028 was adopted in MOP10, the Secretariat implemented the Key Result Areas according to the objectives, and the existing MOUs status was presented. .

Questions and Discussion

55. The meeting asked, since the Science Unit was established in 2018, how has it been included in the budget?
56. Mr Doug Watkins advised that the Science Unit has had limited opportunities to develop a solid plan for the work and interactions they're doing. At present, China is providing the funding for the Science Unit as the original major funder from the conception of the Science Unit had become unavailable. The ultimate intention has always been that the Science Unit would become self-funding.
57. The meeting noted the extensive and comprehensive amount of work completed by the Secretariat on behalf of the members intersessionally.
58. The Science Unit added that there is a lot of work conducted online and offered thanks to the team members. It was noted that in the report there were several items to which the Science Unit had contributed but it had not always been explicitly mentioned and that contributions should be mentioned in the future for the sake of the members.

59. The meeting noted that the website included the audited report for 2020 and requested that subsequent audits be made available to the members. It was further requested that in the Synergies and Partnerships document, clearer information on the decision-making process for Partnerships and MOUs be included in future.
60. The Secretariat noted the 2022 audit is yet to be completed and will make sure that audit reports become available in a more-timely fashion going forward. It was noted the 2021 audit has recently been uploaded to the website and is now available to review. The Secretariat also noted that before signing MOUs the existing process is that the Chair of the Partnerships is always consulted.
61. The funding column in annex 4 was unclear on whether the MOU required that funding *from* the Secretariat or *to* the Secretariat. It was clarified that it was funding the Secretariat received. It was further noted that not all MOUs include funding as an element.
62. The meeting noted that as financial implications can be involved in some MOUs, it is suggested that broader consultation be included as part of the future process.
63. The Chair noted the enthusiastic thanks from the MOP to the Secretariat for their extensive work.

Action: Secretariat to ensure 2022 audit is uploaded to the website for members as soon as practicable upon completion.

Action: Secretariat to ensure timely circulation to members of future audits is a standard part of the process.

Action: The Management Committee to update MOU establishment processes to include greater member consultation.

Agenda Item 13.5: Administrative and financial implications of substantive agenda items (Document 15)

64. The Rules of Procedure include the reporting of all substantive expenditure.
65. Members are asked to consider the possible increase of the staff budget of 412 staff days to \$350,000 USD, which includes an increase of two staff members to the Secretariat staff to accomplish the ambitious goals of the MOP.

Discussion

66. The meeting considered the need to scale back the ambitions of the list of activities and keep it as an ongoing changing document as needs and opportunities proceed.
67. Clarification was sought on the *small grants* line item that has increased. It incorporates an expansion of the small grants program by 30 staff days and a total of \$10,000 USD. It was further noted that this stage of discussion, this document is for information to advise the MOP in preparation for decisions to be made.
68. It was noted that recruitment from the Republic of Korea would be cheaper given the lack of relocation expenses etc.; however, the positions would be advertised globally.
69. The intern program was fantastic, increasing the capacity of both interns and the Secretariat simultaneously. Most of the interns were from Korea. Partners were encouraged to identify individuals to attend the Secretariat as interns. The possible engagement of youth and secondments whereby tasks could be delivered through Partnerships not housed within the Secretariat was considered as measures to increase output whilst potentially reducing costs.

Agenda Item 12.2: Report on Secretariat Activities and Budget 2023 – 2024 (Document 8)

70. Mr Doug Watkins presented the work plan and budget plan for 2023-24.

71. The MOU for the hosting of the Secretariat has been extended to 2024 for approximately \$539,000 USD. The Science Unit remains part of the Secretariat, funded by the People's Republic of China. Voluntary contributions are made by a range of Partners. The Secretariat will continue to explore fundraising opportunities such as the expansion of the Corporate Champions Program.
72. At present there is a predicted deficit at \$70,637 USD in the budget.

Discussion

73. The Chair called for general reflections to the budget proposals and suggested an in-session working group might be the most appropriate way to deal with the detail.
74. The meeting acknowledged the aspirations in the document are seriously good ideas but seriously underfunded; however, good governance must take priority and suggested a working group to analyse what choices are realistically available to the partners and volunteered to contribute to this process.

5:06 PM The meeting adjourned.

Day Two (Tuesday, 14 March 2023)

9:00 AM The meeting resumed.

75. The Chair re-opened the meeting by acknowledging the Turrabul and Yaggera people of the lands on which the meeting was held.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MR DUNCAN LANG, ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (ADB), and DR DING Li YONG

Regional Flyway Initiative (RFI)

76. Mr Duncan Lang (ADB) presented the Regional Flyway Initiative of the Asian Development Bank to the meeting and noted:
 - Wetlands are in a crisis. IPBES report 85% of wetlands have been lost up to 2000; the decline has only continued. The EAAF is recognised as the most threatened of all the flyways in the world.
 - The Nature Positive Investment arm of ADB is a highly desired by the shareholders - the Developing Member Countries.
 - ADB will deliver \$100 billion in finance for climate adaptation and mitigation.
 - RFI long-term vision: To invest \$3 billion over the next 10+ years to deliver 50+ flyway sites under protection/sustainable management.
 - 10 Developing Member Countries in the Flyway Partnership will be the focus: Malaysia, Mongolia, Republic of the Philippines, Kingdom of Thailand, Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Peoples Republic of China, Republic of Indonesia, Lao Peoples Democratic Republic, Kingdom of Cambodia, Peoples Republic of Bangladesh
 - Wetlands are estimated to give \$47.4 trillion a year as global value, without completely considering the intangible values.
 - RFI can help to deliver on a range of overlapping international agreements, Paris Agreement, Ramsar, CBD etc.
 - Output 1: Develop a capacity building program in targeted countries.

- Output 2: Develop site selection framework for 50 sites.
 - Output 3: Long term sustainable financing mechanism to deliver long-term donor financing for the flyways.
- How do we fund it:
 - Nature loans to de-risk investments
 - Carbon/Nature credits
 - Blending sovereign loans with grant resources
 - Blending project elements
 - Sovereign loans
 - Tax credits

Agenda Item 12.3: Report on the Small Grant Fund for Working Groups and Task Forces 2019 – 2022 (Document 9)

- 77. Mr Doug Watkins presented on the report of the Small Grant Fund for last 4 years.
- 78. Operating since 2019, it provides funding for small projects for migratory waterbirds in line with the strategic plan, up to \$5,000 USD or \$1,000 USD for the presentation of a paper.
- 79. Reporting includes a summary statement of outcomes, web article with photo, and costs reporting.
- 80. Total of 75 projects since 2019 have been supported, amounting to \$143,899 USD in funding. 3 projects were withdrawn due to outside factors, 1 was terminated due to non-compliance.
- 81. The annual budget for this scheme has increased from \$25,000 to \$40,000 USD.

Discussion

- 82. The meeting requested to better understand the allocation of money to the different working groups and would like to understand the allocation process more as well as the effectiveness of the scheme.
- 83. The Technical Sub-committee acknowledged that it is likely a closer look at the processes would be warranted to improve it further. The TSc provides a relative scoring of proposals based on how applications meet the priorities. It was noted that some refinements to the process are being examined; however, if some Task Forces are more active in applying for grants than others, this may explain any perceived imbalances in allocation.
- 84. It was also noted that where recurring annual applications are received, there is a concern from the TSc on whether that style of funding is suitable for these grants. Guidance from the Partners was requested on this matter to assist with decisions. Applications for 2023 are currently being evaluated.
- 85. It was felt the Secretariat might take a role in assisting projects requiring ongoing support to secure long-term funding. How to respond to worthy but unsuccessful projects that really need funding remains challenging. An Emergency Intervention Fund was suggested as a potential solution.
- 86. It was noted that though the selection criteria need refinement, they are not technical criteria therefore should not be the purview of the TSc. The Chair suggested such refinement would be conducted by the Management Committee in close consultation with the Partners.
- 87. TSc noted they have the experience for refining the evaluation scoring, suggesting the terms 'technical' and 'scientific' were not mutually exclusive.

