

# **INTER-FLYWAYS WORKSHOP**

**SAMARKAND, UZBEKISTAN**

**10 FEBRUARY 2024**

**WORKSHOP REPORT**





**Editors:**

Spike Millington, Minjae Baek, Hyun-Ah Choi, Bernhard Seliger

**This report should be cited as:**

Inter-Flyways Workshop, Samarkand, Uzbekistan, 10 February 2024, © Hanns Seidel Foundation Korea 2024, © International Crane Foundation 2024

**Acknowledgments**

The Hanns Seidel Foundation Korea would like to express our gratitude to Spike Millington at the International Crane Foundation for his contribution and guidance in the first stages of organizing the workshop and at the end. We thank Nicola Crockford at the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Nina Mikander at the BirdLife International, Rob Clay at the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Network, and Taej Mundkur at the Wetlands International for navigating the planning of the workshop. We also thank Wen Qing at the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership for the pictures of the workshop. We express a special thanks to Max Meier at the Hanns Seidel Foundation Central Asia, Javkhar Dustov and Shakhruzoda Isломova at the Hanns Seidel Foundation Uzbekistan, and Felix Glenk at the Hanns Seidel Foundation Mongolia for their cooperative support.

# LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ACBK	Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity of Kazakhstan
AEMLAP	African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan
AEWA	African-Eurasian Waterbird Network Agreement
CAF	Central Asian Flyway
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COP	Conference of the Parties
EAAFP	East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership
GBF	Global Biodiversity Framework
GIN	Global Inter-flyways Network
HSF	Hanns Seidel Foundation
ICF	International Crane Foundation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Ramsar	Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance
WHSRN	Western Hemisphere Shorebird Network
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

# CONTENTS

- List of Acronyms and Abbreviations .....2
- Introduction.....4
- Proceedings.....7
  - Session 1 – Existing Flyway Initiatives – Success and Challenges.....7
  - Session 2 – New Initiatives & Gaps Identified .....9
  - Session 3 – Discussion ..... 12
- Next Steps ..... 21
- Annex 1 – Programme..... 22
- Annex 2 – List of Participants ..... 25

# INTRODUCTION

In 2011 Representatives of Regional Flyway Initiatives, together with Secretariats of the Conventions on Migratory Species (CMS) and Wetlands (Ramsar) and other key stakeholders met in the Republic of Korea to share experiences, best practices, and lessons learned from flyway initiatives around the world. It was the first and until now only such meeting to do so. The principal recommendation from the meeting was to “establish an open and inclusive network of flyway-scale initiatives “the Global Inter-Flyways Network (GIN)”, to facilitate future networking, sharing of knowledge and approaches, and improve collaboration and synergies among the increasing number of flyway conservation initiatives across the world.” In addition, the meeting recommended a total of 137 thematic recommendations addressing a series of cross-cutting issues.

Despite the best of intentions and continuing communication across flyway initiatives, the GIN has yet to be operationalized.

In 2022, the Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSF) in Korea organized the Global Flyway Conference with the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) to make communication on the flyways. In 2024, the 14<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS COP14) in Samarkand, Uzbekistan presented a significant opportunity to advance global flyways communication and cooperation. Representatives of existing flyway frameworks, member countries, NGOs, and other key stakeholders attended COP 14 and a proposal was developed to hold a day-long “Global Inter-Flyways” workshop immediately before the COP on 10 February 2024. The workshop would highlight the approaches, structures, mechanisms, and lessons learned from a generation of flyway frameworks and promote future regular inclusive exchange, communication and knowledge sharing among flyway initiatives.

This was a particularly opportune time to review flyway initiatives for several reasons.

