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

Document 8

Report of the Technical Sub-Committee

Submitted by the Technical Sub-Committee

Summary

This report is submitted by the Technical Sub-committee to the 12th Meeting of Partners to the East Asian–Australasian Flyway Partnership. It provides a summary of activities undertaken by the TSc during the intersessional period between the 11th Meeting of Partners (12 – 17 March 2023) to present.

Partners are invited to consider the report and take note of the recommendations contained in the report.

Background

1. This EAAFP Technical Sub-committee (TSc) report summarises actions undertaken against a TSc task list for 2023-2025 and in particular its ten High Priority Tasks agreed by the Management Committee and undertaken between MOP11 and MOP12.

2. The TSc has been established in accordance with paragraph 9(9) of the Partnership document, and provides scientific and technical advice to, *inter alia*, the Meeting of the Partners, the Secretariat, any other body set up under the Partnership, and any Partner.

3. The TSc task list for 2023-2025 provided below is derived from tasks allocated in the TSc Terms of Reference (MOP11/D3), the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2018-2028, and MOP10 and MOP11 Decisions.

4. TSc tasks are grouped under a number of thematic EAAFP implementation activities.

5. Given the TSc capacity limitations, there are many more tasks requested of the TSc than it has current capacity to deliver. Therefore, a small number (10) of High Priority TSc tasks are indicated, which have been approved by the Management Committee.

6. This report covers actions undertaken by the TSc between MOP11 and MOP12, primarily focused on its High Priority tasks.

7. The work of the TSc has involved interactions with all Working Groups (Anatidae, Black-faced Spoonbill, Shorebird, CEPA, Crane and Seabird) and Task Forces (Amur-Heilong Basin, Baer's Pochard, Dalmatian Pelican, Far Eastern Curlew, Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Waterbirds, Monitoring of Waterbirds & Sites, Scaly-sided Merganser, Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Yellow Sea Eco Region and Youth) and has advised on establishment of the Masked Finfoot Task Force and reformed Avian Disease Working Group.

8. The TSc has organized virtual meetings, an in person/online (hybrid) meeting and, with the support of the Secretariat, a first joint TSc/WG/TF meeting, in Beijing in Oct 2024 (Appendices 1, 2, and 3).

9. The TSc also participated in the EAAF Science Symposium, in Beijing, October 2024.

Members of the Technical Sub-committee 2023-2025

Name	Position
Prof. Nick Davidson	Chair
Prof. Taej Mundkur	Vice-Chair
Dr. Chang-yong Choi	Member
Mr. Bena Smith	Member
Dr. Sayam U. Chowdhury	Member
Mr. Casey Burns	Member
Mr. David S. Melville	Member
Mr. Spike Millington	Member
Prof. Lei Cao	Member
Prof. Ir. Dewi Malia Prawiradilaga	Member
Invited Observers & Experts	
Dr. Rob P Clay	Observer
Dr. Beom-Sik Yoo	Observer
Mr. Sergey Dereliev	Observer
Dr. Naya Brangenberg	Invited Expert

Recommendations for Technical Sub-committee activities for the next intersessional period

10. Based on the Technical Sub-committee's experience during the last two and a half years, the TSc makes the following recommendations to assist in shaping the intersessional work of the next TSc:

- Continue prioritization of TSc activities against an intersessional work plan agreed after the MOP and approved by the Management Committee. The Work Plan should recognise the volunteer nature of the TSc membership and their time availability.
- Continue to meet at regular intervals during the intersessional period.
- Empower the TSc to make technical decisions to strengthen implementation of the work of the Partnership, including through maintenance of oversight in preparation of the EAAFP

Conservation Status Reports, waterbird population lists, development of monitoring protocols and related needs and development, monitoring and management of the Flyway Site Network.

- Continue to advise on the annual EAAFP Small Grants Fund (SGF) proposal review process. The SGF process needs closer involvement of the Working Group (WG) and Task Force (TF) leads in guiding development and submission of proposals by its members that aim to address priorities identified in the WG and TF work plans.
- Further develop and strengthen the relationship of the TSc with the Secretariat, particularly with the Science Unit, to ensure that their work plan is focused at support to priority technical issues of the Partnership in the short and medium term. For e.g. development and maintenance of a Flyway Site Network (FSN) database that is accessible to the Partners and supports the application and designation of new FNSs, and provisions of through timely/thorough reviews of new site designations.
- Support the Secretariat and its Science Unit to address the urgent need for establishing a central clearinghouse/coordination for all colour marking projects/schemes for all migratory waterbird taxa covered by the Partnership.
- Further develop and strengthen collaboration between the TSc and the WGs and TFs through regular communication and interaction, including through joint meetings, building on the first meeting in Beijing in October 2024 and one proposed during MOP12.
- Advise on updating the Conservation Status Review (CSR), including on the inclusion of seabird families (EAAFP populations of eight families that need to be defined as per format of the Waterbird Populations Portal).
- Provide technical advice on the development of a Science Strategy for the Partnership, being led by the Secretariat and its Science Unit.

Summary of TSc Activities 2023-2025

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
A. Partnership Strategic Plan and work programme			
A.1 The development and implementation of the Partnership's work programme [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.a]	Lower	Advice to Secretariat on general scientific & technical aspects of Partnership Strategic Plan and work plan implementation.	Advice provided when requested.
A.2 Technical Sub-committee participation in Management Committee processes [MC RoP]	**High**	Participation of the TSc Chair in periodic Management Committee meetings to provide technical advice and input as required.	The TSc Chair has participated in the periodic Management Committee meetings between 2023-2025 and has provided technical advice and input as required.
B. Science Unit (SU)			
B.1 Secretariat Science Unit work plan and its implementation, including work needing to be undertaken by the Science Unit [MOP10 D.05]	**High**	SU work plan reviewed, with recommendations for adjustment/ improvement; and following implementation, provide recommendations on next steps and utilisation of products.	The TSc has organised several meetings with the Secretariat and Science Unit staff to review the Science Unit work plan and its implementation, providing recommendations for adjustment/ improvement. Following implementation of the plan, the TSc has provided recommendations on next steps and utilisation of products, as well as provided suggestions for prioritisation of work needing to be undertaken by the Science Unit.
B.2 Science Unit draft outputs and products [MoP10 D.05]	Lower	Reviews of draft SU outputs and products, prior to their finalisation.	No SU outputs have requested review.
C. Flyway Site Network			
C.1 Proposals for new sites to be included in the Flyway Site Network [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.b]	**High**	Review and advise on Site Information Sheets (SISs) of	The TSc has reviewed the Site Information Sheets (SISs) for new sites to be included in the Flyway Site Network (FNS), supporting the work of the

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
		proposed FNSs (and updated SIS) submitted by Partners.	Secretariat and its Science Unit. This has required several iterations of consultation for most of these sites.
C.2 Support FNSs to develop new Sister Site arrangements [MOP11 D.07]	Lower	Working with Secretariat and WGs/TFs, advise on future sister site connections	No advice sought.
C.3. Improving the FNS Site Information Sheet (SIS) – structure, content and guidance [MOP11 D.05]	**High**	In line with issues set out in MOP11 D.05 Annex 1, revise the SIS (2017 version); circulate to Partners for review; and provide to MOP12 for consideration.	In line with issues set out in MOP11 D.05 Annex 1, the TSc undertook an extensive review of the SIS (2017 version) and consultation with Partners to develop comprehensive guidance to improve the SIS of proposed FNSs (and updated SISs). These were presented regional meetings and successfully tested with Partners for a few FNS nominations. These will be presented for consideration by MOP 12.
D. Proposals to MOP12			
D.1 Draft decisions and recommendations submitted to MoP12 (by Secretariat and Partners) [D.03 Annex 1 6.c]	**High**	Provide review comments to Secretariat on all relevant draft MoP12 decisions. Participation in the MoP12 to provide technical advice and input as required.	The TSc will have reviewed and provided comments to Secretariat on all relevant draft MoP12 decisions, once available.
D.2 Migratory waterbird species to be included in EAAFP Partnership document Appendix III [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.d]	Lower	Advised by expert Partners, review and make recommendations to MoP12 on waterbird species and biogeographic populations to be included in Appendix III.	No advice sought.
D.3 Proposals by Partners to MOP12 for amendment of Appendix III [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.e]	Lower	Provide advice and recommendations for amendments to Appendix III.	No advice sought.

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
D.4 Solutions to problems relating to the scientific and technical aspects of the implementation of the Partnership objectives [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.j]	Lower	Recommendations to MOP on proposed solutions to identified problems.	No advice sought.
E. Research and monitoring needs			
E.1 Flyway research needs on migratory species and their habitats (especially those that are listed in Appendix III or are candidates for such listing) [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.f]	Lower	Recommendations to MoP on a categorized and prioritized list of research needs that is sourced from technical contacts within all countries within the flyway.	Discussed at the Science Symposium in Beijing, Oct 2024. Secretariat including SU to develop a Science Strategy.
E.2 EAAFP *Conservation Status Review* for EAAFP waterbird populations [KRA 3.2] [MOP11 D.08] *Note.* This is expected to include delivery of Strategic Plan KRA 5.2, covering: i. updating and maintaining a list of threatened migratory waterbird populations; and ii. Assessing whether populations of threatened migratory waterbirds are [decreasing,] stable or increasing	**High**	Advice and guidance provided to the Secretariat and Wetlands International on the scope, content and preparation of a second edition of the EAAFP *Conservation Status Review*. Advice on frequency and scope of future *Conservation Status Reviews.* Review of guidance for developing and implementing comprehensive national waterbird monitoring programmes to be developed by the Waterbird Monitoring Task Force.	Advice provided to the Management Committee on frequency and scope of future Conservation Status Reviews. Advice and guidance provided to the Secretariat and Wetlands International on the scope, content and preparation of a second edition of the EAAFP Conservation Status Review, focussed on updating population boundaries, estimates and trends, specifically for populations with new information or for new populations or populations affected by recent taxonomic changes. Discussion with the Seabird Working Group Chair regarding the group creating population boundaries, and updating size and trend estimates for eight “seabird families” lacking this information to enable deriving 1% thresholds as a contribution to CSR2. This is most urgently required to encourage designation and management of Flyway Network Sites.