Action: Management Committee and TSc to work with all Working Groups and all Partners to refine the criteria of the Small Grants scheme applications to ensure they are fit for purpose for the next round.

AGENDA ITEM 13: IMPLEMENTATION OF PARTNERSHIP

Agenda Item 13.1: Progress on implementation of the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019 - 2028 (analysis and synthesis of information provided by Partners, Working Groups and Task Forces using the new Reporting Template) (Document 11)

88. Mr Doug Watkins presented the feedback from Partners on the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2019-2028.
89. Survey Reports were received from a large range of Partners giving a good indication of the progress of the objectives of the Partnership.

Discussion:

90. The Chair noted the reporting rate is high and commended the Partners. The synthesis document of the results is comprehensive and members are encouraged to read it for more detail.
91. The meeting queried whether the survey template was useful for Partners to complete and what feedback on the template was received. The Secretariat noted that it can only be judged at present by the quality of the reporting received, which seems high and comprehensive and so one might conclude that the template is working well; however, more work can be done on improving the template to get even better information for the Partnership.
92. As feedback on the template, the numbering system of the template was found to be confusing. Additionally, it was sometimes difficult to complete the document online as that required one person to have all the knowledge, when multiple team members needed to contribute, and they could be at a spread of geographic locations. It was noted that this was why a paper version was also available, and that the rate of online completion was surprisingly high. A system where responsibility for separate sections can be electronically delegated to other team members might be a beneficial change. It would also allow for sections to be omitted if not relevant to that type of partner. The Secretariat noted that this feedback would inform future iterations.
93. The meeting thanked the Secretariat for completing this task, noting both the process and results were useful.
94. It was advised that considering who is intended to receive this information and why, before asking these questions, will help to ensure the data is relevant. The meeting agreed that without wishing to put more burden on Partners, seeking feedback on the template would be useful.

10:30 AM The meeting adjourned for morning tea.

11:03 AM The meeting resumed.

Agenda Item 13.2: Status and management of the EAAFP Flyway Site Network (Document 12)

95. Mr Doug Watkins presented an update on the Flyway Site Network.
96. He reported that 70% of the site information sheets (SIS) are outdated, some more than 10 years old so updating is required. Across the region, 1,060 sites are recognised as internationally important. 152 (14%) are recognised flyway sites. This covers over 23 million hectares. Early nominated sites lack information sheets. As they were Ramsar sites, the information from Ramsar was used instead.
97. Since the last MOP there have been 6 new sites designated from 4 countries. Two potential sites in Myanmar have been supported by the Secretariat and are in the process of being nominated. The Sister Site Program has 11 Sister Site arrangements as of February 2023.

Discussion:

98. The meeting advised that there was a need to approve online accessibility of data from designated sites, as downloads of site data had to happen one by one.

99. The meeting expressed interest in how significant threats to flyway sites were identified and responded to. If no process exists, it was put that the membership might wish to develop something for MOP 12.
100. The Secretariat advised that they generally become aware of threats to sites through the media, which means that the Secretariat must monitor for these as it is unlikely governments will ever advise the Secretariat directly.
101. It was agreed that building a closer relationship with the groups and those working at the sites would give more incentive for information on threats to flow.
102. The meeting noted that for many Partners, international days of significance like World Wetlands Day later in 2023 present an opportunity to celebrate these flyway sites, so the timeline for those awaiting results of their applications was requested. The Secretariat advised that the timeline should already have been completed and apologised for the delay. In future the processes, if agreed by the MOP, would include greater transparency and reliability.
103. The TSc noted that at present there is no guidance on what applicants should include in the forms and by making this clearer it will be easier for partners to apply and ultimately faster to complete a review. It was further noted that it helps for all Partners to have a clear understanding of the process of the review by the TSc.
104. The Science Unit noted the importance of updating the information sheets for flyway sites to get the true ecological profile of a site.
105. The meeting questioned whether there is any process for the delisting of sites. The Secretariat responded that if there is no awareness of changes to the site then there is a reliance on government Partners to inform them. It is hoped that the listing will provide that protected status that maintains the site as a flyway site of importance but beyond that there is no delisting process. If the Secretariat is aware of a problem, they can approach the government and offer support. It was noted that Ramsar has this delisting process that contains multiple stages; this may be worth exploring or adopting for the EAAFP. The TSc noted they have begun drafting steps that should be taken before delisting occurs as a final possible step, modelled on Ramsar rules. It was noted that delisting is an undesirable outcome so all measures to avoid it should be attempted.
106. The Shorebird Working Group advised that they intend to produce a training manual for site managers, which may assist with maintaining sites. The Science Unit responded that the SIS document templates possibly need to be updated. In the SU 2024 work plan the intention is to include training materials to assist with data collection and would like to collaborate with Shorebird Working Group to achieve this.
107. It was queried whether there was support or a grant program for updating sites and for nominating new sites. The Secretariat advised that some funds are available to successful sites for celebration but there is no specific proposal for funding of this kind of pre-work or for updating of the SIS. The TSc noted that some small grant fund applications had included elements to survey sites in preparation for a flyway site application.
108. A series of training modules has been developed by Ramsar Regional Centre - East Asia and these were offered to share with the Partners.
109. Further feedback noted that whilst the SIS is important, it can also be onerous especially for those countries with a large number of sites. Determining the correct reporting interval is therefore important.
110. The meeting discussed the need to explore how the group comments on sites that are in danger of development. This could include a need to participate in any environmental or assessment process for a site so that the EAAFP voice is included. Within the boundaries of the Partnership it would be important to engage in these processes and inform the Partners in the event they would like to comment or contribute. Countries with robust environmental assessment procedures in place would find that more possible but for countries lacking that mechanism, it is more difficult to find the appropriate way to

express opinions into a process. Often the action isn't about getting something stopped, but in some cases, it is about suggesting alternative ways of development proceeding so that the conversation is more productive.

111. For comparison, it was mentioned that the Ramsar articles require their Secretariat to be notified 'without delay' if a site is likely to be negatively impacted by human action. Draft resolutions identifying non-compliant nations at Conventions often provide an incentive to reach a satisfactory outcome so that the resolution is withdrawn. Some gentle persuasion of this nature might be considered within the Flyway Partnership. It was noted that as a voluntary partnership, the Flyway Partnership is complementary to other agreements and retains a flexible and cooperative spirit that has always been a key and valued element. Offering support rather than a resolution of non-compliance aims to avoid problems arising politically for government Partners.

AGENDA ITEM 14: DECISIONS

Agenda Item 14.1: CEPA Action Plan (DD. 1)

112. Ms Lindall Kidd, on behalf of Mr Casey Burns (Chair of CEPA WG), presented the CEPA Action Plan 2023-2028.
113. The aim was described as providing guidance for all Partners on future CEPA activities. The revised CEPA action plan is organised into two objectives:
- a. To promote the Partnership and the Flyway Site Network
 - b. People living within the flyway are aware of migratory birds and their importance.
114. Prioritisation of actions will be conducted by the WG intersessionally with active consultation of Partners if the action plan is accepted.
115. Comments and feedback from members during the development of the action plan were largely very specific to local sites or to a prioritisation process. In the case of the current CEPA action plan, there isn't any evaluation on the current effectiveness but this will be an element of the next iteration. Translation of materials is intended for the partners.
116. The meeting noted the implications of agreeing to draft decision 1 required a resourcing capacity. The Secretariat advised the meeting that no current budget allocation existed and that the prioritisation process would inform later budgeting and resourcing decisions.
117. Given there is a one year overlap between the existing action plan and the proposed updated action plan, the meeting agreed that the agreement should clarify explicitly that the existing action plan would be retired as of the adoption of the updated action plan.

12:36 PM The meeting adjourned.

2:06 PM The meeting resumed.

118. Chair appointments for the following Working Groups were announced with the congratulations and thanks of the MOP:
- CEPA Working Group: Casey Burns
 - Dalmatian Pelican Task Force: Nyambayar Batbayar
 - Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force: Sun Lili
 - Crane Working Group: Zhang Zi Zhong

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: JOE APPIOTT SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: A New Catalyst for Action

Joe Appiott presented on the 2020 UN Conference on Biological Diversity/COP 15, which adopted the framework for the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The vision for 2030 is 1) To take urgent action to halt and reverse biodiversity loss. 2) To have at least 30% of degraded areas of coastal and marine systems under restoration by 2030.