1. Established flyway initiatives have matured significantly over this time, potentially enabling assessments to be made of their success in implementation and their impact on migratory birds, giving us a better idea of what works well and what works less well.
2. Several new flyway initiatives have been revived (Central Asian Flyway), recently developed (AEMLAP) or proposed (Marine Flyways). Note that these initiatives have expanded beyond migratory waterbirds, which have traditionally been the focus of the more established flyway initiatives, to include landbirds and seabirds. Nevertheless, these initiatives should certainly be able to benefit from the experiences of the more mature flyway initiatives.
  - A CMS Decision on the Initiative for the Central Asian Flyway (CAF) was adopted at COP14, with a commitment from the Government of India to establish a Coordinating Unit <https://www.cms.int/en/document/initiative-central-asian-flyway-1>

- A CMS Decision on the Action Plan for African-Eurasian Landbirds (AEMLAP) was adopted at COP14. <https://www.cms.int/en/document/action-plan-migratory-landbirds-african-eurasian-region-aemlap-9>
  - A CMS decision on Flyways was adopted at COP14 that includes a review and update of the Americas Flyways Framework, and the Action Plan for the Americas <https://www.cms.int/en/document/flyways-7>
3. The CMS Decision on Flyways states that the Flyway Working Group will “act as a platform that ensures the exchange of best practices and the identification of global synergies and gaps across the different flyway-related initiatives, either developed within the framework of the CMS or outside”.

The workshop was hosted and supported by the HSF in Korea, a Partner of the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership. HSF has recently held a series of meetings on migratory bird policies, institutions, and cooperation for the East Asian-Australasian Flyway and the emerging Central Asian Flyway Initiative.

Following welcoming speeches from Sherimbetov Halilulla, Head of the Department of Protected Natural Areas, the Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of the Republic of Uzbekistan, and Bahtiyor Holmatov, Director of the Institute of Zoology, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Spike Millington, Senior Advisor of the International Crane Foundation, introduced the objectives and format of the workshop, referring the 2011 GIN workshop and noting that several of the participants present at the workshop also participated in the GIN workshop. However, most participants began work on flyways after 2011 and some were even new to flyways, including representatives of local environmental NGOs. There was a call for greater involvement of young people both in the workshop and flyways work and it was encouraging to see more young people participating in the workshop. Spike emphasized that this meeting was not intended to be a “GIN2” but to share information on existing flyway initiatives, including successes and challenges, introduce new flyway initiatives and approaches, and generate discussion around some key issues affecting the implementation of flyway programs. The expectations from a single-day workshop should be quite limited, but the success of the workshop will depend on whether a process of ongoing engagement will be maintained, e.g. through future multilateral meetings such as CMS COPs and/or more formal mechanisms, such as the CMS Flyways Working Group. The current expansion of flyway initiatives across taxonomic groups and new geographies offers significant opportunities.

The workshop was divided into three sections:

1. Sharing experiences from existing flyway initiatives (AEWA, EAAFP, Americas Flyway, and various CMS programs)

2. Recent and new Flyway initiatives (AEMLAP, CAF, Marine Flyways, Regional Flyway Initiative for Asia, and Migration Atlas)
3. Group Breakout Sessions around:
  - How to Build Engagement and Inclusiveness: Engaging Key Stakeholders
  - How to Strengthen On-Ground Implementation and Impact
  - How to Mobilize and Increase Resources for Flyway Programs
  - How to Encourage Communication and Collaboration Among Flyway Initiatives

It is extremely useful to bring these frameworks together to share lessons learned and best practices for flyway conservation that can then inform structures, mechanisms, and actions for future efforts, e.g., around the Central Asian Flyway, migratory seabirds, and migratory landbird conservation, for example building on the existing CMS African-Eurasian Migratory Landbird Action Plan and associated Working Group. Perhaps for Landbirds migrating on a broad front, a flyway approach based only on sites may not be the most effective approach and will need to include means of influencing landscape management at broader scale.

A recent strategic review of the CMS Flyways Program identified several issues, notably the broadness of the scope, the need for significant resources, stakeholder engagement, and reporting. The subsequent proposed revision of the [CMS Flyways Resolution 12.11](#) (Rev. COP 13), including relevant decisions regarding the mandate of the CMS Flyways Working Group under the CMS Scientific Council provides a unique opportunity to consider how best the Flyways Working Group in particular can engage with the other existing frameworks.