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
			The TSc is will review the CSR2 as and when it is produced. The TSc has provided input to plans for developing and implementing comprehensive national waterbird monitoring programmes as they are developed by the Waterbird & Site Monitoring Task Force. It remains willing to provide guidance as called up on.
E.3 Development and maintenance of a regularly updated list of sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds on the EAAFP [KRA 3.3]	Lower	Provide review comments to Science Unit of an updated list of sites of international importance for migratory waterbirds. A plan to review and update at set intervals.	No review requested by the SU.
E.4 Establishment of mechanisms for periodic reporting on the ecological character and conservation status of Flyway Network Sites and other wetlands [TsC, MOP10 report]	Lower	Contribute to development of, or adoption of an existing system, to assess and report on the ecological character and conservation status of Flyway Network Sites and other wetlands.	No advice sought.
E.5 EAAF colour-marking register [TsC discussions]	Lower	Advice to Secretariat (Science Unit) on re-establishment of EAAF waterbird colour-marking register.	A review of and recommendations have been provided on the update to the colour-marking protocol of shorebirds developed by the Shorebird Working Group. A recommendation has been provided to the Secretariat/Science Unit to address the urgent need for a central clearinghouse/coordinator for all colour marking projects/schemes for all migratory waterbird taxa covered by the Partnership. This requires coordinating amongst WG and TFs for updates of colour marking

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
			protocols of all waterbird groups and for these to be uploaded on a regular basis on EAAFP website.
E.6 Improving knowledge about climate change impacts on waterbirds and wetlands [KRA 3.4]	Lower	Provide guidance and review scope of a review of reports on existing knowledge about climate change impacts on waterbirds and wetlands, identification of data gaps, and development of a plan to address data gaps. A substantial piece of work to be done either by SU or through a consultancy if funding can be found.	No advice sought.
E.7 Collaborative research programs to support conservation and sustainable management efforts, particularly the sustainable use of resources for local livelihoods benefits [KRA 3.5]	Lower	Contribute to identification of existing collaborative research programmes, with a summary of research results, to support conservation and sustainable management efforts, identification of data gaps, and a plan to address data gaps. SU needed to coordinate this work, with input from national Partners and others.	No advice sought.
F. Conservation measures			
F.1 Specific conservation and management measures for the conservation of Appendix III species and their priorities, or other mechanisms for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats, undertaken within the	Lower	Guide development of a list of specific conservation and management measures for the conservation of migratory waterbirds and their habitats, including measures derived from traditional knowledge, with an	

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
framework of the Partnership [MOP11D.03 Annex 1 6.g]		emphasis on Appendix III species.	
F.2 Priorities for conservation activities relating to migratory waterbird species and their habitats [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.i]	Lower	See F.1	
F.3 Availability of best practice guidelines for waterbird and wetland conservation programs, including the incorporation of traditional knowledge, and need for additional guidelines. [KRA 3.6]	Lower	Support Secretariat (SU) and Partners in identifying best practise guidelines for a toolkit of available guidelines on waterbird and wetland conservation on the EAAF.	No support yet requested.
F.4 New and emerging issues relating to the conservation and management of migratory waterbird species and their habitats on the Flyway [D.04 Annex 1 6 h.]	Lower	Advise on development of a categorized and prioritized list of emerging issues that is sourced from technical contacts within all countries within the flyway.	
F.5 Promoting the range of available training tools to address challenges at Flyway Network Sites [KRA 4.1]	Lower	A prioritized list of challenges to migratory bird conservation at FNSs, with a list of existing training tools to help address the challenges, plus a list of challenges without training tools available.	
F.6 Collaborative development by Partners of innovative and improved approaches to conserve migratory waterbirds and their habitats in the EAAF [KRA 5.1]	Lower	Support and advise Partners in developing collaborative conservation approaches	
G. Working Groups and Task Forces			

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
G.1 Review and recommendations on the operations and effectiveness of Working Groups and Task Forces [MOP11 Report; see also MOP11 D.03 Annex 1.6.l and 1.6.n]	**High**	Consolidated report on WGs and TFs common-concern issues, and lessons learned. *Note that as currently scoped this is a major and complex task and would be best progressed through the Secretariat (including Science Unit) with the engagement of a consultant, working under the guidance and review of the TSc.*	The TSc has led and overseen the Secretariat team in undertaking of a review on the operations and effectiveness of Working Groups and Task Forces (see MOP11 Report; also MOP11 D.03 Annex 1.6.l and 1 discussed results with WG/TF in Beijing Oct 2024 and a summary report with recommendations to MoP12 (Appendix 4). The TSc also advised the Secretariat on ways to improve communication and working of Working Groups and Task Forces.
G.2 Scientific and technical proposals from Working Groups and Task Forces [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6. m]	**High**	Advice on WG/TF scientific and technical proposals, if requested. See also H.2 below.	The TSc has encouraged establishment of the Masked Finfoot Task Force and reviewed its Terms of Reference, and provided feedback/review of the updated Spoon-billed Sandpiper Action Plan and review of implementation of the Far Eastern Curlew Action Plan.
H. Project selection and implementation			
H.1 Selection, monitoring and evaluating projects which will promote implementation of Partnership objectives [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.i]	Lower		Advice provided. See also G.2 and H.2
H.2 Small grant proposals from Working Groups and Task Forces [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6. o]	**High**	Review of annual grant proposals, recommendations for improvements to proposals, recommendations on proposals to fund.	The TSc has supported the Secretariat through organising a review of annual EAAFP Small Grants Fund (SGF) proposals, recommendations for improvements to proposals, and recommendations on proposals to fund in 2024 and 2025 SGF cycles. The SGF projects are focussed on implementing priority actions of the Work Plans of Working Groups and Task Forces to improve understanding of the conservation needs

Topic/Task	Priority 2023-2025	Technical Sub-committee deliverable(s)	TSc Actions undertaken 2023-2025
			of migratory waterbirds, important sites, build local capacity and raise awareness of policy/decision makers, local communities, youth, etc. The TSc has advised the Secretariat on ways to improve the SGF proposal and application procedures.
I. Partnership collaboration and membership			
I.1 Technical Committee meetings [MoP11 D.03]	**High**	Hold regular TSc meetings, virtually or if possible face-to-face	The TSc has organized virtual meetings and an in person/online (hybrid) meeting in Beijing in Oct 2024. The TSc has also participated in the EAAF Science Symposium, and joint TSC/WG/TF meeting, Beijiing, Oct 2024.
I.2 Technical Committee participation in meetings of Partner Focal Points [KRA 4.2]	Lower	Active participation of TsC members in any such meetings.	None requested.
I.3 Information to all Range States (through the Secretariat) on particular species and relevant organizations, in support of encouraging non-partner Range States and relevant organizations to become Partners of the Partnership [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.k]	Lower	Help with identification of potential additional Partners and leveraging of contacts to promote the Partnership.	

Appendix 1

Report of Decision and Agreed Actions of the EAAFP Technical Sub-committee Meeting of 15 October 2024

EAST ASIAN – AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP
Technical Sub-committee Meeting
14:00 – 18:00 GMT+8, 15 October 2024

EAAFP Technical Sub-committee Meeting
Record of Decisions and Agreed Actions

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
1. Welcome and introductions	Jennifer George, Chief Executive of EAAFP, opened the meeting with a short speech to welcome all participants and appreciated their efforts to join the meeting on-site and online. The meeting agenda appears as Attachment 1 to this document, while the list of participants and observers is recorded in Annex 1 below.
2. Review of progress of implementation of the 2023-2025 TSc Wwork Pplan	Nick Davidson, the Chair of TSc, discussed the TSc 2023-2025 Work Pplan which contains the high-priority tasks of TSc during the intersessional period. The work plan is shown in Attachment 2 of this document.
A.2 Technical Sub-committee participation in Management Committee processes	TSc Chair shared that he acts as an observer in the quarterly? Management Committee (MC) meetings, as a high-priority task. He noted that the MC meeting reports werewas not sent out to TSc members. **Action**: a. Secretariat to circulate the reports of the MC meetings in 2024 to TSc members after the upcoming meeting in November.
B.1 Secretariat Science Unit work plan and its implementation, including work needing to be undertaken by the Science Unit	The Chair explained that the TSc is tasked with reviewing the Science Unit (SC) work plan and its implementation, as well as to recommend improvements. He reflected that this task has not been progressing well due to a lack of information.
C.1 Proposals for new sites to be included in the Flyway Site Network	The Chair shared that new sites are being proposed for FNS designation, and the new tabular structure for presenting count data in the revised SIS was helpful during the review process.
C.3. Improving the FNS Site Information Sheet (SIS) – structure, content and guidance	Another TSc high-priority task is the review of the Site Information Sheet (SIS) which he leads together with Taej Mundkur, the Vice Chair of TSc, but at times farming out for advice from TSc members and Working Groups and Task Forces.