A wholistic and comprehensive approach to actions is necessary. Actions in one area alone will not be sufficient to achieve the outcomes needed. Goals and targets are crafted to be generic and applicable to all biomes.

The new goals are the most ambitious that have been seen for biodiversity. Political realities such as the COVID-19 economic recovery has certainly imposed delays and barriers; however, political attention on nature is at its highest ever.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: ANATIDAE WORKING GROUP UPDATE- MR KATSUMI USHIYAMA (COORDINATOR)

Mr Katsumi Ushiyama presented on the achievements Anatidae Working Group.

- Publications: 16
- Significant joint research programs taking place
- Future works
- International Anatidae Management Plan
- Population modelling
- Data sharing on tracking studies
- Natural habitat conservation for declining specialist species.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CEPA WORKING GROUP UPDATE – MR CASEY BURNS (CHAIR) (Virtually)

Mr Casey Burns presented on the achievements of the CEPA Working Group.

- Reactivated the working group
- Updated the terms of reference
- Updated CEPA portions of the reporting template
- Updated the CEPA Action Plan
- Proposed Youth Mainstreaming
- Grown WG membership to 15
- Met monthly for 18 months
- Appointed a youth member to the Working Group

Mr Burns noted that the work of CEPA crosscuts all the activities of the EAAFP.

What's next?

- Engaging under-reached communities
- Continuing to support youth engagement
- Coordinating with related large-scale CEPA groups (e.g. Ramsar, CBD)
- Providing technical support for local projects including small grants.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CRANE WORKING GROUP UPDATE – MR SIMBA CHAN (COORDINATOR)

Mr Simba Chan presented on the achievements of the Crane Working Group.

- There was a recent avian influenza outbreak in Japan/Korea. The Working Group was on alert for this and have drafted a decision and submitted to EAAFP. Avian disease and wildlife management to be followed up.
- Supported the conservation status of cranes and storks.
- Mr Chan highlighted the excellent international cooperation with the International Crane Foundation and with Mongolia, who are also group members.

Agenda Item 14.10: Youth Mainstreaming in the EAAFP (DD. 10)

119. Mr Dylan Jones (Australia) presented the Draft Decision for Youth Mainstreaming in the EAAFP.
120. He noted that youth are important stakeholders in the EAAFP. The Partnership will benefit from the greater participation of young people.
121. The Draft Decision seeks to encourage greater inclusion in all areas of the Partnership and inclusion on all working groups, Task Forces and sub-committees. This does not mean mandating they must be present. It includes establishing a Youth Task Force, crosscutting all working groups and Task Forces. National Partners should identify one or two young people to be part of the youth Task Force. This will create a pathway for young leaders in science and conservation to get involved in the EAAFP.
122. He noted the age range defined as 18-35 years and facilitated discussion on the purpose of the age range. Whilst members generally noted the UN definition of youth was 18-24, the meeting concluded that the age range 18-35 was acceptable as long as the purpose of a youth Task Force was understood to refer to people early in their careers, that those in the later bracket of the age category would generally only be included on the notion they were representing groups that are mainly comprised of the younger 20s. It was noted that this was not a space for an experienced professional to take advantage of potential grants or support by co-opting the label of youth out of context.
123. The meeting noted that the Ramsar model for a similar youth Task Force has recently been endorsed with considerable support and enthusiasm.
124. The meeting indicated strong support for the swift introduction of a Youth Task Force. The meeting further proposed the youth Task Force be endorsed to commence under the existing draft terms of reference and return to MOP 12 with recommended changes that will best suit their needs after gaining some experience.

Agenda Item 14.3: Adjustments to the Technical Sub-Committee Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure (DD. 3)

125. The Chair of the TSc outlined the origin of the TSc and noted that in the course of operations it has identified the need for certain minor but important changes to be considered.
 - There is no mechanism in the current TOR to fill a gap in the TSC intersessionally. A simple mechanism for co-option would maximise the membership of the TSc.
 - Clarifying the role of representatives of the other regional flyway initiatives in the TSc. Establishing a 'permanent observer' status for such participants, without voting rights, would be advisable.
 - Resolving a contradiction by requiring the TSc appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair as soon as practical after the MOP appointment. Currently the rules require the members to appoint these roles before the MOP but the members are appointed at the MOP.

126. The Finance Sub-committee noted the proposed changes 1 and 3 would apply equally well for the Terms of Reference for them and that this demonstrates the value of reviewing all the Terms of Reference for all the sub-committees, working groups, and Task Forces.
127. The meeting suggested there would be benefit in considering gender in relation to the membership composition of the TSc as encouraging greater female participation in committees would be a positive outcome. Additionally, it was suggested that term limits for participation in any committee would be worthwhile. It was lastly suggested that a geographic representative distribution also be considered. The meeting noted that these elements firstly depend on people making themselves available to stand for the TSc and that having the ability to co-opt intersessionally may give the sub-committee greater ability to redress balances.

Action: The TSC to continue consideration in preparation for discussion at MOP 12 of the most suitable reporting lines of Working Groups and Task Forces.

3:38 PM The meeting adjourned.

4:08 PM The meeting resumed.

Agenda Item 14.4: Appointment of the EAAFP Technical Sub-Committee members for 2023 – 2025 (DD. 4)

128. Draft Decision 4 contained a blank list of names as the deadline for nominations was extended, but circulation of the Draft Decision was required to be circulated by the rules.
129. Mr Bena Smith, Mr Sayam Chowdhury, and Mr Spike Millington as new nominations.
130. 5 returning nominations, Prof Nick Davidson, Mr David Melville, Mr Choi Chang-Yong, Dr Taej Mundkur, Mr Casey Burns
131. The Chair and Vice Chair of the TSc thanked the retiring members of the TSc and welcomed the newly nominated members. The meeting echoed this sentiment.

Agenda Item 14.8: Maintaining up-to-date Population Estimates and Trends of Migratory Waterbird Populations for the EAAFP (DD. 8)

132. Dr Taej Mundkur presented on Draft Decision 8, outlining each of the elements in Draft Decision 8 that the members are being asked to consider and decide upon.
 - It addresses objective 3 of EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028, the need to ‘enhance flyway research and monitoring activities, build knowledge and promote exchange of information on waterbirds and their habitats’.
 - The CSR1 Summary Report was reviewed and approved by the TSC in July 2022.
 - a. Of 216 migratory waterbird species of the 276 EAAF biogeographic populations 34 (16%) belong on the IUCN Red List of threatened species 2021, a further 25 (12%) are near threatened.
 - b. Of the known populations the majority of species are showing declines, trends could not be assessed for 118 (43%) of species.
133. Recommendations are based on the identified gaps in data:
 - a. Majority of population size estimates are unknown or of low quality.
 - b. The definition and distribution of most biogeographic populations is poorly understood.
 - c. Future editions of the CSR could consider inclusion of the 8 seabird families that were not included as no population boundaries are established.

Discussion

134. The meeting noted the strength of international cooperation involved in CSR1 and expressed hopes that this continues in CSR2.
135. It was felt that CSR1 should not be underestimated for the value it will add to the work of the Partnership. It was further noted there was a need to make efforts to create a sustainable funding model for this.
136. It was requested that the data gathered be incorporated into relevant databases to augment other work being done in that space. Would like to request and encourage the 8 species of seabird be researched as a priority to allow for inclusion in the CSR2 and close that identified gap as soon as possible. The meeting noted the difficulty in creating the CSR1 especially for the bird species for which there was little information. CSR1 will now mean that many studies will not need to commence from square 1. Some pre-existing studies probably exist in Japan and Russia but are not in English. A longer period of consultation was recommended to provide feedback and create a more robust.
137. The addition to point 6 of a robust oversight mechanism and the inclusion of the TSc was suggested for consideration.
138. Concern was expressed for the long-term sustainability of this project and the proposed budget line to maintain this work. It was noted that the timeline for this project was determined by the contract with the Secretariat. The consultation period could be extended to 2 years; however, it is a concern that information may become dated. Additionally, with migratory species there is always fieldwork being done somewhere so finding a mutually agreeable time for all PPartners is naturally difficult. The PPartnership will need to find funding for the annual report if the work is intended to carry on permanently.