The first Global Inter-flyways Network meeting in 2011 noted that all existing regional flyway initiatives are inherently built for purpose and different for a reason. Despite there being no “one-size-fits-all”, the workshop will have a focus on supporting consideration of how to develop the most effective possible process for the Central Asian Flyway based on learning lessons from existing flyway frameworks and adapting to the regional situation.

Discussions focused on;

- Existing flyway initiatives sharing experience on what has worked, challenges, and lessons learned with respect to implementation and impact on migratory bird populations.
- Collating ideas to scale up successes and solve challenges, share best practice and next step guidance for the CMS Flyways Working Group, the Central Asia Flyway Initiative as well as potential processes for migratory land- and seabirds.
- Agreeing a format for regular conversations across flyway initiatives.

# PROCEEDINGS

Sessions 1 and 2 list presentations: title and presenter(s), a short summary and a link to the PowerPoint presentation.

## **Session1. Existing Flyway Initiatives – Success and Challenges**

*Lessons learned from the previous flyways program of work and next steps for the CMS Flyways Working Group by Ivan Ramirez & Umberto Gallo-Orsi, CMS Secretariat*

In addition to geographically specific flyway-related initiatives (for the Americas, Central Asia and African-Eurasian landbirds), CMS also supports initiatives related to threats, such as poisoning and illegal killing, cross-cutting areas such as energy and infrastructure and species- and species group-specific action plans and MoUs.

A CMS flyways strategic review aligned flyways work with the new Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and renewed membership of the Flyways Working Group. With the new decision on Flyways, the challenges for the Flyways WG are to be focused, yet strategic, in working with both CMS Parties and non-Parties, including regional flyway initiatives. The Flyways decision calls for a gap assessment and monitoring tool to assess the needs and effectiveness of flyway-related actions. This provides an opportunity to work with a broad set of actors working in flyway conservation.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MzxiGPcFh1IOwqwUezzwhXezfT12yXIS/view?usp=sharing>

*African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement – setting an example for flyway conservation by Jacques Trouvilliez & Sergey Dereliev, AEWA*

The African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement has 25 years of experience of implementing a legally-binding inter-governmental treaty to save migratory waterbirds in the flyway, using a systematic and structured approach that includes a Strategic Plan, regional Action Plans and species Working Groups and Action Plans, as well as regular reporting on the status and trends of migratory waterbirds in the flyway.

Low capacity and high staff turnover in government administrations place a significant burden on the Secretariat and means addressing government needs in a meaningful way. Developing sustainable use and adaptive management plans responds in part to this need. Inclusiveness is critical to success but requires time and patience to develop and nurture.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/19nhW5XVvpXVoHVozxgAq0-aDmj8Dg9Io/view?usp=sharing>



***Successes, Challenges, Potential by Jennifer George, EAAFP***

In contrast to AEWA, The East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership is a voluntary, informal partnership of national governments, inter-governmental, international non-government and private sector organizations to save migratory waterbirds in the flyway. In addition to fostering international collaboration at the flyway level, EAAFP also promotes national and site level partnerships, with varying levels of success. Sister site cooperative relationships and a variety of taxonomic and thematic Working Groups and Task Forces strengthen both international collaboration and site-specific work.

Effective communication has proven key to collaboration at all levels.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KG90JEqHPogQzeNTYdgfErDPTBqrYS8m/view?usp=sharing>

***An Overview of Flyways Conservation in the Americas by Rob Clay, WHSRN***

A multiplicity of initiatives for migratory birds and flyways have been developed in the Americas over the years, including flyway-wide, regional, and species-specific plans and actions. Although there is a capacity gap between North, Central, and South American countries, the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network has succeeded in developing site network and strong site-level action throughout the Americas, and CMS is promoting an Americas flyway initiative at this COP. National plans and conservation investment strategies (business plans) have proved important.

The need for leadership, representation, funding and mainstreaming were highlighted among lessons learned, but challenges remain for information gaps, capacity, partnership development and maintenance, governance and resourcing.