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	The Chair emphasised that the revised version aimed to simplify the SIS and will now only require essential data for the FNS designation. Other details are useful for management planning purposes but not necessarily directly for designation. The current structure (2017) is inconsistent including two sets of criteria for designation with a key gap in the guidance on how to apply the criteria for designation. The Vice Chair shared that the draft revised SIS was presented at the ASEAN Flyway Network training in Singapore and the new guidance is currently being used by the national focal point of Thailand for the designation of a new site. All comments gathered by the Chairs are being fed into the updated version of the SIS. The Vice Chair also emphasised the importance of consulting flyway site managers during the revision process, as many sites lack or have outdated SIS. It is crucial to ensure the new guidance is effective for flyway site managers both to update or develop a new SIS. It was also highlighted that the list of threatened species is evolving, and sites should be nominated or proposed based on the most current list. It is crucial to ensure the new guidance is effective for flyway site managers both to update or develop a new SIS. The Chair acknowledged the ongoing review of the Ramsar criteria, noting that they will be considered after their adoption at the Ramsar COP in July 2025 and any relevant changes will be reflected in the SIS. The Vice Chair added that efforts are being made to ensure that the latest guidance submitted to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands is integrated into the SIS guidance, ensuring consistency across these documents. The Ramsar Secretariat is also being notified of any FNS designations that meet the Ramsar criteria, which enhances communication, especially since the Ramsar national focal point and the EAAFP national focal point are not always the same in many countries. Bena Smith, TSc member/WWT, brought up the topic of possible delisting of FNS after updating the SIS. The Chair clarified that there is currently no mechanism to de-list FNS and that this needs to be added to the revised SIS. He also added that the Convention of Wetlands recommends not basing the designation on one criterion. As the EAAFP does not have a formal process for delisting a site, David Melville, a TSC member, raised the question of whether this should be addressed as part of the SIS review. The Vice Chair suggested that encouraging better management of sites, including providing guidance on how to restore their value for migratory waterbirds, could be an initial step to ensure the sites remain important for the waterbirds. This could also be part of the process for considering whether a site should be delisted in the future, if it has either completely or largely lost its value and is no longer of international importance for migratory waterbirds.

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	Actions: a. Secretariat to circulate the revised SIS to Partners with a review period of 2 months as discussed with the Management Committee Chair. The document should be circulated by the end of the year. a. TSc to prepare a final revised version of the SIS to be submitted to MOP for adoption. b. TSC to further discuss the potential delisting process of designated sites.
D.1 Draft decisions and recommendations submitted to MOP12 (by Secretariat and Partners)	The Chair clarified that it is not the intent of TScC to comment on every aspect of every draft MOP decision. Instead, the TSc is asked to provide advice specifically on the technical components and suggest revisions where appropriate. **Action**: a. TSC members requested to provide technical advice on MOP decision papers as needed.
E.2 EAAFP Conservation Status Review (CSR) for EAAFP waterbird populations	The Chair highlights the importance of the first CSR which was approved by MOP11 and led by Wetlands International. He also mentioned the need for possibility of a second review which is subject to funding. The budget used for CSR1 came from the unused travel budget of the Secretariat due to the pandemic and funding from the Norway-Myanmar bilateral wetland project. Ward Hagemeijer added that parts of the Secretariat activity budget are not used for activities due to the lack of capacity in the Flyway to implement some of the strategic priorities. Parts of the budget is also used to fill gaps in the capacity within the Secretariat in delivering important functions to the operations of the EAAFP. There is a need to look at how to use the budget for impact rather than process. The Vice-Chair highlighted that MOP11 Decision 8 is about maintaining the population estimates and requests Wetlands International to prepare a proposal and budget for CSR2. This needs to be in consultation with TSc, Science Unit, Working Groups, and Task Forces. He added that the second CSR needs to be done before the end of the current Strategic Plan in 2028. Decision 8 also requests for the Seabird Working Group as a priority to produce delineation, size estimates and trends of the eight seabird families which were not included in CSR1 and are also not part of the Convention on Wetlands. The Waterbird Populations Portal focusses on waterbirds as per the definition of waterbird families traditionally covered by the Ramsar Convention. The exception is the inclusion of a few coastal seabird populations that are listed under the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement except for a few coastal seabirds AEWA has included. He added that the second CSR needs to be done before the end of the current Strategic Plan in 2028.

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	Actions: a. TSc to encourage Wetlands International to prepare a proposal and budget for CSR2 in consultation with TSc, Science Unit, Working Groups, and Task Forces. b. TSc to advise the Secretariat and the Management Committee on the need to prioritise resourcing for the development of CSR2. c. TSc to advise the Seabird Working Group of the priority to organise the production of population delineations, population size and trend estimates of the eight seabird families which were not included in CSR1.
G.1 Review and recommendations on the operations and effectiveness of Working Groups and Task Forces	The Chair presented the background and results of the Review of Operations of Working Groups and Task Forces (WGs/TFs) a. Recommendations for future operations of the WGs/TFs will go to MOP12. 12 out of 16 WGs/TFs have submitted the form with helpful feedback and information. The slides presented are shown in Attachment 3. Spike Millington, TSc member, highlighted the need to review the membership procedures of the WGs/TFs and how they can influence the effectiveness of these groups. Bruce McKinlay, observer, raised that the overarching purpose or direction of the subgroups needs more definition, which will help clarify where the relationships best fit. As even at the very high level, the name leads to inconsistencies in function, which causes problems in form and delivery. **Actions**: a. Secretariat to forward the survey form to Spike Millington for the Amur-Heilong Basin Task Force. b. Secretariat to circulate the survey responses after receiving feedback from the Dalmatian Pelican Task Force and Amur-Heilong Basin Task Force. c. TSc Chair to complete the synthesis of the survey and the Secretariat to circulate both the compiled responses and synthesis to TSc members. d. Secretariat to research which MOP decisions establish/originated the WGs/TFs including their updated Terms of Reference. e. TSc Chair to complete the synthesis of the survey and the Secretariat to circulate both the compiled responses and synthesis to TSc members.
H.2 Small grant proposals from Working Groups and Task Forces	The Chair noted that the number of SGF applications in 2024 went down in comparison to past cycles as well as a decrease in quality in some of the applications. He also highlighted that there were certain regions with higher numbers of applications which did not coordinate with each other (e.g. Aceh region Indonesia) as well as reoccurring applicants from previous years. Kyle Esperanza Zuleta, EAAFP Secretariat, shared that the EAAFP national focal point of the Republic of Korea had been consulted regarding potential funding support for Russia through the SGF. The Secretariat received no

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	objections from the Ministry of Environment Korea to facilitate the international fund transfer. The Chair raised the question if there should be regulations on how many times one person can apply to spread the fund distribution and if the SGF should be open for non-members. Vice-Chair suggested that due to limited funding available, members should be prioritised. Spike Millington also highlighted the need for better guidance from WGs/TFs leads to help improve the proposals. The Vice -Chair pointed out there are various parts of the SGF that need to be looked at more closely. Especially if the WGs/TFs members find it as a useful mechanism to support their projects. He considers the upcoming Working Group and Task Force meeting as valuable to re-engage with them to promote this SGF mechanism and hopefully get better and more applications in the future. Ward Hagemeijer raised the question to the TSc, asking whether the current size of the SGF is sufficient to have a meaningful impact. He noted that while the Partnership's investment in a limited-sized grants fund requires considerable management effort, the size may not be appropriate. He suggested that there could be an opportunity to actively seek corporate funding to double the amount contributed by the Partnership, which could make it more sellable. The Vice Chair noted that more lead time is needed for the TSc team to finalise, review, and approve proposals. A similar approach was previously taken in the 2024 cycle, where additional time was allocated to try to engage leads of Working Groups and Task Forces to review proposals before submission. However, if this approach has not been effective and fewer proposals have been received, it may be necessary to reassess what factors are hindering the submission of better and more proposals. Ward Hagemeijer queried whether the Science Unit could play a role in engaging with applicants to assess and improve the quality of proposals. **Actions**: a. Secretariat to develop a promotion plan for the SGF programme and conduct interviews of successful grantees if possible. b. TSc and Secretariat to work on the SGF 2025 cycle application and improve the timeline if necessary.
I.1 Technical Sub-Committee meetings	
3. TSc tasks for 2024-2025 (up to MOP12)	Bruce McKinlay noted the lack of strategic direction, which impacts the ability to effectively carry out tasks. This is particularly felt when other parts of the organisation lack clarity around their roles or are not fully

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	contributing, which has a significant effect on the work of the TSc. He suggested that between now and the next MOP, the priority list should be restructured to ensure that key support is delivered to the Management Committee and the Secretariat in preparation for the MOP. Vice-Chair acknowledged the point made and emphasised that the TSc should focus on its core mandate and responsibilities. While other important issues have been addressed, the goal of the current and upcoming meetings is to reach broader agreement on the key areas TSc should focus on in the coming months, especially given the limited time available, it is essential to prioritise key tasks for the period between 2024 and 2025, leading up to the next MOP. Ward Hagemeijer noted that the majority of the MOP is now process-oriented. TSc could add significant value by addressing technical issues that may not be directly reflected in MOP papers but are essential for improving processes behind the scenes. This would enhance the efficiency and impact of the Flyway Partnership. For example, SIS are crucial for the Flyway to achieve its desired impact, and if this mechanism doesn't function properly, it diminishes the overall impact. Bena Smith shared that the Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force is likely to bring its action plan to the TSC, and the Baer's Pochard Task Force will be presenting a technical guidance document to the TSC as well prior to MOP. The Chair responded that this falls under task G2 "*Advice on WG/TF scientific and technical proposals, if requested."* The Chair also noted that this is similar to the question raised by the Shorebird Working Group regarding the mechanism for improving the colour marking protocol, and added that such proposals have not been presented to the TSC in the past. The meeting discussed several issues of the mandate of the TSc, of its technical and scientific roles in terms of providing advice, reviewing MOP decisions, WGs/TFs TORs, action plans, and single species action plans, etc. **Action**: a. TSc to seek Management Committee's advice on the most appropriate process in dealing with scientific and technical proposals coming from Working Groups and Task Forces.
4. Longer-term-horizon scanning for scientific and technical issues to 2028 (to end of current EAAFP Strategic Plan)	The Vice-Chair explained that with time the Partnership lost focus on the main target of the Strategic Plan due to its ambitious nature. If the targets are not being met according to the plan, the TSc should analyse if there are technical issues that should be raised at MOP12. He also noted that it is currently possible to track the progress against the key indicators. He suggested to further think about how to solve this issue as TSc.