5:04 PM The meeting adjourned.

Day Three (Wednesday, 15 March 2023)

9:05 AM The meeting resumed.

The Chair opened with an acknowledgement of Country.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: PROF WILLIAM SUTHERLAND, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

The World Coastal Forum: helping deliver evidence based coastal ecosystem conservation.

139. Prof Sutherland presented on the World Coastal Forum.
- EAAFP has long recognised the high pressure on coastal environments, having coordinated many conferences and conducted significant studies in this field.
 - WCF will be an umbrella organisation. It will be voluntary and independent of treaties. It is endorsed at the highest political level and multi stakeholder and is intended to be a benefit not a burden to Partners.
 - WCF has extracted data on studies of spartina grass control. When China announced an attempt to control the invasive grass, an analysis could be quickly done on the effectiveness of different methods of control and offer that information.
 - With the data ready and waiting, a fast response time becomes possible and brings about change. Expert guidance is used to interpret the evidence into practical outcomes.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: DR IVAN RAMIREZ HEAD AVIAN SPECIES TEAM CMS

Global Energy Developments and Migratory Species: The Case of the Energy Task Force (ETF).

140. Dr Ivan Ramirez (CMS) presented on the ETF.
- CMS is the only global treaty under the UN that deals with migratory species.
 - Correlation between the energy production of countries and bird habit loss, disturbance, and impacts is high.
 - Bird collisions with power lines show that whilst power lines are dangerous, renewable energy production can also be dangerous to migratory species, but it is under-studied.
 - Parties, as of 2019, are now reporting on energy impacts on species, including over 50% reporting on power line impacts. Only 3% mentioned solar energy.
 - Migratory flyways are a perfect approach to transboundary cooperation, even more with energy related issues.
 - With a radical increase in the Asia-Pacific region of renewable energy there are great opportunities as well as challenges. It is vital to consider the human impact of proposed measures or changes.
 - CMS ETF has 37 Members including EAAFP Secretariat and 22 observers.
 - ETF has a very simple nomination process: www.cms.int/en/taskforce/energy-task-force
141. The meeting thanked Dr Ramirez for the presentation. The Crane Working Group noted there is plan for the formation of Task Force in renewable energy and invited those interested to participate.

Agenda Item 14.6: Guidelines for EAAFP National and Site Partnerships (DD. 6)

142. Mr Doug Watkins advised the development Guidelines for EAAFP National and Site Partnerships as was directed by MOP 10. Ms Jennifer George, Secretariat consultant, was introduced to meeting.
143. Ms George presented the Draft Guidelines. It was noted that the intent was not to provide strict rules, but supportive guidance. It has been suggested that Guidance be a better name, however, it was noted that the MOP 10 language instructed to develop the Guidelines.
144. Partners at the MOP 11 are requested to approve and implement the proposed new Guidelines for EAAFP National and Site Partnerships. Draft Decision 6 Appendices 1-3

Discussion

145. It was felt it is time to support the National and Site Partnerships and to learn from each other in that process. It would be good for the Secretariat to consider how best to facilitate that learning and sharing of experiences. Presumably countries will have a plan to have National Partnerships support Site Partnerships; however, a network of Site Partnerships within a country is likely to be something countries are also considering. Fostering exchange, resource and the sharing of technical expertise will be important and possibly there is language to be added to DD6, which could support this intention.
146. It was noted that sometimes the potential Partners don't quite meet the definition for EAAFP as they don't work internationally; however, this guidance will assist the Secretariat to provide meaningful and effective ways of engaging those organisations to participate in the conservation of migratory birds.
147. The meeting recognised that it takes significant resources to develop a national work plan, which may pose a barrier to commencing Partnerships. It was positive to hear that the Secretariat is already facilitating the necessary communication in potential Partnerships rather than require expensive resourcing before being able to commence.

Agenda Item 14.7: Guidelines for EAAFP Sister Site Program (DD. 7)

148. Ms Jennifer George presented on the guidelines for the Sister Site Program.

149. Knowing who in the flyway has the information or skills to assist a site is a difficult challenge and is largely what the guidelines are intended to facilitate.
150. The guidelines include case studies of existing arrangements, benefits, and expectations.

Discussion

151. The meeting noted this was a simple and straightforward proposal with a very positive impact across the flyway. The opportunity to expand this from bilateral sister site arrangements to multi-lateral, especially where sites have complex relations with migratory birds, was suggested. This was acknowledged as probably being outside the original scope of this discussion but that it was a good time to begin consideration of this expansion. The Secretariat responded that some unofficial facilitation by the Secretariat of these relationships already occurs through forums and other events.
152. It was noted that sites that have commonalities should be linked up together for closer compatible management.
153. Representatives from Japan advised that, regarding pg. 8 table 2.2 row 2, the formalisation of the relationship of the government Partners of Korea and Japan has not been finalised but suggested this could be reflected in the table without removing the listing.
154. It was noted this MOU template was offered as a starting point to facilitate the commencement of the relationship and was never intended as the sole permissible version.

10:30 AM The meeting adjourned.

11:09 AM The meeting resumed.

Agenda Item 14.5: Propose amendments to improve the use of the Flyway Site Network Site Information Sheet (FNS SIS) (DD. 5)

155. The Chair of the TSc noted that MOP 10 instructed the TSc to consider the Site Information Sheet with the intention of creating a more efficient and less burdensome process for Partners as well as a faster completion timeframe for the review and confirmation.
156. He advised that in looking at the structure:
 - a. The current version has 30 data and information fields. 15 fields were identified as essential by asterisks (numbers 1-14 and 30). Remaining 15 fields are *implicitly* optional.
 - b. The suggested solution is to restructure the form into 2 clear and distinct sections, *required* and *optional*.
157. The information gathered in the optional fields hasn't been utilised much, which may speak to the difficulty of accessing SIS data for analysis by Partners.
158. The TSc gave additional recommendations:
 - a. Clarification on whether the form is an update to an existing site or is a new site.
 - b. There are two SIS sets of criteria formulations, which are unlikely to be helpful to Partners. Recommended a consistent single set with harmonised language throughout.
 - c. Questions over criterion 6 on whether it is worth retaining as it is qualitative and there is no current indication on whether it is useful or being used.
 - i. SIS field 10 (criteria justification) recommended a more structured approach.
 - d. Guidance is not provided on filling in the criteria justification. This guidance exists separately but not within the SIS.
 - e. There were in fact some early sites that transferred from the original Crane Network for example, had never submitted the SIS for those sites.

- f. There can be confusion over the purpose of the SIS. Primarily the purpose is clarification of the justification for the sites' inclusion in the network. Secondly it can identify threats and inform at a national site level ways to analyse patterns of management; however, these purposes are not required for the core purpose.

Discussion

- 159. The meeting suggested further benefit to this revision could be achieved through consultation with government Partners. Concern was raised over the treatment of the text of the guidance in relation to Partnership criteria. This specifically refers to criteria in this guidance differing from the language in the Partnership text. If the Partnership text is not fit for purpose, the MOP would need first to reconsider that text then return to the SIS for the inclusion of compatible text in the guidance.
- 160. The TSc responded that no explicit government consultation has occurred at this stage; the circulation of the Draft Decision was, in essence, an invite for comment from government Partners. Changes to the Partnership text were not possible at MOP 11 given the timeframe required for giving notice. Changes to the Partnership text would therefore necessarily be a decision for MOP 12.
- 161. Concern was noted of altering any definitions to fit the SIS if that would be contrary to the Partnership agreement. It was suggested instead that bringing the SIS into alignment and/or amending the Partnership text would run as a parallel process, even though this will create a delay in approving the SIS. The Partnership text must take precedence over the editing of the SIS.
- 162. The meeting noted that SIS has been a long-standing problem and therefore is happy with the advances the TSc has made in this proposal. A draft updated version of the SIS, even if incomplete, was thought to be useful as a sample.
- 163. The TSc noted that a draft SIS was not presented at this time as it was felt to be premature without further feedback from Partners.
- 164. The meeting noted that migratory waterbirds don't tend to aggregate at breeding sites, which makes it difficult to meet the thresholds for breeding sites to qualify as sites. It is therefore requested that a new SIS consider this problem and greater consultation with partners covering sites like this be included.
- 165. The TSc noted that in the Ramsar Convention, an application was successful in a semi-quantitative method where population density estimates were not available. Techniques such as this are potential methods for solving this problem. It was noted that clear guidance on this should be included in the SIS to these methods.
- 166. The meeting raised that it may be necessary to reconsider the 1% population threshold for a site given the complex way sites support migratory waterbirds for all stages of their life. The TSc Chair urged Partners not to re-open the debate around the 1% threshold, even noting that it doesn't meet every scenario.