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qaZmPx2e\\_r055G7jTjSWSjVpBFvRYxQp/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qaZmPx2e_r055G7jTjSWSjVpBFvRYxQp/view?usp=sharing)

## Session 2 – New Initiatives & Gaps Identified

### *Central Asian Flyway: Situation Analysis - Key Recommendations by Taej Mundkur, Wetlands International*

The Central Asian Flyway situation analysis outlined key recommendations that fed into the decision approved at CMS COP 14 on the flyway, including need for improved coordination among international frameworks and key stakeholders, both in the formal and informal sectors. [https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/document/cms\\_cop14\\_inf.28.4.2\\_central-asian-flyway-situation-analysis-2023\\_e.pdf](https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/document/cms_cop14_inf.28.4.2_central-asian-flyway-situation-analysis-2023_e.pdf).

The CAF also provides an opportunity to bring together the various instruments and initiatives under CMS for a specific flyway and also to learn from the experiences of other regional flyway programs. The commitment to the creation of coordinating unit by the Government of India offers great potential for developing an adaptive institutional framework to facilitate international cooperation to conserve migratory birds in the flyway through both CMS and non-CMS initiatives.

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KEbzG7gr7bp2MpMWooTbkyW\\_P10yr7FJ/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KEbzG7gr7bp2MpMWooTbkyW_P10yr7FJ/view?usp=sharing)

### *Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds by Olivier Biber, AEMLAP*

Conservation of migratory landbirds requires a different approach to conserving migratory waterbirds, the latter being easier to monitor, since they often depend on discrete habitats and sites, usually wetlands, during their life cycles. We need to better understand why and where migratory landbirds are declining and target broader approaches to land use and restoration, such as biodiversity-friendly agriculture in key areas and reducing threats to roosting sites.

A Coordination Unit has been set up within an existing organization, the Swiss Ornithological Institute, with a focus on research and monitoring, but also a range of communication, education and public awareness programs. The challenge is to coordinate international action but also catalyze actions at national level along migratory pathways from Eurasia to Africa.

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PswjxWGZiKPHtIGNduXlsQujSi\\_kd4S0/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PswjxWGZiKPHtIGNduXlsQujSi_kd4S0/view?usp=sharing)

### *Seabird Flyways by Nina Mikander, BirdLife International*

Pelagic seabirds undertake complex migrations from often remote and vulnerable breeding sites to exploit spatial and temporally patchy food resources often across vast areas of the oceans. As the threats to seabirds and their patterns of migration become better understood, there is a significant opportunity to incorporate marine flyways into recent appreciation and work, e.g. through the High Seas Treaty, on marine spatial planning.

Currently there is no single framework for marine flyways although coastal and marine species are included in the mandates of some flyway initiatives and specific instruments. It is intended to work through the CMS Flyway Working Group to engage parties and non-CMS initiatives to raise awareness and propose approaches and measures towards conserving marine flyways, including integrating seabird migration into ongoing work in the marine area, such as Marine Protected Areas, as well as threats posed by by-catch from fisheries, plastic pollution, etc.

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1trlmdFjGyI\\_jzO7unR2p57NUIIWwDLjs/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1trlmdFjGyI_jzO7unR2p57NUIIWwDLjs/view?usp=sharing)

***The CMS/EURING/Movebank Eurasian-African Bird Migration Atlas by Fernando Spina, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA)***

Understanding how, why and where migratory birds use the pathways, habitats and sites along their flyways is critical to identify, conserve and manage ecological networks, identify the importance of threats and develop solutions for threat mitigation.

The Eurasian-African Bird Migration Atlas uses recovery and capture data to provide a database that can help answer these questions, including estimating ecological connectivity among sites and species, changing migration patterns and identifying mortality hotspots, e.g. legal and illegal killing, collisions with infrastructure, etc.

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Z-Y1\\_wJ6\\_BypF7V\\_5wIhA1G23YdGpobP/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Z-Y1_wJ6_BypF7V_5wIhA1G23YdGpobP/view?usp=sharing)

***WWF - Wetlands for Asian Flyways by Vivian Fu, WWF-Hong Kong***

Identifying networks of wetlands that migratory species depend on along migratory routes is relatively straightforward compared to making sure those wetlands are managed in a way that supports these birds in the long-term.