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	The Chair added that TSc should raise reporting progress on implementation of the Strategic Plan and reporting the development of the next Strategic Plan as an issue at the next MC meeting in November. Ward Hagemeijer supported this approach and suggested bringing up the possibility of a mid-term review of the Strategic Plan as there is no indication about which targets have been met so far. He also proposed a establishment of a review mechanism, in which the Technical Sub-committee should play a role. **Action**: 1. Chair to raise questions about the Strategic Plan and its implementation status at the Management Committee meeting in November 2024.
5. EAAF waterbird colour-marking	The Chair shared two issues regarding colour marking. The colour-marking protocol and the re-development of the colour-marking register. The TSc currently has no task regarding the colour-marking protocol but was tasked (low priority) with advising the Science Unit on reestablishing the colour-marking register. He added that the Shorebird Working Group is currently developing an updated Shorebird colour-marking protocol which is under review by the TSc. Attachments 4 and 5 contain the revised Shorebird colour-marking protocol and the proposed new colour-marking chart. The Vice-Chair noted that there needs to be a mechanism in developing these protocols that does not require MOP approval for faster action. It is also important to engage national authorities to support and promote the colour-marking protocols for consistency along the flyway. David Melville mentioned that in the Shorebird Working Group colour-marking protocol, Indonesia's combination needs to be added in the review process as well as other combinations that are currently used in small quantities or not at all but are allocated to geographical areas. He further clarified that this colour-marking chart is not a major departure from what was posted on the website, it's an update of what's already there. He also raised the challenges of coordinating colour-marking protocol across national banding schemes, with a specific emphasis on the lack of communication platforms for countries along EAAF and between flyways. In terms of the colour-marking of migratory waterbirds in the EAAF, it was recognised that: a) there is the need for reviews of colour-marking protocol(s) for different waterbird taxa. e.g. through Crane, Anatidae and Seabird Working Groups and b). re-establishing a colour-marking register for EAAAF. This is needed to reduce duplication of efforts by new schemes. **Actions:** a. Updated protocol to be endorsed by TSc after the review, and then published on the EAAFP website by the Secretariat.

Agenda item	TSc Decisions/Agreed Actions
	b. TSc recommends for the Science Unit to take up the role of maintaining an up-to-date colour marking register for all migratory waterbird species and groups covered by the Partnership and work with the Working Groups to complete reviews of colour-marking protocol(s) for their taxa.
6. Strengthening working relationships between the Secretariat, its Science Unit, and WGs/TFs	Vice-Chair shared that there was a review of the Science Unit workplan which he offered feedback. He also added that a tripartite agreement is in place between the Secretariat, Beijing Forestry University, and NFGA, outlining the support the Science Unit will provide to the Partnership. However, the specifics regarding individual responsibilities and the balancing and prioritisation of those actions have yet to be firmed up. He also emphasised that there is a need for more technical support to Working Groups and Task Forces, including maintain support for the SISs from the Secretariat via the Science Unit to Working Groups and Task Forces, including to seek input for the SIS reviews. **Action**: a. Secretariat to arrange a meeting between them, members of the Science Unit and TSc to review the work plans of the Science Unit and strengthen the working relationships.

Annex 1. List of Attendees on-site

Technical Sub-committee Members	
Prof Nick Davidson	Chair
Prof. Taej Mundkur	Vice-Chair
Mr. Sayam U. Chowdhury	Member
Mr. David S. Melville	Member
Mr. Spike Millington	Member
Prof. Lei Cao	Member
EAAFP Secretariat	
Ms. Jennifer George	Chief Executive (not full meeting)
Ms. Kyle Esperanza Zuleta	Programme Officer
Ms. Sabine Leykam	Programme Coordinator
Ms. Minjae Baek	Communication Officer
Ms. Yoon Lee	External Relations Manager (not full meeting)
Mr. Wanli Ma	Programme Assistant
Ms. Yangsirui Zhang	Programme Assistant

Observers	
Mr. Bruce McKinlay	New Zealand Focal Point, Convenor Yellow Sea Eco-Region Taskforce
Mr. Ward Hagemeijer	Wetlands International, Management Committee and Finance Sub-Committee member
Mr. Phil Straw	Australasian Wader Study Group

Annex 2. List of Attendees online

Technical Sub-committee Members	
Bena Smith	Member
Prof. Ir. Dewi Malia Prawiradilaga	Member

Appendix 2

Report of Decisions and Agreed Actions of the EAAFP Technical Sub-committee Meeting of 15 June 2025

EAST ASIAN – AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP
Technical Sub-committee Meeting
20:00 – 22:00 GMT+8, 12 June 2025

EAAFP Technical Sub-committee Meeting
Record of Decisions and Agreed Actions

The Technical Sub-committee had an online Meeting on 12 June 2025; 20:00 – 22:00 GMT+8. The meeting was Chaired by Prof Taej Mundkur, Vice-Chair of TSc, in the absence of the Chair Prof Nick Davidson. The List of Attendees is attached as Annex 1. The Meeting was supported by the Secretariat.

Agenda item	Technical Sub-committee (TSc) Decisions/Agreed Actions
1. Welcome and introductions	The meeting was chaired by Prof Taej Mundkur, Vice-Chair of TSc. Attendance was taken as recorded at Annex 1. One observer was admitted.
2. Review of the 2023–2025 Workplan High Priority Tasks	The Secretariat shared a list of high priority actions in the Work Plan. The meeting reviewed and discussed the high priority tasks approved by the Management Committee (MC) Meeting in 2023, proposing additions for inclusion in the TSc report. These are outlined below: **Action:** The update is to be used in the TSc Report to the MOP.
2.1 A.2 Technical Sub-committee participation in Management Committee processes [MC RoP]	The meeting discussed the process of reporting to the MC Meeting and reiterated the request to receive the reports from the TSc to the MC Meeting from MOP11 (2023) onwards. It was also discussed which file-sharing platform is accessible to all members and observers. **Action**: Secretariat to share all reports of the TSc to the Management Committee since MOP11 (2023) via Microsoft SharePoint.
2.2 B.1 Secretariat Science Unit work plan and its implementation, including work needing to be undertaken by the Science Unit [MOP10 D.05]	Challenges in implementing the Science Unit's work plan, e.g. reduced capacity due to staff reallocation to non EAAFP tasks, were noted during the meeting. The Chief Executive informed the meeting that there is no single person at the Science Unit allocated to supporting the work of the Partnership on an ongoing basis. It is planned that she discuss the work plan priorities, as well as the original TOR, during an in-person meeting with the Science Unit the following week.

Agenda item	Technical Sub-committee (TSc) Decisions/Agreed Actions
	Action: Secretariat to update the TSc on the discussion on work plan priorities for the Science Unit.
2.3 C.1 Proposals for new sites to be included in the Flyway Site Network [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.b]	The meeting provided an update on the consultation process of the revised Site Information Sheets (SIS), which will be submitted as a paper at MOP12. The aims of the guidance are to enable the National Focal Points to prepare site nominations and Secretariat to be able to review the completeness of these nominations and thereafter to consult with TSc. As for the current SIS review process of recently nominated sites, it was raised that clearer guidance is needed to define the roles of the Science Unit, relevant Working Groups and Task Forces, and the TSc during the review process. The Secretariat has provided the draft SIS guidance at a number of national workshops and encouraged its use. The meeting also explored the possibility of developing an online SIS linked to the Ramsar Information System (RIS). This would allow for a more efficient system for the review of new sites. This integration would streamline the designation process for EAAFP Partners and Contracting Parties. A recommendation was made to prioritise this within the Partnership to facilitate resource allocation. The Secretariat informed that four new sites are being proposed in the Philippines, and possibly others from other countries. **Action**: TSc to prepare the MOP paper on the revised SIS and submit to the Secretariat by 1 August 2025, that takes into consideration any outcomes of the Ramsar COP15. **Action**: TSc proposed that the Secretariat develop a proposal for an online SIS system and for this to be prioritised for resource allocation. **Action:** Secretariat to inform the TSc of the number of new site nominations are to be proposed in the lead up to the MOP to enable the TSc plan their review, once these have been reviewed by the Science Unit.
2.4 D.1 Draft decisions and recommendations submitted to MoP12 (by Secretariat and Partners) [D.03 Annex 1 6.c]	It was discussed whether the TSc is invited to review relevant draft decisions and provide technical input as required, as well as the review process of MOP documents, which may include the Secretariat, the MC, and the TSc. It was suggested that the MC need not delve into technical issues but should focus on ensuring that such matters are appropriately referred to the TSc and the Science Unit for review. TSc members initially shared issues they plan to present to MOP, which include the following: Review of implementation of Single Species Action Plan (SSAP) for Far Eastern Curlew, Update of the SSAP for Spoon-billed Sandpiper (SBS), SSAP for Nordmann's Greenshank, Baer's Pochard management guidance, a