Agenda Item 14.1: Christmas Island Frigatebird Single Species Action Plan (DD. 11)

- 167. Dr Rebecca Haughey (Australia) presented on Draft Decision 11 and acknowledged the contributions of Indonesia and Philippines in preparing this submission.
- 168. Dr Barry Baker and Dr Keith Reid were thanked for their extensive contributions and consultations in the preparation of the SSAP.
- 169. The SSAP has been presented at bilateral agreements with Japan and with Korea.
- 170. It was noted that the SSAP will also be submitted to the 14th Conference of the Parties of CMS later in 2023.
- 171. The SSAP outlines the high priority actions necessary to protect the habitat of the Christmas Island Frigatebird.

172. It was advised that the decision requests that the Seabird Working Group monitor the implementation of the Plan and report on progress at MOP 12.

Discussions

173. The Seabird Working Group noted there has been good consultation with this proposal and the Seabird Working Group is happy to accept the responsibility of ongoing monitoring of the plan.
174. The meeting suggested the inclusion of a distribution map and confirmation of threats, such as mercury poisoning. It was also noted that the potential for generating joint work/collaborations could have benefits for other species; the Christmas Island Frigatebird could be a flagship species for such future collaborations.

12:25 PM The meeting adjourned.

2:06 PM The meeting resumed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: SEABIRD WORKING GROUP UPDATE, MR SIMBA CHAN (MEMBER)

- Using terns as a flagship for seabirds and 2022 was the "Year of the Tern" with a series of campaign activities.
- A photo contest was held. The entries were used to create a 2023 calendar.
- World Seabird Day Webinars were held in 2022.
- Every month a 'tern of the month' species is promoted.
- Training was provided to seabird researchers along the flyway covering topics on identification, survey methods, census, and monitoring.
- An Asia Seabird Colony registry has been compiled from existing databases in late 2021-22. It will be uploaded to the Global Seabird Portal. Expecting more sites to be identified as gaps are still being detected and historic sites, which have been included but may no longer be active, are still to be clarified.
- Simba Chan from Seabird Working Group was awarded the Special Achievement Award from the Pacific Seabird Group.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: SHOREBIRD WORKING GROUP UPDATE, DR RICK LANCTOT, (CHAIR)

175. Dr Lanctot noted that a lot of the great work and achievements were accomplished by groups in the field; the Shorebird Working Group assisted but did not lead the actions.
176. Key outputs of the working group going forward are:
- SWG will continue for two more years.
 - Work Programme for 2023-2025
 - Supporting identification and monitoring of internationally recognised shorebird sites.
 - Supporting conservation of shorebird species
 - Providing specialist scientific advice
 - Supporting capacity building through training and workshops
 - Improving communications.
 - New Leadership structure
 - New Chair appointed, Mr David Li from Singapore
 - Aiming for a core group of 6-8 people
 - Making SWG more effective
 - Recruiting and confirming membership of the working group

- Aiming to hold mini-virtual meetings focused on key issues.
- Aiming to hold a second Shorebird Science Meeting. Currently looking for a host.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: BLACK-FACED SPOONBILL WORKING GROUP UPDATE, MR YAT-TUNG YU (COORDINATOR)

- Census data with collaboration of all the Partners in this region reports unconfirmed result of over 6,500 as of 2023. The survey has increased from 41 to 150 sites over the last 20 years.
- CEPA activity included the 2022 Black-faced Spoonbill Birthday Party in Namdong Reservoir, Republic of Korea.
- More site managers are required to accommodate the increasing population of the BFS. More Sister-Sites will be beneficial to the birds as well.
- The increase and recovery of the species is largely thought to be due to the high-quality action plans in place, giving the birds the best chance at long term survival.
- SPECIAL PRESENTATION: DALMATIAN PELICAN TASKFORCE UPDATE, DR NYAMBAYAR BATBAYAR (CHAIR) The Dalmatian Pelican Task Force was established in 2019.
- It is a tradition in western Mongolia that grooming a horse with the beak of the pelican is good luck. This has contributed to the decline of the species. The work of the Task Force in education saw a decrease in the practice but recent seizures at the border of Kazakhstan suggest it may be an international issue.
- Development near the last breeding colony site is a considerable threat to the species. Availability of roosting spaces at night during the migration time is diminishing, adding pressure.
- Met with a series of influencers and political leaders to secure support.
- Main challenge: Finding potential sites for pelicans and then attracting them to those locations and encouraging them use the platforms for nesting.
- National Action Plan for Dalmatian Pelican Conservation is expected to be completed in 2023.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: SPOON-BILLED SANDPIPER TASK FORCE, MR SAYAM CHOUDHURY (ASSISTANT COORDINATOR).

177. Sayam Choudhury presented on the work of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force.
- Predictions of extinction by 2020 has not come to fruition indicating the measures taken are helping, however, the Spoon-billed Sandpiper population is still declining. It is still highly possible the species will be lost in the next 15 years.
 - Head-start project involved collecting eggs from the field for incubation. The breeding pair then usually re-lay, increasing the numbers available. In 2014 the first of the released 'head start' birds were detected at the survey site.
 - Tiaozini wetlands was threatened by development but is now a World Heritage site.
 - 110 illegal nets were reported and removed by police in 2019. Now we see a 90% reduction in illegal nets.
 - There are two main long-term monitoring sites; Myanmar and Bangladesh. Results show population was stabilising but from 2019 onwards the decline has resumed. A new action plan will be prepared to address this.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MASKED FINFOOT – SAYAM CHOWDHURY

Can we still save the masked finfoot?

178. Sayam Choudhury presented on the need for a Masked Finfoot Task Force.

- A Task Force is suggested to be necessary given the emergency of the population. There are only three species of finfoot in the world. The masked finfoot is the only migratory one and the only endangered one.
- The increase in sightings is due to targeted surveys, not an increase in numbers. The decrease was only detected two years ago, largely thought to be due to habitat loss.
- 7 sites in 4 countries with Bangladesh holding the largest populations.
- Future conservation actions: There is an urgent need to establish a team to pursue the actions.

Agenda Item 14.9: Monitoring and Reducing Impact of HPAI and other avian diseases along the East Asian Australasian Flyway (DD. 9)

179. Mr Simba Chan presented the Draft Decision to the Partners.
180. He noted that since late 2021 the HPAI disease has been devastating to populations with mass deaths of cranes recorded in Israel, Japan, and Korea.
181. The Crane Working Group called an emergency meeting in December 2022 at which it was discovered that no instructions existed for actions to be taken in such an eventuality, which led to the submission of this decision paper.
182. The main objective is to expand and reconstruct the Avian Influenza Working Group to an Avian Disease Working Group to develop and disseminate relevant guidance and information to Partners. It would look to be a widely representative group with appropriate expertise, develop its terms of reference and an action plan and report back to MOP 12

Discussion

183. The meeting noted the urgency of action in this issue and that waiting until MOP 12 would not be sufficient. Guidance of monitoring of sites is urgent and there are already draft documents to do this. It was further noted this is not an issue that will go away.
184. It was suggested there is a need to link in with the veterinary, human health, and wildlife concern groups and caution not to duplicate existing work. An interim report to the Management Committee and to the TSc would be welcomed given the urgency.
185. It was noted that Thailand is currently engaged in combatting Avian Influenza through their One Health approach and encouraged cooperation between nations and partners, especially given the impacts to human health. The creation of an information-sharing early warning system was considered a good step but cautioned not duplicating existing efforts.
186. The Secretariat has been maintaining the old Avian Influenza Working Group web space, which contained much information on avian influenza already.
187. It was further noted that the current strain of avian influenza is more virulent and affects a wider range of species. It is a rapidly evolving situation; however, it should be noted that some good management systems are in place that have, for example, reduced the severity of the impact to cranes in Japan.