WWF aims to conserve, restore and effectively manage ecologically functional networks of wetlands in Asia to stabilize or reverse the decline of migratory bird populations that use the flyways through promoting and building community stewardship at wetlands for long-term sustainable livelihoods, and enhance community adaptation and resilience to climate change and disaster risk. It will also seek to integrate migratory waterbird and wetland management into broader flood risk management and sustainable agriculture projects.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IL24sdg8Pn76rKMz8WWg293bNBHdRkQT/view?usp=sharing>

***East Asian-Australian Flyway - Regional Flyway Initiative by Duncan Lang, Asian Development Bank***

The gap in funding at scale for flyway conservation is often cited as a major constraint for delivering conservation outcomes across large geographies. Healthy, well-managed wetlands provide a wide array of ecological services that benefit local livelihoods and deliver climate adaptation and resilience, including coastal protection, flood management and carbon storage. ADB's Regional Flyway Initiative aims to mobilize \$3 billion of investment in priority wetlands for migratory waterbirds in Asia through loans, grants and a variety of innovative financing options. These projects will demonstrate a return on investment through the continued and enhanced delivery of ecosystem services and co-benefits.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KOGvmSdmO1IFcyxUrVMA-GBUFv5QYkEO/view?usp=sharing>

## Session 3 – Discussion

### Group 1. How to build engagement and inclusiveness: Engaging key stakeholders (National governments, civil society etc)?

- **General considerations**

To enhance efficiency and avoid duplication of efforts, the flyways should be integrated into a comprehensive umbrella mechanism. This mechanism would connect various ongoing initiatives, promoting their scalability and replication while adhering to established guidelines. This integration requires three key roles: mediators, multiplayer, and mentors.

Additionally, involving non-traditional actors like city networks and educational institutions is essential, with a focus on prioritizing the subnational level as an innovation hub. Implementing protocols to enhance both vertical and horizontal communication and collaboration, with a multidisciplinary and inclusive approach, is equally important.

- **Key recommendations**

- Discussed using the flyway as an umbrella and coordinating body that can monitor, coordinate, manage, and address a wide variety of issues/problems/challenges.
- Discussed the need for clear guidelines like protocols that can serve as an orientation for the partners in the flyway.
- Emphasized the importance of involving non-traditional actors like city networks and educational institutions.

### Q&A and Discussion

- **Communicating between communities**

- Discussed the local level agreement which can make a stronger relationship between village and village.
- Support mechanisms (e.g., Site network and a sister site program) keep the communication between communities moving forward.
- There is no site network among Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, and India. So, in an area like this, there needs to be some mechanism to start this communication.
- Government and NGOs can discuss and prioritize together under the national partnership and the site managers can build it in their regions.

- **Changing the government focal points**

- Constant changing of the government focal points and motivating them to communicate at a certain level is challenging in many countries.

- **Making a connector**

- Discussed the global flyway can think about everyone funds a little bit of somebody who can go around to support the international structure.
- Building up of capable local NGO and partnership.
- Noted bottom-up process about identifying the committed and capable local NGO, building up, and investing at that level.
- Noted natural partnership among INGOs and local NGOs.



Group1 discussion: 'How to build engagement and inclusiveness: Engaging key stakeholders?', © EAAFP