Agenda item	Technical Sub-committee (TSc) Decisions/Agreed Actions
	proposal on management of SBS in breeding grounds by Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust and a draft Masked Finfoot TOR. **Action**: TSc to assist with the technical review of draft decision papers as requested by MC/Secretariat, recognising our capacity limitations to do so.
2.5 E.2 EAAFP Conservation Status Review for EAAFP waterbird populations [KRA 3.2] [MOP11 D.08]	The meeting discussed the development of the Conservation Status Report (CSR)2. The need for input from the Seabird Working Group was highlighted as eight seabird families need to be covered and fed into CSR2. The necessity to gather more information on a small number of populations to update trends and boundaries in CSR1 was also mentioned, as well as the need to institute a review mechanism to evaluate individual changes as new information becomes available similar to the AEWA process. The Secretariat mentioned that 6,000 USD was available to support CSR2 development. **Action:** TSc Vice Chair to circulate the AEWA document on the population boundary review process **Action**: TSc Vice Chair to explore options with the Chair of the Seabird Working Group to scope/prepare a proposal to cover preparation of delineation, size estimates and trends of eight seabird families; information that will need to feed into CSR2.
2.6 G.1 Review and recommendations on the operations and effectiveness of Working Groups and Task Forces [MOP11 Report; see also MOP11 D.03 Annex 1.6.l and 1.6.n]	The meeting discussed the status of the report for the Review of Operations of Working Groups and Task Forces. It was noted that the TSc Chair is currently tasked with the preparation of the survey report, including recommendations. However, as the Chair is unavailable, it was suggested to review the existing survey documents to develop a structured plan for efficiently analysing and drafting the report, as well as the possibility of involving other TSc members to assist with this task. It was suggested to organize a joint meeting of the TSc/Working Group (WG)/ Task Force (TF) leads following the Beijing meeting to better understand how the TSc can support the WGs and TFs, emphasising the importance of having a well-structured meeting with clear objectives. It was noted that substantial preparatory work would be required to maximise the opportunity, as this is a rare chance to bring together the Working Groups, Task Forces, and the Technical Sub-Committee in one place. The meeting also discussed the status of the Terms of Reference (TOR) of Working Groups and Task Forces, and the possibility of reviewing the alignment of TORs. It was also suggested to look beyond the TOR as functionality, operational needs, and membership of these groups must also be considered. It was noted that the survey on the operations of the groups was intended to address these broader aspects, including how effectively the groups are functioning and their specific needs to operate efficiently.

Agenda item	Technical Sub-committee (TSc) Decisions/Agreed Actions
	Action: TSc Chair to finalise summary report of the WG/TF survey in consultation with the TSc members, WG/TF leads with support of the Secretariat. **Action**: Secretariat to share the WG/TF survey documents with the TSc members. **Action:** TSc produce a template to guide review/update of the WG/TF TORs. A plan for engagement with the WG/TF in advance of the MOP to prepare the updated TORs, if needed, need to be prepared. Spike Millington and Bena Smith volunteered to lead on this. **Action**: TSc wishes to organise an in-person pre-MOP joint meeting in Cebu for Technical Sub-committee members and leads of Working Groups, and Task Forces; Spike to submit a side event application. The meeting also discussed the review of guidance for developing and implementing comprehensive national waterbird monitoring programmes developed by the Waterbird & Wetlands Monitoring Task Force. It was noted that the Task Force is currently inactive, but a background paper has already been prepared by Wetlands International, who have indicated they would be willing to lead on this. The issue about the length of the document was raised, and it was suggested to add a concise summary to increase accessibility and feedback. **Action**: TSc Vice Chair to revisit the Monitoring Task Force document in consultation with Wetlands International and to ensure that it includes a summary prior to recirculation to TSc. **Action:** Secretariat to advise on refocusing/restructuring of the Yellow Sea TF.
2.7 G.2 Scientific and technical proposals from Working Groups and Task Forces [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6. m]	The meeting discussed the review process for incoming SSAPs and other technical documents from Working Groups and Task Forces. The discussion on that will continue in further meetings. **Action:** A process on the role & responsibilities of TSc, Working Groups and Task Forces in reviewing technical reports, reports of implementation of SSAPs, updated SSAPs, especially for SSAPs not linked to a Working Group/Task Force.
2.8 H.2 Small grant proposals from Working Groups and Task Forces [MOP11 D.03 Annex 1 6.o]	The Secretariat gave a brief overview of the 2025 grantees and the status of the fund transfer, highlighting challenges in completing the fund transfer to Russia. The Secretariat also outlined its upcoming tasks, which include developing a promotion plan for the SGF and drafting a report on SGF activities for the period 2023–2025 to be presented at MOP12. It was also suggested to convene another meeting after the new TSc is formed to explore ways to further improve the grant process, particularly the criteria. **Action**: Secretariat to share the overview of the SGF updates.

Agenda item	Technical Sub-committee (TSc) Decisions/Agreed Actions
	Action: Secretariat to update the 2025 SGF webpage and publish a special newsletter promoting the grantees of this year's cycle.
2.9 I.1 Technical Sub-Committee meetings [MoP11 D.03]	The meeting discussed arranging a TSc meeting during MOP12. The Secretariat informed the TSc that, as stated in the Sponsorship Guidelines, the Chair of the TSc can be funded, and others as needed. Funding limitations were highlighted. **Action**: Secretariat to advise on funding available to support TSC meeting to be organised during MOP12.
3. A.2. Technical Sub-committee participation in Management Committee process	The meeting discussed the drafting of the necessary reports for the upcoming Management Committee Meeting in July 2025. This includes the regular report of activities of the Technical Sub-committee, the intersessional report of the TSc for MOP12, as well as the election and appointment paper for new committee members. The meeting also discussed the appointment of new members and members stepping down after MOP12. It was recommended to eligible members to consider a second term, as well as for observers to join as TSc members. **Action**: TSc Vice Chair to prepare the relevant documents and circulate to TSc members for their review and comments. **Action:** TSc Chair reach out to contact existing and eligible TF members to guage their interest in standaring for a second term. **Action**: TSc to detail indicative knowledge and expertise to promote representation of different technical areas that can guide Partners in their nomination process.
4. Other Matters **Wintering Count Data Sharing China**	Prof. Cao Lei shared that the Chinese National Forestry and Grassland Administration (NFGA) conducted wintering counts in January 2025. However, authorities expressed concerns over publishing the data due to possible perceived inaccuracy. It was noted that receiving regular data from China would be very valuable to close the data gaps from CSR 1. Secretariat was requested to raise this to the EAAFP National Focal Point at NFGA during the upcoming visit to Beijing. **Action**: Secretariat to include waterbird monitoring and population data sharing in the discussion points with NFGA for the and to update the TSc.

Annex 1. List of Attendees

Technical Sub-Committee Members and Observers	
Prof. Taej Mundkur	Vice-Chair
Mr. Bena Smith	Member
Mr. David S. Melville	Member
Prof. Lei Cao	Member
Dr. Sayam U. Chowdhury	Member
Mr. Spike Millington	Member
Dr. Beom-Sik Yoo	Invited Observer
Dr. Naya Brangenberg	Invited Expert
Dr. Rob P. Clay	Invited Observer
EAAFP Secretariat	
Ms. Jennifer George	Chief Executive
Ms. Yoon Lee	Deputy Chief Executive
Ms. Kyle Esperanza Zuleta	Programme Officer
Ms. Sabine Leykam	Programme Coordinator
Observer	
Ms. Fanjuan Meng	Chinese Bird Monitoring Network (invited by Prof. Lei Cao)
Apologies	
Prof Nick Davidson	Chair
Prof. Ir. Dewi M Prawiradilaga	Member
Mr. Bena Smith	Member
Mr. Sergey Dereliev	Observer

Appendix 3

Report of Decision and Agreed Actions of the EAAFP Technical Sub-Committee, Working Groups, & Task Forces Workshop of 16 October 2024

EAST ASIAN – AUSTRALASIAN FLYWAY PARTNERSHIP
TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE, WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES WORKSHOP
14:00 – 18:00 GMT+8, 16 October 2024

EAAFP Technical Sub-Committee, Working Groups, & Task Forces Workshop
Record of Decisions and Agreed Actions

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
1. Welcome and introductions	TSc Chair, Nick Davidson, opened the meeting and welcomed participants. Attendance was taken as recorded in Annex 1. Observers were also admitted. The workshop agenda circulated to in-person and online participants appears in Attachment 1 to this document.
2. Updates from the Technical Sub-committee (e.g. SIS updates; SGF 2025 cycle updates)	TSc Chair provided updates on the TSc tasks and priorities including the revisions on the 2017 version of the Flyway Network Site (FNS) Site Information Sheet (SIS) as well as the expected process and timeline of the consultations with Partners. The Chair also provided updates on the 2024 cycle of the Small Grant Fund (SGF) for Working Groups and Task Forces highlighting the revised guidance for applicants as well as an overview of the applications received this year. The Chair encouraged WGs/TFs to look into developing SGF proposals to support holding workshops, and developing guidance, among others. TSc Vice Chair, Taej Mundkur, raised the issue of how to prioritise the work of WGs/TFs and making this information as priorities and work plans available to the Secretariat and on the EAAFP website so proponents of projects can easily identify priority projects that directly contribute to the WGs/TFs. **Actions**: a. Secretariat to circulate the proposed revisions to the SIS to all Partners and WGs/TFs. TSc to finalise a draft SIS for MOP12 approval. b. Secretariat and TSc to capture the challenges of the previous SGF cycle and develop ways to resolve them and update the 2025 cycle accordingly.