Other:

188. Partners interested in joining the Masked Finfoot Task Force were asked to share contact details with Sayam Chowdhury to begin an informal Task Force and may proceed intersessionally with the support of the Secretariat.

3:28 PM The meeting adjourned.

4:00 PM The meeting resumed.

Revisited Agenda Item 14.10: Youth Mainstreaming in the EAAFP (DD. 10)

189. The Chair advised the revised Draft Decision 10 document was available to the meeting.
190. The meeting queried why the term ‘capacity building’ was removed. It was suggested that possibly it was because capacity building wasn’t technically part of the brief of CEPA, under which this proposal was developed.
191. The Chair suggested the draft be amended to incorporate that all Partners, not just national partners, be encouraged to nominate young people.

Discussion

192. It was raised that there were two overlapping and potentially conflicting definitions of youth in the document. It was noted that the definition that is more explicit would be only in the background paper, not in the formal decision, which only specifies the definition as ‘generally defined to include those aged 18-35’. It was proposed to include an expanded definition as a footnote. On closer examination it was discovered that one definition noted the age range of generally 18-35 and another in a different part of the paper noted the range as early twenties to mid-thirties, which was in fact inconsistent. The meeting agreed that one expanded definition was necessary and that it should start from the age of 18.
193. It was suggested that the entire dot point in the Terms of Reference defining the sources youth members could be drawn from could be removed altogether or redefined by the activities in which young people are involved, including research, as the draft language could still potentially exclude desired groups. The meeting agreed to the addition of ‘encouragement’ of the inclusion of minorities and Indigenous and ‘local communities’.
194. The meeting was reminded the intention was that that the Youth Task Force was able to consider their own Terms of Reference in advance of MOP 12 and suggested this be included in the decision to save time in crafting each word of the Terms of Reference now.

Revisited Agenda Item 14.4: Appointment of the EAAFP Technical Sub-Committee members for 2023 – 2025 (DD. 4)

195. TSc Chair advised of the minor but not substantive amendments to the Draft Decision paper and noted that point two, was conditional on the agreement of the members to another decision. If the dependent decision was rejected, this clause would be removed.

4:56 PM The meeting adjourned.

Day Five (Friday, 17 March 2023)

10:00 AM The meeting resumed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: H.E. CLARE FEARNLEY DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO BEIJING FROM AOTEAROA NZ.

196. Ms Fearnley spoke of the importance of international cooperation in achieving biodiversity objectives.
 - She noted that the economic impact of small losses of the natural environment were often extreme and cascading.

- The Friends of the Flyway, inspired by the Bar-tailed Godwit, has been a cross government and NGO Partnership and thanked the EAAFP for their ongoing support of the Friends initiative.
- Ms. Fearnley acknowledged the bilateral Partnership for the conservation of migratory birds between China and NZ. She noted the EAAFP is an exemplar of international cooperation.
“If you take care of the birds, you take care of most of the problems in nature.”

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MR SUH SEUNG OH, RAMSAR REGIONAL CENTRE – EAST ASIA,

Wetlands Link International Asia Oceania: Overview and Strategies

- Wetlands Link International (WLI) is a global network of wetland visitor centres.
- Biennial conferences are held, the last was held in Manila 2022 when a new MOU was signed, and WLI Asia and WLI OCEANIA combined
- At present there are 72 members from 15 countries.
- Current programs include:
 - Exchange visits
 - Exhibition sharing
 - Grant program.
- Recently compiled a Wetland Centres in Asia booklet, which includes information that had not been previously collected.
- Expansion of the network activities include:
 - Inventory of wetlands
 - Engagement with other relevant networks
 - New members in the Pacific Islands and Territories
 - Definition of Wetland Centres
 - More time for new members in the conference
 - Promote WLI in other conventions, e.g., CBD.
- Recordings and reports to be shared widely.
- Planned future initiatives include:
 - Internship exchange
 - Exhibition exchange
 - Technology exchange
- WLI hopes to be an EAAFP member soon for the mutual benefit.

197. The chair thanked WLI for their presentation and encouraged their application to membership of the EAAFP.

CONCLUDING BUSINESS (DECISIONS)

10:30 AM

AGENDA ITEM 15: APPROVAL OF DECISIONS (DD. 1 – 10)

Draft Decision 1

198. The Chair presented the updated version of Draft Decision 1, CEPA Action Plan 2023-2028, for final consideration.
199. It was mentioned the role of working groups and Task Forces as being relatively limited when they could play a more substantive role and alleviate the workload of the Secretariat. Wetlands International noted there may be no need to make alterations to this document but would encourage all members to consider this role moving forward. The Chair noted there is language in the document that encourages collaboration generally, even if not specifically mentioning the Working Groups and Task Forces, and such support would be welcomed. It was also noted the document doesn't exclude or limit working groups and Task Forces from greater participation, notwithstanding the table prescribing the responsible parties and their scope.
200. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 1. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

Draft Decision 3

201. The Chair presented Draft Decision 3, Adjustments to the Technical Sub-committee Terms of Reference and Rules and Procedures, for final consideration.
202. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 3. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

Draft Decision 5

203. The Chair presented Draft Decision 5, Proposals to improve the use of the Flyway Site Network Site Information Sheet for final consideration.
204. The suggestion was made it might be helpful to the Partnership if the words *inter-alia* (Latin for 'amongst others') to paragraph 1 to allow the TSc to consider other issues as they arise.
205. The meeting raised that paragraph 2 may be confusing given there are already processes for circulating documents for consideration by the MOP. The Chair noted this was in response to the Partners desire for an earlier consultation to allow for multiple iterations well in advance of MOP 12. The inclusion of the word 'intersessionally' would clarify this.
206. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts draft decision 5. There being no objection the decision was adopted with amendments as noted above.

Draft Decision 6

207. The Chair presented Draft Decision 6, Guidelines for the EAAFP National and Site Partnerships, for final consideration. It was noted that in point 2, the reference to Appendices 2and3 was removed as an unnecessary inclusion/limitation.
208. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts draft decision 6. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

Draft Decision 7

209. The Chair presented Draft Decision 7, Guidelines for the EAAFP Sister Site Programme, for final consideration.
210. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 7. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

Draft Decision 8

211. The Chair presented Draft Decision 8, Maintaining up-to-date Population Estimates for Migratory Waterbirds, for final consideration. It was noted that Partners had expressed considerable interest in the population estimates.
212. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 8. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

Draft Decision 9

213. The Chair presented Draft Decision 9, Monitoring and Reducing impacts of HPAI and other avian diseases in wild birds along the East Asian-Australasian Flyway, for final consideration.
214. ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) expressed interest to join this Working Group as an observer.
215. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 9. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

Draft Decision 10

216. The Chair presented Draft Decision 10, Youth Mainstreaming in the EAAFP, for final consideration.
217. It was noted that in point 5, the term Partner did not specify National Partners, noting that there are other types of Partners, and that if young people nominated were to be representatives of the nations from which they come, then nominations should only come from National Partners or at least with National Partner consultation. The Chair proposed the inclusion of the text, 'in consultation with a National Focal Point'.
218. The meeting discussed that young people should not be limited to representing their country and that deleting the text 'per country' was suggested to allow the most inclusive and broad approach. It was felt that, based on prior discussions, the intent was to be as inclusive as possible. Further, that a Partner that operates over national boundaries has an unclear 'national focal point' with which to consult. The Chair suggested amending the text to include 'where applicable' after focal point.
219. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 10. There being no objection the decision was adopted with amendments as noted above.