## **Group 2. How to strengthen on-ground implementation and impact?**

- **Long term Monitoring and Impact:**
  - Emphasized the importance of long-term monitoring (at least ten years) to assess both social, economic, and ecological impacts of interventions but also need adaptive management to address unintended consequences effectively.
- **New Technology to Streamlining Monitoring and Reporting:**
  - Need to take advantage of new technology, e.g., the potential for AI to contribute to and simplify reporting (inputting once to produce multiple outputs according to different needs), as well as remote sensing to lighten the monitoring load.
- **Capacity Building:**
  - Ongoing capacity building in wetland management, governance, reporting, fundraising - set of modules, formalise participation to provide qualifications upon completion. Tailor training to age groups. Develop a network of expertise but both trainers and trainees. Design incentives.
  - Advocated for tailored training modules for different age groups, emphasizing smartphone apps for reporting. Use social media to enhance monitoring, reporting between communities and developing training apps on smart phones that can use multiple languages.
- **Collaborative Monitoring:**
  - Proposed collaborative monitoring along flyways to strengthen connections between different groups. Suggested flyway internships and exchange programs to facilitate knowledge exchange and strengthen connections.
- **Research and Knowledge Strategy:**
  - Need a diversity of socio-economic research to understand local contexts, including discussing the nature of the benefit with the community affected. Not necessarily just funding but need to ask a diversity of community members on appropriate incentives/compensation/rewards. Interventions are context specific but can be guidelines on the types of thinking to be considered.
  - CMS needs a knowledge gap strategy so researchers know where they can contribute most effectively. Research needed not just on biology but on the context of projects. Need for a strategic knowledge strategy, emphasizing context-specific guidelines.
  - Robust science background to prioritize sites can help maximise returns from and avoid elite capture of conservation investment. Then needs government buy-in and ownership of a project. But need to think of sequencing - talk to the right people in the right order.

- **Funding**

- Opportunities for long-term project funding but changing political priorities can make that difficult except in large organizations like CMS, ADB where decision-making is deliberate and sometimes slow, but are also more stable.

## **Q&A and Discussion**

- **Impact of Interventions:**

- Questioned which types of interventions e.g. sister sites, single species action plans, task forces, working group, national partnerships, integrating migratory birds initiatives, and CEPA have the greatest impact on the ground.
- Highlighted the need for a meta-analysis of projects to understand context specific effectiveness.

- **Research Opportunities:**

- Suggested research opportunities for universities, such as master's or doctoral theses, focusing on the effectiveness of different interventions.
- Proposed collaboration with existing structures like Conservation Evidence for meta-analysis on flyway conservation.

- **Comparative Advantage of CMS:**

- Acknowledged CMS's comparative advantage in conducting meta-analysis due to its access to data from all flyways.
- Emphasized the timing and opportunity for CMS to assess what works across different flyways.



Group2 discussion: 'How to strengthen on-ground implementation and impact?', © EAAFP



### Group 3. How to increase resources from all sources?

- **General considerations**

First, looking at financial resources, there are a lot of different working arrangements, from fixed contributions (AEWA), according to UN scale, per country to voluntary contributions (EAAFP). The fixed contribution system, currently with a minimum contribution of 2000 USD, does work well, but not everyone pays, and this brings problems, since the sanctions are not well-defined and difficult to implement. The voluntary system often leads to a strong reliance on one or few contributors. Second, resources are not only money, but also staff, office space etc. given as an in-kind grant. This works also reasonably well for voluntary contribution systems.

- **Resources for whom**

- Resources are needed on various levels of the flyway: a centralized budget for flyway wide initiatives; this includes, as an absolute minimum, certain personnel in the secretariat, but also “variable” (project) costs, where coordination is necessary.
- COP/ MOP: To organize a MOP often requires a huge (often 7-figure) budget, to bring all delegates and members together, fund those unable to fund their own trip etc. Here, often the main burden is with the organizing state or partner.
- Subsidiary bodies (technical, etc. committees); they also need a minimum of funding for meetings (at least an infrastructure for online meetings).
- Non-centralized budget: governments, stakeholders, NGO, organizations “on the ground”
- State budgets are often not sufficient, human resources are usually more easily available; DNA (policy officer, technical focal point, “super” political focal point) – often in reality inactive.
- Planning, implementation plans very important (national planning is critical).
- Identifying threats (costless in monetary terms, needs planning).