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
	c. WGs/TFs leads to provide 2025 priorities and work plans to the Secretariat to make available on the EAAFP website.
3. Waterbird and wetland monitoring needs for the Partnership, at flyway and national level, gaps, and ways forward	TSc Vice Chair discussed the need to develop a protocol considering the different schemes running across the flyway for different groups of waterbirds, for single species, for single families or for all waterbirds. These differ in countries, regions, frequency, and methodologies which result in challenges in synthesising data for analysis at the local, national, and flyway levels.
a. Introduction to the EAAFP Decision and Background Paper - Taej Mundkur, Wetlands International (background paper to be shared) b. Discussion on needs & next steps to strengthen monitoring of waterbirds and wetlands c. Some issues to guide development of protocols	Given this need to develop a protocol and to respond to the decisions from the latest MOP decisions, there is a need to revive the EAAFP Monitoring of Waterbird Populations and Sites Task Force which has been inactive in recent years by building on the skills and knowledge and expertise of various WGs/TFs and other experts in the region. Recommendations from the Conservation Status Report 1 produced in 2022 that feed into what the priorities are for monitoring were also presented. These include developing a comprehensive monitoring programme for all waterbird populations, special monitoring efforts and techniques for some species of shorebirds, waterbird species often outside wetlands like grasslands and croplands, waterbirds using coastal or offshore areas, finding ways to resource national monitoring efforts, expanding coverage to cover areas where there is less coverage, building local capacity, and expanding single species monitoring programmes to cover all waterbirds (e.g. Scaly-sided Merganser, Spoon-billed Sandpiper, etc.). Suggested next steps included seeking feedback from Working Groups/Task Forces, developing of a plan with TSC, Secretariat & Science Unit & WG/TFs for actions to be undertaken and resources to support process, organisation of a workshop session at the proposed EAAFP Science Meeting to develop/agree plan, development of a decision paper for MOP12. The slides presented are shown in Attachment 2. Sayam U. Chowdhury (TSc Member) shared that there is a need to assess novel methods to extrapolate populations from where we have data as done in Bangladesh with fairly narrow confidence limits which was done using various remote sensing variables and machine learning. These methods might be possible to use for the entire flyway

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
	using tidal flat areas and other freely available global data sets. On the frequency of counts, TSc Vice Chair discussed the different monitoring frequencies in each country or region which could be the capacity to conduct such counts. It emphasised the importance to get good representative information taking into account the possible barriers for some sites to conduct counts regularly, including due to poor weather conditions. TSc Chair emphasised the need to get as much improved monitoring of flyway network sites as the core set of sites that will inform waterbird population trend patterns. On reviving the Monitoring Task Force, Spike Millington (TSc Member), suggested consulting WGs/TFs about their thoughts in terms of monitoring and capacity, and based on their feedback, develop a Terms of Reference if there is an added value to it. Also adding that there is no need to go through any MOP approval procedure as this can be considered work between existing WGs/TFs. Chair of the Dalmatian Pelican Task Force, Nyambayar Batbayar, recommended the importance of supporting the establishment of national and provincial-level waterbird monitoring schemes. He raised that relying only on flyway network sites for population monitoring covers just a small proportion of the wetlands used by waterbirds during migration, which is not enough. Noting that tracking studies show only the key sites and are project-dependent, leaving many smaller, potentially important wetlands unmonitored, yet they are rarely discussed in these meetings. Dewi Prawiradilaga (TSc Member) noted that it remains difficult to conduct monitoring at least three of four times a year including migratory seasons but noted that Sumatra and Java have bird watchers who are interested in monitoring and with the SGF support, monitoring in South Kalimantan can be expected this year. Robb Kaler, Chair of Seabird Working Group, suggested considering reducing the resolution of information as, for instance, obtaining population trends over time, is more complicated for seabirds. The quality of data is also a challenging point. The TSc Chair reflected on the need to

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
	decide which period of time is best to collect population size information for different birds (to be covered later in agenda). Bruce McKinlay (Observer) suggested that a better use of our resources would be to triage to critically evaluate what priorities are, and by ranking species according to threat classification. A triage list could highlight major gaps and guide progress. Noting that a comprehensive assessment is a humongous job whereas focusing on priorities based on threat classification and lack of knowledge is more manageable. **Actions**: a. Secretariat to re-share to all participants the MOP11 Decision 8 paper on *Maintaining up-to-date Population Estimates and Trends of Migratory Waterbird Populations for the EAAFP* which appears as Attachment 3. b. Sayam to share papers or reports on these new methods. c. Robb Kaler to follow up his recommendations to TSc Vice Chair
i. Monitoring of waterbirds - Protocols needed for all waterbirds, or groups (shorebirds - David Li) and single species (Black-faced Spoonbill - Yu Yat-Tung) - Use of different methodologies and techniques. - Frequency of counts	David Li, Chair of Shorebird Working Group (SWG), shared that SWG work plan item 1 focuses on the role of the WG in supporting shorebird monitoring by providing technical advice to various stakeholders, particularly in developing countries where large areas of potential shorebird habitats remain unsurveyed. Outcomes of the SWG webinar underlined the achievements and ongoing challenges in shorebird monitoring in EAAF such as the need for continued innovation in data management and community engagement to effectively conserve shorebird populations across the flyway. Refer to Attachment 4 for the full report. Yat-tung Yu, Coordinator of the Black-faced Spoonbill (BFS) Working Group, presented the monitoring of BFS and highlighted two points: all sites are well counted and population trends and conditions in each site are well known and people who conduct the monitoring have good experience on site which is important to collect the most accurate data. He discussed the growth and success of their monitoring, noting that over 200 people participated last year, emphasising the simplicity of using platforms like Facebook to organise and share information. The census is now a well-established annual event, with participants awaiting instructions on dates to conduct their monitoring.

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
	Also noted was the importance of including breeding sites in DPRK. The presentation appears in Attachment 5. **Action:** a. Secretariat to circulate the SWG report and presentation to all participants of the workshop.
d. Renewed focus/role for the EAAFP Monitoring of Waterbirds and Wetlands Task Force in leading/ supporting the developments – Ward Hagemeijer, Wetlands International (background paper to be shared)	Ward Hagemeijer, Wetlands International, underlined that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to how we monitor birds, highlighting the possibility of proposing methods to select the method that is most appropriate to get the best possible estimates and the few principles that can be applied for it. Approaches to prioritising populations to monitor in EAAF was also presented, particularly a decision flowchart where populations are prioritised based on factors like whether they are already well-monitored, if they have a species action plan, or if they are globally threatened. Attachment 6 provides the detailed proposal for the re-establishment of the EAAFP Waterbird and Wetland Monitoring Task Force as well as its Terms of Reference for approval at MOP12. The process of re-establishing the Task Force was discussed where TSc recommended encouraging Wetlands International to take a lead on preparing the materials for the re-establishment of the Task Force and submitting them to the TSc inter-sessionally for advice. TSc Vice Chair suggested taking it beyond just Terms of Reference as it could be useful to bring together experts to develop a plan for what should be happening over the next years and ideally to organise a meeting in 2025 prior to MOP12. **Actions:** a. TSc recommends that Wetlands International lead the re-establishment of Monitoring TF in consultation with WG/TFs for preparation of related documents. b. Participants requested to provide feedback on the background paper (Attachment 6) including on proposing actions on next steps. c. Secretariat to prioritise organising a meeting of experts next year to develop a plan on how to develop this work prior to MOP12.
4. Strengthening coordination of colour marking of migratory waterbirds – David Melville	David Melville (TSc Member) provided some background information on the updating of the Shorebird Working Group (SWG) colour marking protocol already available on

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
- Progress on review of colour marking protocol of shorebirds - Role of EAAFP Secretariat in coordination	the EAAFP website. The update was done by experts actively banding in the field rather than with national banding schemes. He shared that TSc will review and propose some edits to the updated colour marking protocol for shorebirds. David raised the issues on the lack of coordination on the marking of some waterbird and seabird species and recommended for each WGs/TFs to look at what colour marking is being done in their group of birds and as appropriate, does an update of what is happening and if there are problems identified. While most colour marking in EAAF is controlled by a government agency in Partner states, however, it was noted that not all Partner states have a national banding scheme, but they may have a wildlife protection department which still needs to authorise the marking of birds. TSc Chair highlighted that the Partnership has no legal authority over any of these activities and processes as it is with the national banding schemes. David Melville further suggested that the Science Unit may take on a role to help coordinate this amongst WGs and TFs. **Action**: a. As agreed at the TSc meeting, the SWG colour marking protocol will be reviewed by TSc and uploaded to the EAAFP website to replace the existing document. b. The Science Unit coordinates amongst WGs and TFs for updates of colour marking protocols of all waterbird groups to be produced and for these to be uploaded on the EAAFP website to replace outdated information.
5. Updates from EAAFP Working Groups and Task Forces - Report and discussion on the Secretariat Working Groups and Task Forces survey results – Nick Davidson - Understanding the governance structure and relationships – Jennifer George - Feeding back/reporting on 2023-2024 activities, including challenges – WG/TF leads	The TSc Chair presented the results of the WGs/TFs survey, as outlined in Attachment 7, highlighting common themes such as the groups are largely voluntary, unfunded nature of these networks, and their limited capacity. Despite these challenges, some groups acknowledged the valuable support from the Secretariat, with the SGF Programme for WGs/TFs seen as useful. However, there was recognition that the approval process for documents produced by WGs/TFs remains unclear, and there is a need for stronger links and greater support from the TSc. It was also noted that communication between the TSc and the groups has been insufficient, but this workshop was seen as an

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
- Standardisation/updates of WG/TF ToRs, work-planning for 2025 – WG/TF leads	opportunity to improve that. TSc Chair shared a suggestion in the survey results that one way to enhance communication would be to include representatives from WGs/TFs within the TSc itself and agreed that this can be done by inviting WGs/TFs leads as observers to TSc work and meetings. David Li acknowledged that having leads of WGs/TFs in TSc meetings would help in improving the communication. Given that there was some strong feedback on the MOP reporting template, the TSc Chair recommended having a meeting to discuss the issues on the document. Lindall Kidd, Co-chair of CEPA Working Group, commended this initiative and highlighted the need for better strategic communication. She provided an example of how the CEPA WG can help with some of the monitoring implementation and potentially help to get some of the flagging and ringing schemes in order. She urged to work out how WGs and TFs can better communicate with one another. Robb Kaler, Chair of Seabird Working Group, requested the Secretariat to help provide a platform service similar to Listserv which is no longer functional. TSc Chair suggested reviewing the survey responses to identify patterns in how WGs/TFs view the Secretariat's role as a support system for the EAAFP, and where additional support may be needed. **Actions**: a. After further analysis of the survey results, the TSc will convene a virtual meeting to discuss the findings and agree on the next steps for moving forward. Secretariat to circulate the analysis of results prior to the meeting. b. TSc representatives and WGs/TFs leads to work with the Secretariat to review the MOP reporting template to identify ways to make it fit for purpose. c. Review the survey responses of WGs/TFs relating to the Secretariat's & Science Unit's role in supporting these groups and identifying areas where additional assistance may be needed. d. Secretariat to respond to a request from the Seabird Working Group to help set up a Listserve to improve communication amongst the group.