11:20 AM The meeting adjourned.

11:38 AM The meeting resumed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: FLYWAYS, THE UNTOLD JOURNEY.

220. Prof Richard Fuller introduced the team producing the documentary led by Randall Wood. A short introduction to the documentary was shown. The Flyways documentary screenings begin from 06 May 2023 in Australia.

AGENDA ITEM 15: APPROVAL OF DECISIONS (DD. 1 – 10) (cont.)

- 221. The Chair presented Draft Decision 11, Christmas Island Frigatebird Single Species Action Plan, for final consideration.
- 222. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts Draft Decision 11. There being no objection the decision was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 16: ADOPTION OF SECRETARIAT'S ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET (Document 8)

- 223. Dr Martin Spray, Chair of the Finance Sub-committee, presented the revised Secretariat Workplan and Budget 2023-2024. He thanked the Partners who contributed heavily to the process of creating this document, with special thanks to Alison Russell-French and Doug Watkins for their work on this during the MOP.
- 224. He noted that the priorities in developing this plan and budget was to create a balanced budget, maintaining a contingency of \$100,000 USD and noting that the renewal of MOUs is not guaranteed and EAAFP keeps a clear view of what is and isn't secure funding. It was further noted that the financial environment for EAAFP is not a completely secure scenario because of these unknown factors.
- 225. The carry-over amount for the past years is a result of the COVID-19 pandemic making the delivery of some projects/expenditure impossible.
- 226. He warned that additional funding from the Partners will be necessary in future to cover the gaps.
- 227. The meeting raised the suggestion that the budget be used to send a short letter or invitation to the Partners requesting a voluntary additional contribution to the Secretariat's budget.
- 228. The meeting noted that some funds intended for programs are reassigned to keep the Secretariat going in the eventuality of MOUs with funding attached not being renewed. It was also noted that indication of the MOUs is likely to occur shortly, allowing a rebalancing of the budget towards the programs as appropriate.
- 229. The Secretariat noted the need for innovative approaches to supporting the activities of the Secretariat, including in-kind support.
- 230. The Chair of the FSc noted that the allocating of the urgent financial needs of the decisions now agreed to by the Partnership at MOP 11, which are not in Annex 3, will be a priority of the Resourcing Plan that follows.
- 231. The MOP expressed deep appreciation to the Incheon Government and The Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea for their support over 14 years as hosting the Secretariat. The People's Republic of China as the central supporters of the Science Unit were offered the significant and deeply felt thanks of the MOP.
- 232. The meeting proposed a formal letter of thanks from the MOP and the EAAFP Secretariat to be sent to People's Republic of China, the Incheon City Government, and the Republic of Korea.
- 233. The Secretariat Workplan and Budget for 2023 - 2024 was adopted and approved.

Action: The Management Committee to write a formal letter of thanks on behalf of the Meeting of the Partnership and the EAAFP Secretariat to the People's Republic of China, Incheon City Government, and the Republic of Korea. And, the Secretariat to send a letter or invitation requesting voluntary contribution (including in-kind contribution)

AGENDA ITEM 17: ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS (DD. 1 – 11)

Agenda Item 17.1: Chair and Vice Chair of the Partnership (No Document)

234. The Chair and the Secretariat gave thanks to the United States representative for performing the role of Chair of the Partnership.
235. Mr Doug Watkins invited nominations to the position of Chair and Vice-Chair.
236. Cambodia nominated Australia to take the role as Chair of the Partnership. Australia indicated their willingness to accept the nomination with thanks to Cambodia for their kind nomination.
237. Singapore seconded the nomination of Australia.
238. There being no other nominations, the Chair declared Australia duly elected to the Chair of the Partnership.
239. New Zealand nominated Cambodia to the Vice-Chair of the Partnership.
240. The Australasian Wader Studies Group nominated the International Crane Foundation for the Vice-Chair.
241. The meeting voiced that both candidates were excellent nominees. Benefits could be seen to including an international NGO in this role. Hans-Seidel Foundation noted both nominees were excellent choices and indicated their support for a NGO partner as Vice-Chair, noting the significant contribution to the Partnership that is asked for from NGOs, it would be appropriate to see an NGO as Vice-Chair.
242. The Chair informed the meeting a secret ballot would be held at 2:00 PM for the election of a Vice-Chair of the Partnership.

12:30 PM The meeting adjourned.

2:07 PM The meeting resumed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: *ENGAGING YOUTH*

- Flyway Youth Forum 2020
- Youth Think Tank Competition 2021 and 2022

Ms. Hou Shuyu from the winning team of the EAAFP Youth Think Tank Competition presented ‘Dining wetland for humans and birds’.

- Community engagement aspect of the program aimed to achieve greater open-mindedness with birds in croplands.
- Recommendations for site management from the project are being considered by the government.

Declaration of the 2020 Flyway Youth Forum

- Ms. Lena van Swinderen read the Declaration of the 2020 Flyway Youth Forum

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CORPORATE CHAMPION PROGRAMME

- A three-tiered program for future corporate sponsorship was presented:
 - Species Champion
 - Flyway Champion
 - Prestige Champion.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: BIRGITA HANSEN, AUSTRALASIAN WADER STUDIES GROUP

GOLD SPONSOR ‘40+ YEARS OF COMMITMENT TO THE FLYWAY’

Charles Allen Foundation thanked for their support of AWSG to provide the Gold Sponsorship for the MOP 11
AWSG formed in 1981 as a special interest group of Birdlife Australia, founding partner of EAAFP.

- Exmouth Gulf Project. National Shorebird Monitoring. Program Oriental Pratincole. Latham's Snipe Project
- Geolocator Program. Advocacy and Collaboration.
- AWSG produce STILT the peer reviewed journal and the TATTler.
- The Mark Barter Award
- Database Management is a significant challenge given the volume of data accumulated over the decades.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MS. MAY-LE NG, FAUNA TECH, BRONZE SPONSOR –

- Introduction to Song Meters, Micro, Mini and SM4 – field recording devices
- Kaleidoscope data analysis software allows quick identification of sound profiles to automate some analysis that would otherwise take a lot of time manually.

Agenda Item 17.1: Chair and Vice Chair of the Partnership (No Document) (cont.)

243. The meeting proposed, in the spirit of collaboration and recognising the appropriateness, skills, and benefits of both candidates, to have 2 equal Vice-Chairs. It was recognised that this was not outlined in the Rules of Procedure but suggested this would be a simple amendment to allow the Partnership to move forward.
244. The Chair noted the expression of support from the Partners in the room; however, also noted that amending the Rules of Procedure without giving adequate notice across the Partnership was also not supported by the Rules of Procedure and suggested this may lead to setting a precedent with unintended consequences.
245. After an examination of the Rules of Procedure, the Chair advised the amendments to the Rules of Procedure must be achieved by consensus of the Partners and could only be done if the Partners agree the item is to be added to the agenda if the matter was 'unforeseen' and 'urgent and important'. The Chair ruled that if the Partnership wanted the issue of potential joint Vice Chairs to be considered it should be done so at MOP 12.
246. International Crane Foundation announced their withdrawal from nomination to facilitate the ongoing consensus approach of the Partnership.
247. Cambodia was declared elected unopposed to the position of Vice-Chair.
248. The meeting acknowledged the INGOs desire for greater participation in the Management Committee.
249. The partners all thanked and acknowledged the magnanimous gesture of ICF in the name of continuing a strong Partnership.
250. The MOP congratulated Cambodia for their election as Vice-Chair

Action: Management Committee to consider the issue of joint-chair and/or vice-chair positions on the Management Committee and present a report to MOP 12.

Agenda Item 17.2: Election and Appointment of the Management Committee (Document 16)

251. The Convention on Migratory Species (Intergovernmental Partner), Wetlands International (non-governmental Partner) and Thailand (government Partner) re-nominated to continue their positions. The Chair called for additional nominations.
252. The Mangrove Foundation was nominated by Birdlife International and seconded by the Pukorokoro Miranda Naturalists Trust. There being no further nominations, The Mangrove Foundation was duly elected to the Management Committee as a non-government Partner.