- **Considering alternative funding mechanisms**

- **Green Climate Fund:** In particular, for a newly emerging flyway like the CAF the readiness projects seem attractive and the bar for application is relatively low (for governments)
- **Bilateral funding:** for example, IKI (Germany), JICA (Japan), KOICA (Korea)  
If there is a flyway organization/ initiative, this could be an enabler (plus INGO accredited); the INGO: would need to know well the local NGO/ stakeholder scene.
- **Climate and Clean Air Coalition** (non-binding, weak local Focal points, sometimes select NGO)
- **AEWA:** involves NGO, but no formal network, and based on long-standing cooperation, due diligence.

- **Private sector:** another untapped possibility, but must be aware of potential reputational risks, “greenwashing”, etc.
  - **Philanthropists:** individual contributions or philanthropic organizations. Needs a specific strategy and contacts.
- **Resource Allocation and Planning:**
    - Emphasized the importance of considering resources beyond financial contributions, such as staff, organizers, and resources.
    - Discussed the allocation of centralized budgets for flyway wide initiatives and variable costs for projects requiring coordination across multiple locations.
- **Challenges with Government Funding:**
    - Noted challenges with government funding, including limited budgets and issues with bureaucratic inefficiency.
    - Highlighted the importance of government involvement in accessing certain funding sources.

## **Q&A and Discussion**

- **New Funding Opportunities:**
  - Explored new funding opportunities, such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and readiness projects, for preparing countries to participate in flyway initiatives.
  - Discussed the potential role of international organizations and accredited entities in accessing funding for flyway projects.
- **Engaging Local NGOs and Philanthropy:**
  - Emphasize the importance of engaging local NGOs and leveraging philanthropic donations for on ground implementation.
  - Explored strategies for creating alliances and partnerships to access different funding sources.
- **Tailoring Funding Approaches:**
  - Highlighted the importance of tailoring funding approaches to different donors and blending different funding sources to maximize leverage.
  - Discussed the significance of framing projects in a way that appeals to different donors' interests, such as climate adaptation and mitigation.



Group 3 discussion: 'How to increase resources from all sources?', © EAAFP

## **Group 4. How to encourage collaboration and communication among various initiatives?**

- **Internal**

- With regard to improving collaboration and avoiding duplication, communication among group members is the first step. We meet periodically but how to have meaningful cooperation in between without it being burdensome? It is suggested that the CMS Flyway Working Group could be the mechanism: it has a platform on the CMS website and has a spreadsheet (the website has social media links and the new website will strengthen these). We could commit to organizing webinars and on-line events.
- Strengthening the mandate of the group might unlock money to organize meetings and/ or hire a coordinator and/ or publish a newsletter.
- Some of the less formal initiatives could benefit from learning how the Convention Secretariats handle communication and logistics. Large NGOs have good capacity in communications and logistics.
- It would be useful to have a communicators' meeting, bringing together communications people from different organizations.
- We need to focus on intersections where flyways and related initiatives overlap. Interaction with experts outside our group will benefit us, e.g., in stimulating ideas. Focus on improving communication, in order to avoid duplication and fill gaps.
- We need to develop flexibility with languages beyond English. Could we build a multilingual glossary of the most commonly used terms?

- **External**

- To be meaningful we need professional communicators. We can share ideas about what we can communicate but we don't have the capacity to deliver external communication targeted to different sectors.
- Resources permitting, we could organize another Global Flyways summit.
- Could we have a flyways theme for a forthcoming world migratory bird day?
- Can we communicate how we can contribute to achievement of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and to its Global Monitoring Framework. What capacity have we to attend and participate in CBD meetings?
- To start with, the Flyways Working Group has to show its added value to external audiences, in order to attract resources for expanding communication

## Q&A and Discussion

- **Communication Challenges and Resource Limitations:**
  - Concerns about lack of resources and capacity for communication.
  - Importance of adequate funding and dedicated personnel for effective communication.
  - Challenges of managing internal and external communication effectively.
  - Highlighting the need for improved coordination and resources for communication efforts.
  - Discussion on utilizing platforms like the Pertila communication group within CBD.
- **Policy and Technical Aspects of Collaboration:**
  - Emphasis on the importance of demonstrating relevance to attracting resources.
  - Discussion on aligning communication efforts with the Global Biodiversity Framework.
  - Need for showcasing success stories and tangible results of conservation efforts.
  - Recognition of the role of CMS in shaping policies and demonstrating relevance.
  - Proposal for subgroup formation within the flyways working group for specific technical aspects.
  - Importance of balancing technical expertise with policy experience in the group's membership.
  - Focus on bridging the gap between technical knowledge and policy implementation.