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
5. Understanding the governance structure and relationships – Jennifer George	Jennifer George, Chief Executive (CE) of EAAFP, discussed the informal and relationship-driven nature of the Flyway Partnership, emphasising the importance of clear governance structures despite the lack of formal obligations. The existing governance structure—comprising Committees, WGs and TFs, and Secretariat—was acknowledged as complex, but generally functional. It was also stressed how important communication and relationships are in ensuring progress, recognising that the Secretariat needs to play an active role in improving communication and providing support. Bruce McKinlay (Observer) requested the CE to expand on where the Finance Sub-committee (FSc) sits and pointed out how the current organisational diagram emphasises the Flyway Site Network as a surrounding or underpinning thing. CE explained that FSc functions as an advisory committee to the Management Committee. The Flyway Site Network is fundamental to the whole Partnership and the governance structure should be enabling what happens at the site level. TSc Chair raised some potential priorities where the Science Unit could take a role which includes data management from SIS of FNS to allow us to report back to Partners effectively about what we have done and where the gaps are, as well as re-establishing a register of colour marking systems. Further discussions among participants clarified that based on the current structure, WGs/TFs directly report to the MOP. It also emphasised the value of mentoring new members, recognising that some TSc members will step down at MOP12. Spike Millington shared that while there is clear appreciation for the Secretariat's work, there is a lack of recognition for TSc partly due to its recent formation. Spike highlighted the importance for WGs and TFs to share what they see as the value the TSc adds to their work and cautioned against creating unnecessary complexities in structures, stressing that communication and collaboration should be simplified. In terms of improving the relationships between national governments and site managers, David Li shared how the ASEAN Flyway Network projects facilitated cooperation

Agenda item	Decisions/Agreed Actions
	among governments and site managers at national and regional levels in Southeast Asia. On behalf of the Science Unit, Dr. Lu Cai provided an overview of its establishment in 2018 and highlighted the operational challenges it has faced, particularly due to the economic impact of COVID-19 and geopolitical issues. Given these challenges, he proposed different scenarios based on available resources, while recognising the limitations of the current capacity. Dr. Lu Cai also suggested focusing on cost-effective solutions, such as online training, while learning from other conventions like Ramsar.
Standardisation/updates of WG/TF ToRs, work-planning for 2025 – WG/TF leads	TSc Vice Chair raised the need to address the standardisation and updates of the Working Group and Task Force TORs and work planning for 2025, which will be led by the WGs and TFs themselves; emphasising prioritisation for the next MOP and to clarify the responsibilities of the leads in delivering plans and reports. Further highlighting that some groups lack TORs or work plans, hence reporting is not possible. The suggested action is to work with the Secretariat over the coming months to resolve these issues, and how this can be taken forward again. **Actions**: a. Secretariat to help verify the most recent versions of the Terms of References the Working Group and Task Forces available on the EAAFP website with the ones mentioned in the survey results. Secretariat to communicate with each lead to double-check if updates are needed on these documents. b. All Working Groups and Task Forces should prepare a work plan for 2025 and submit these to the Secretariat.

Annex 1. List of Attendees on-site

Technical Sub-committee Members	
Prof Nick Davidson	Chair
Prof Taej Mundkur	Vice-Chair
Sayam U. Chowdhury	Member, Coordinator Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF
David S. Melville	Member
Spike Millington	Member, Representative Amur Heilong Basin TF

Prof Lei Cao	Member, Coordinator Baer's Pochard TF, Representative Anatidae WG
Working Groups and Task Forces	
Ye Yuanxing	Representing the Chair of Baer's Pochard TF
Dr Diana Solovyeva	Coordinator, Scaly-sided Merganser TF
David Li	Chair, Shorebird WG
Khwankhao Sinhaseni	Core Team Member, Nordmann's Greenshank Subgroup
Dr Sunleang Srey	Chair, Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade TF
Porchhay Taing	
Bruce McKinlay	Chair Yellow Sea Eco-Region TF
Dr Yat Tung Yu	Coordinator, Seabird WG & Black-faced Spoonbill WG
EAAFP Secretariat	
Jennifer George	Chief Executive
Dr LU Cai	Science Unit
Kyle Esperanza Zuleta	Programme Officer
Sabine Leykam	Programme Coordinator
Minjae Baek	Communication Officer
Dr JIA Yifei	Science Unit
Observers	
Ward Hagemeijer	Management Committee, EAAFP
Phil Straw	Observer Technical Sub-committee, Shorebird WG member
Courtney Price	AMBI/CAFF

Annex 2. List of Attendees online

Technical Sub-committee Members	
Prof. Ir. Dewi M Prawiradilaga	Member
Bena Smith	Member
Working Groups and Task Forces	
Dr Nyambayar Batbayar	Chair, Dalmatian Pelican TF
Connor Walsh	Co-Chair, CEPA WG
Lindall Kidd	Co-Chair, CEPA WG
Dr Kisup Lee	Chair, Black-faced Spoonbill WG
Robb Kaler	Chair, Seabird WG
Matthew Tabilog	Chair, Youth TF
Takehiko Shimizu	Member, Shorebird WG
Doug Watkins	Former Chair, Monitoring TF
Observers	
Anusha Shivram	Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
Lorenzo Gaffi	Wetlands International
Jacelyn See	Malaysian Nature Society MNS
Dr Philip Round	
T. Moriya	

Appendix 4

Summary Report of the Survey of the Operations of EAAFP Working Groups/Task Forces

Background to this review

This review has been requested as a High Priority in the Technical Sub-committee's 2023-2025 Work Plan (Task G.1).

An outline of draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for EAAFP Working Groups (WGs) was considered by EAAFP MOP2 in 2007 (see Annex 1 below). These were revisited by MOP3 in 2008, when according to the MOP report minor amendments to the ToRs were agreed. Regrettably, it has not yet been possible for the Secretariat to yet locate this finalised MOP3 document in its archives.

The EAAFP guidance for the establishment of Single Species Task Forces and developing Action Plans have also been approved by Partners at EAAFP MOP5. These are now proposed for revisions by Partners at MOP12.

What are EAAFP Working Groups (WGs) and Task Forces (TFs)?

WGs and TFs are voluntary expert groups established by EAAFP Partners through Meetings of Partners (MOP) Decisions.

The overall purpose of establishing WGs and TFs is to provide expert support and enhanced implementation of the objectives of the Flyway Partnership and its Strategic Plan.

Limited support funding to WG & TF activities is available from the EAAFP, except for the annual WGs/TFs Small Grant Fund (total $40,000).

How many WGs and TFs have been established by EAAFP?

Three Working Groups (Anatidae, Crane and Shorebird) were recognised at EAAFP MOP1 to carry on with the work of the three waterbird site networks previously established by the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership.

Since 2006 (when the Partnership was launched), EAAFP has established seven WGs and 11 TFs, as follows:

Anatidae Working Group	Amur-Heilong Basin Task Force
Avian Disease Working Group	Baer's Pochard Task Force
Black-faced Spoonbill Working Group	Colour Marking Task Force*
CEPA Working Group	Dalmatian Pelican Task Force

Crane Working Group	Far Eastern Curlew Task Force
Seabird Working Group	Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Waterbirds Task Force
Shorebird Working Group	Masked Finfoot Task Force**
	Monitoring of Waterbirds & Sites Task Force
	Scaly-sided Merganser Task Force
	Spoon-billed Sandpiper Task Force
	Yellow Sea Eco Region Task Force
	Youth Task Force

* Disbanded at MOP 7 in 2023.
** Called for as per MOP11/D12, to be formally established at MOP12.

In addition, the EAAFP website says: "An EAAFP task force was therefore formed MOP4 to investigate how coordination of colour-marking could be better coordinated with main tasks led by Australia." This Task Force was later closed after MOP5 and the coordination handed over to the Science Officer at the Secretariat. No further information found.

Note that there is no clear distinction as to why some groups are called WGs and some are TFs, but most TFs have been established to develop and/or implement Single Species Action Plans (SSAPs) approved by EAAFP Partners.

This review

The EAAFP Technical Sub-Committee (TSc) has been requested to undertake a review of, and make recommendations on, the operations and effectiveness of WGs and TFs (TSc Work Plan 2023-2025 High Priority Task G.1).

To better understand the current operations of, and issues for WGs & TF, and Partners the EAAFP Secretariat issued a questionnaire survey to all WG/TF leads, with advice from the TSc, in September 2024.

This report summarises the preliminary findings of this survey. The results of the survey will inform TSc work to better connect with and support WGs & TFs.

12 of 18 WGs & TFs responded to the questionnaire survey – many thanks indeed!

How active are WGs & TFs?

Most (13 of 18 WGs/TFs) are currently active.

Of the other WGs/TFs:

- Amur-Heilong Basin Task Force is inactive (no current Chair or Coordinator)
  Avian Diseases WG: established by MOP11 to replace the former Avian Influenza WG: Currently developing a core membership group and Terms of Reference etc.
- Monitoring Waterbirds & Sites TF: inactive since 2008, when previous tasks were completed. Now under redevelopment, with an offer to led by Wetlands International
- Youth TF: established by MOP11; TOR adopted by MOP11 Decision
- Masked Finfoot TF: requested to be established by MOP11: ToR drafted; an SSAP is planned

Leadership of WGs/TFs

Most WGs/TFs have a Chair (or Co-Chairs or a Vice-Chair); most also have a Coordinator; some have also established sub-groups, with coordinators, e.g.:

- Anatidae WG: Brent Goose, Lesser White-fronted Goose
- Baer's Pochard WG: China, Russia, Southern Asia
- Shorebird WG: Nordmann's Greenshank

Appointment of officers:

- Most WGs/TFs – appointed by group members, in line with ToRs, where they exist
- For some (e.g. Anatidae WG) the process is not defined in TORs

Duration of officers' terms:

- Very varied. Some with fixed (renewable) duration; others with no time-limits

Group membership

Number of members:

- Very variable: from 5 (Black-faced Spoonbill WG) to c. 40 (Spoon- billed Sandpiper TF) and c. 80 (Shorebird WG).
- Seabird WG reports not having a number or list of members: varies as people join and leave between MOPs.