Agenda Item 17.3: Finance Sub-Committee (Document 17)

253. The 7 members of the committee indicated their nominations to continue serving on the sub-Committee.
254. The meeting requested clarification on term limits for FSc members noting a need to ensure continuity of knowledge during turnover. The Chair clarified there is no current term limits for the sub-Committee but that is an issue that is being examined to ensure to good governance from turnover and continuity.
255. It was noted that an additional seat on the FSc is available, and any additional nomination was welcomed. No further nominations were received.

Agenda Item 17.4: Technical Sub-Committee (DD. 4)

256. The Chair presented Draft Decision 4, for final consideration.
257. The Chair moved the Partnership adopts draft decision 4. There being no objection the decision was adopted.
258. The Chair of the TSc announced that by consensus the committee has re-elected Professor Nick Davidson as Chair and elected Dr Taej Mundkur as Vice-Chair. David Melville was thanked for his previous work, wisdom, and guidance as he steps down from the position of Vice-Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 18: DATE AND VENUE OF THE 12TH MEETING OF PARTNERS (No Document)

259. Singapore encouraged that a south-east Asian country could host MOP 12 for the benefit of diversity and the expanding awareness of people of the flyway itself. The Philippines was encouraged to consider hosting.
260. The Philippines replied with thanks, that it is an honour to be thought of as a potential host, and welcomed a letter from the Secretariat for an invitation to host as a matter of protocol.
261. Vietnam expressed support for the Philippines hosting MOP 12 and indicated a willingness to explore hosting a future MOP.

Action: The EAAFP Secretariat to send a letter of invitation to the Philippines Government inviting them to host MOP 12.

3:42 PM The meeting adjourned.

4:00 PM The meeting resumed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CONSERVATION STATUS REVIEW PROJECT – DR TAEJ MUNDKUR

How many migratory birds in the EAAF?

Dr. Mundkur presented on the recent findings. Special thanks given to the Science Unit for their assistance.

- We can now say the estimate of migratory birds in the flyway is between 28-68 million waterbirds. This data is drawn from analysis of 248 of the 276 populations with size estimates.
- Waterbirds Population Portal has been uploaded with the species data collected.
- The designation of Network Sites qualification of supporting 1% of a population is now based on this data.
- Species Population trends:

Increasing	16%
Stable	16%

Decreasing 25%
Unknown 43%

- Examining biogeographic regions of a species can give a more complex understanding of the species, potentially giving a range of differing behaviours within a species population.
- Recommendation: Ideally that an updated CSR is produced every three years.

AGENDA ITEM 19: ANY OTHER BUSINESS (No Document)

Announcement of EAAFP becomes official partner to World Migratory Bird Day

262. Video Message: World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD)- Official Partner Ceremony: Amy Fraenkel, CMS Congratulated and welcomed the EAAF formally joining the World Migratory Bird Day Partnership.
263. Video Message: Dr Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary, AEWA (Conservation of African Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds) congratulated and welcomed the EAAFP as an official partner of the World Migratory Bird Day Partnership. It was noted that at the first identification of avian influenza the media coverage was negatively affecting public perception of migratory waterbirds and World Migratory Bird Day was founded in response.
264. Video Message: Dr Susan Bonfield Exec. Director, The Environment for the Americas welcomed the EAAFP as an official partner of the World Migratory Bird Day Partnership.
265. Mr Robb Kaler announced that EAAFP was now an official partner of World Migratory Bird Day. He acknowledged and thanked the three organisations above for their great support and messages of congratulations. We look forward to growing the WMBD relationship.

Masked Finfoot

266. The meeting recalled the issue of the Masked Finfoot, brought to the attention of the MOP earlier in the week. A statement for endorsement of the MOP was presented to support and give a mandate to people working in the field to protect this unique species.
267. An amendment was suggested to the mandating of point b) to substitute 'consider developing' for 'develop' to allow more flexibility for the experts to determine the correct pathway forward. It was further proposed that point b) include the words 'and prioritised workplan', to facilitate the studies of population data as a necessary step towards conservation. The meeting noted the presentation of populations in the draft statement was not entirely consistent with the reporting EAAFP uses and proposed amending the number from 108-304 to 160-460 and noted this was based on the same data.
268. It was noted that the habitat loss the species is experiencing is critical already, and it would be good to facilitate the commencement of protection work as soon as possible. This species is a charismatic, short distance migrant and this could present an opportunity for public awareness.
269. There being no dissent, the resolution with amendments was approved and adopted with the amendments as noted above.

AGENDA ITEM 20: CLOSING CEREMONY (No Document)

270. The Republic of Korea, as host of the Secretariat, expressed sincere gratitude to the Government of Australia, BirdLife International, and the EAAFP Secretariat for hosting, to USA and Singapore for past chairing, to Australia and Cambodia for their election. They noted the Ministry of Environment will continue to explore all the ways to continuously support the EAAFP. The Chair acknowledged the

excellent relationship and Partnership with the Republic of Korea and thanked them for their ongoing Partnership.

271. Dr Ilse Kiessling acknowledged all the positive outcomes the Partners had achieved together at this Meeting of the Partners. MOP 11 has been an opportunity to reset the agenda and renew the relationships between colleagues. Australia has been very pleased to have had the chance to host MOP 11 and extended sincere thanks to BirdLife Australia as co-host of the event for their incredible work. She acknowledged the work of the Secretariat for the excellent work in making the event run so well. Specific thanks were given to the Chair, Narelle, for skilfully guiding the MOP through the business of the meeting and, in particular, thanked the Partners for their participation and ongoing commitment.
272. Outgoing Chair of the EAAFP Management Committee, Mr Robb Kaler, acknowledged and thanked the Chair of the MOP for her work leading the meeting. He noted that though there is so much fantastic work being done, it is still not enough and we must do better.
273. Doug Watkins, Chief Executive, EAAFP Secretariat encouraged Partners to develop a work plan and thanked all the Partners for their work. Special thanks to the committees for their guidance and hard work. And thanks to the fantastic staff of the Secretariat.
274. Awards of thanks were presented to Robb Kaler, Martin Spray (FSc), and Professor Nick Davidson (TSc) by Chief Executive, Doug Watkins, and a speech of appreciation to the Doug Watkins delivered by Robb Kaler.

Closing remarks

275. The Chair (Narelle) thanked everyone who participated. Special thanks on behalf of all the members were given to the Secretariat staff.
276. The Chair declared the meeting closed at 5:15 PM

5:15 PM The meeting closed.

ACTIONS ARISING:

Arising from:	Action:	Responsible person:	Due date:
MOP 11	Secretariat to ensure 2022 audit is uploaded to the website for members as soon as practical upon completion.	Secretariat	Mid 2023
MOP 11	Secretariat to ensure timely circulation to Partners of future audits result. .	Secretariat	Mid 2023
MOP 11	The Management Committee update MOU establishment processes to include greater member consultation.	Management Committee	
MOP 11	Management Committee and TSc to work with all Working Groups and all Partners to refine the criteria of the Small Grants scheme applications to ensure they are fit for purpose for the next round.	Management Committee and TSc	
MOP 11	The TSc to continue consideration in preparation for discussion at MOP 12 of the most suitable reporting lines of groups and Task Forces.	TSc	MOP 12
MOP 11	The Management Committee to write a formal letter of thanks on behalf of the Meeting of the Partnership and the EAAFP Secretariat to the People's Republic of	Management Committee/Secretariat	

	China, Korean Governments to host the Secretariat and Science Unit		
MOP11	The EAAFP Secretariat to prepare a letter or invitation requesting the kind and/or in-kind Voluntary Contributions to Partners	Finance Sub-committee/Secretariat	Immediately (beginning of each year)
MOP 11	Management Committee to consider the issue of joint-chair and/or vice-chair positions on the Management Committee and present a report to MOP 12.	Management Committee	MOP 12
MOP 11	The EAAFP Secretariat to send a letter of invitation to the Philippines Government inviting them to host MOP 12.	Secretariat	Immediately