Membership list?

- Most groups have an email list/listserv of members
- Seabird WG does not currently have a member list

How to become a group member?

Varies between groups

- Some: contact Chair/Coordinator
- Others: by invitation of Chair/Coordinator
- Others: defined organization representatives

Communications

- Most groups communicate with members by email.
- Seabird WG and Shorebird WG use Facebook.
- CEPA WG uses WhatsApp for Youth TF communications.

Newsletter:

- Only the Spoon-billed Sandpiper TF produces a regular newsletter
- Some other groups provide news items and articles for the EAAFP newsletter

Websites:

- Most groups rely on the EAAFP website WG and TF pages.
- Japanese Committee of the Anatidae WG have a separate website.

Terms of Reference (ToR)

- All active groups report having ToRs.
- Most active groups report that their ToRs have been approved by MOP Decision.
  - For Shorebird WG and Anatidae WG, it is not clear if ToRs have been approved by MOP Decision.
  - For some groups, the relevant MOP Decision needs to be identified.
  - For some groups, most recent ToRs need to be relocated and web-posted.
  - For some groups (e.g. Anatidae WG), ToRs need revisiting and revising.

WG/TF work plans/action plans

- Some, but not all, active groups have work plans or action plans.
- Single-species TFs have SSAPs as their action plan
- Groups without a current work plan or action plan are: Anatidae WG, Crane WG, Seabird WG, Yellow Sea Eco Region TF.
- SSAPs approved by MOP
- Scaly-sided Merganser TF: unclear if AP has been approved by MOP
- Other groups: mostly plans approved by members, not but by Partners at MOP.
- Reporting frequency: varies greatly between groups.
- Reporting to MOPs: only 5 WGs and 3 TFs provide implementation reports to MOP11

WGs/TFs reporting to TSc and Partners

- For WGs/TFs, the text of MOP11 Decision 3 retains the previous process of WGs/TFs reporting directly to Partners at each MOP.
- Most WGs & TFs express wish to continue to report to Partners at each MOP.
- Some suggest also intersessional reporting to TSc.

WG/TF challenges and lessons learned

- As volunteer, largely unfunded, networks, lack of funding and capacity is reported as a common problem.

- EAAFP Secretariat support is helpful to some groups (e.g. CEPA WG)
- WGs/TFs Small Grant Fund is helpful to support WG/TF implementation. More is needed to streamline the implementation of the SGF application and review process.
- EAAFP processes for document approval (e.g. shorebird colour-marking protocol) unclear – need further clarifying.
- WGs/TFs plans are outdated and need updating, especially as most predate the Strategic Plan 2019-2028 and need to demonstrate how they are focused on contributing to achieving relevant Key Result Areas in addition to the objectives of the Partnership, relationship with the TSc and Science Unit at the Secretariat that have been established at MOP9 and MOP10 respectively.
- Closer links with the TSc are needed.

WGs/TFs next steps

1. In the questionnaire survey, WGs & TFs have provided a wealth of additional information and suggestions on future operations, and for enhanced future TSc and Secretariat support.
    - These will be further analysed, and results and recommendations compiled by Secretariat.

2. Results and recommendations from the survey will be further shared with TSc, WGs & TFs and the Management Committee. A mechanism for regular and improved communication among WG/TFs, TsC and Secretariat should be discussed at MOP12, building on results of the survey.

3. An overview of the WGs & TFs has been produced from the review and a scan of all other documentation by the Secretariat. This should be finalized in consultation with the WG/TFs and be used to promote greater awareness of the role and functions of WG/TFs to partners and potential donors.

4. The leads of Working Groups and Task Forces, with the support and advice of the Secretariat and Technical sub-Committee, should review, and as necessary to update, their Terms of Reference and *modus operandi*;

Annex 1

Standard content of Terms of Reference for EAAFP Working Groups
DRAFT (14/11/2007; 1230)

Considered at EAAFP MOP2 2007

1. Background / Introduction	brief: 2-3 para.
2. Goal of Working Group	To be framed with clear reference to Partnership (rather than appear as a stand-alone entity)
3. Taxonomic and geographic scope of activities	Clarification as necessary, if different from entire EAAF* * to accommodate current situation of Crane Working Group, however some discussion may be required in future as to whether any gaps need to be addressed with regard to countries not covered by the existing Crane Working Group.
4. Well-defined objectives for the WG	eg. 5-10, explicitly linked – cross-referenced - to Flyway Partnership objectives
5. Membership	Describe a consistent practice for membership appointment (i.e. Chair to invite all interested Partners to propose a single candidate to serve in the group; as well as other experts, in consultation with other members of the working group. Flexibility as to whether individuals serve in an official or personal capacity.)
6. Chairing / Coordination arrangements	Specification of selection method (and role of chair)
7. Modus operandi / Meetings	eg. E-mail communication; teleconferencing; define expected frequency of in-person meetings, specification of invitations (eg. meeting to be open to all WG members and other interested observers)
8. Financing	Fund-raising (methods, expectations); arrangements (if any) for coverage of expenses of members
9. Other (special, optional arrangements)	eg. provisions for any supporting officers, advisory board etc.
10. Priority action/task list (current plan)	Optional, to be attached as an annex

Terms of Reference of [EAAFP Species/population Name] Task Force from MOP5 (2010)

Annex 1

(see Agenda 3.5.1)

Terms of Reference for EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force

Goal (as defined in the International Single Species Action Plan for the [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME]

To restore the [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] to favourable conservation status and to remove it from the threatened categories on the IUCN Red List.

Role

The role of the EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will be to:

- Produce, coordinate and catalyse the implementation of the International [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Single Species Action Plan (SSAP);
- Stimulate and support Range States in the implementation of the SSAP; and
- Monitor and report on the implementation and the effectiveness of the SSAP.

Remit

The EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will:

- Develop an International Single Species Action Plan for the [SPECIES/POPULATION NAME] if not already developed, in accordance with the EAAFP Action Planning Guidelines and consistent with the agreed process;
- Set priorities for action and implement them (this step and later steps can happen while an SSAP is still under development or awaiting formal approval);
- Coordinate the overall international implementation;
- Raise funds for development and implementation;
- Assist Range States in producing national action plans;
- Ensure the Task Force is open to governmental and expert members from all key Range States and other Partners.
- Ensure regular and thorough monitoring of the species populations;
- Stimulate and support scientific research in the species necessary for conservation;

- Promote the protection of the network of critical sites for the species, by assisting Partners to develop new Flyway Site Network nominations, and encourage the designation of new protected areas by Partners;
- Facilitate internal and external communication and exchange of scientific, technical, legal and other required information, including with other specialists and interested parties;
- Assist with information in determination of the IUCN Red List status and population size and trends of the species;
- Regularly monitor the effectiveness of implementation of the SSAP and take appropriate action according to monitoring results;
- Regularly report on the implementation of the SSAP to the EAAFP Meeting of the Partners; and
- Revise the international SSAP by [DATE] and update it in [DATE] or as required.

Membership

The EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will be open to (1) designated representatives of EAAFP Governmental Partners of all principal range states, (2) representatives of the relevant EAAFP Working Group (Anatidae, Crane, Shorebird, Seabird), (3) representatives of national experts and conservation organisations from all principal range states, international organizations, and (4) other experts (not necessarily from the EAA Flyway) as required.

Officers

A Chairperson of the EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force will be elected amongst its members. This position should ideally be filled by an EAAFP Governmental Partner from a key range state.

A Coordinator post will be nominated by the Chairperson from among the Task Force members. The Coordinator will be in charge of the day-to-day operations of the Task Force, participate in fund raising, and shall act in close cooperation with the Chairperson, the EAAFP Secretariat and the relevant EAAFP Working Group (Anatidae, Crane, Shorebird, Seabird). The coordinator will be a member of the Task Force and, ideally, represent an EAAFP Partner.

Meetings

The EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force should aim to hold face-to- face meetings at least once every three years. Other face-to-face meetings may be arranged as circumstances allow (e.g., at EAAFP MOPs). Between meetings, business will be conducted electronically such as via an appropriate Task Force website and list server.

Reporting

A report on the implementation of the SSAP will be produced for each EAAFP MOP according to a standard format agreed by the EAAFP Secretariat, with contributions from all major range state Governmental Partners and Task Force members. Reports should be provided to and collated by the EAAFP Science Officer in order to ensure uniform handling of communication and record-keeping. At each EAAFP MOP, the Task Force Chairpersons, Task Force Coordinators, and/or the EAAFP Science Officer, should give an overview report on Single Species Action Plan development and implementation, summarizing progress for each Task Force, lessons learned, challenges common to the Task Forces, and any adjustments needed. Other reports will be produced by Task Forces as required by the EAAFP Secretariat or relevant EAAFP Working Group.

Financing

The operations of the EAAFP [SPECIES / POPULATION NAME] Task Force, including the Coordinator post, are to be financed primarily by its members and the organizations they represent. The Lead Organisation should ideally support or raise funds for development and implementation of the SSAP, including the Coordinator post, and associated SSAP activities of the Task Force. Funds may be sought from members and various external sources.

The EAAFP does not derive annual membership dues from its Partners and thus has limited resources. Accordingly the Secretariat cannot commit regular financial support and may only provide such if possible. Funding for SSAP activities of the Task Force or its members is to be sought from various external sources.