Group 4 discussion: 'How to encourage collaboration and communication among various initiatives?', © EAAFP

## NEXT STEPS

As discussed in the report-back from Group 4, for cooperation to significantly advance requires a willingness on the part of those involved, i.e. it should not be burdensome. So perhaps the first step would be to gauge the level of interest of participants to engage further, in one form or another, in promoting cooperation and information sharing among flyway initiatives.

A clear opportunity, and mandate, exists through the [CMS Flyways Working Group \(FWG\)](#) and the decision passed at this COP to re-invigorate this group. The current membership includes representatives of the major flyway initiatives and some key stakeholders. The next meeting, perhaps in May 2024, should consider the best modalities for advancing inter-flyways work and broadening participation. While the FWG itself may have limited capacity and other focused priorities in the short-term, it can certainly catalyze and promote new and inclusive approaches to flyway cooperation.

The CMS Secretariat has indicated that the CMS website will soon be significantly upgraded, potentially offering new tools and forums for flyway cooperation and interaction. However, the success and utility of this will depend on the willingness of stakeholders to contribute and an open and accessible forum. Such a forum could be created under an existing organization with a related mandate, e.g., the IUCN Connectivity Conservation Specialist Group and this could also be discussed at the next FWG meeting.

The Samarkand meeting was possible because key participants were already attending the CMS COP so related travel and lodging cost was not the factor it otherwise would be in convening a face-to-face meeting at an independent location. To the extent that similar workshops could be held around other global meetings, e.g. regional flyway meetings, IUCN World Conservation Congress and CBD COPs, this could be encouraged. The focus could be tailored to the meetings, e.g., incorporating flyways into CBD's Global Biodiversity (Monitoring) Framework.

The new (and relatively new) flyway initiatives discussed in Samarkand, such as the Central Asian Flyway initiative, are opportunities to incorporate lessons learned and best practice from existing, longer-standing flyway initiatives. The discussions held during this workshop will certainly have relevance for those programs and the new initiatives can only benefit from further reflection and analysis. Such analysis could include a comparative review of the findings and recommendations of the 2011 GIN and the Samarkand workshop. This could include a targeted set of questions to further assess the factors for success of flyway initiatives related to implementation and their impact of migratory bird populations.

# ANNEX 1 - PROGRAMME

**SAT 10 FEB 2024 Inter-Flyways Workshop**

**Venue: Water Margin in Silk Road by Minyoun, Samarkand, Uzbekistan**

- 09:00 Registration
- 09:20 Opening of the Inter-Flyways Workshop
- Welcome remarks: Bernhard Seliger, HSF
  - Congratulatory remarks: Sherimbetov Halilulla, the Department of Protected Natural Areas, the Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of the Republic of Uzbekistan
  - Congratulatory remarks: Bahtiyor Holmatov, the Institute of Zoology, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences
  - Self-introductions, all participants
  - Commemorative photo
- 09:35 Introduction
- [Key relevant outcomes of the 2011 Global Interflyways Network Meeting \(GIN1\)](#)
  - Challenges and Opportunities: What has worked and what has not, Spike Millington, ICF

Session 1. Existing Flyway Initiatives – Successes and Challenges  
(Moderator: Bernhard Seliger, HSF)

- 09:50 Convention on Migratory Species – lessons learned from the previous Flyways Program of Work, proposed next steps for the CMS Flyways Working Group etc. (including AEMLAP, Action Plans, thematic initiatives such as on Illegal Killing/Hunting, Raptors MoU, and Energy), Ivan Ramirez, CMS
- 10:10 African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement, Jacques Trouvilliez & Sergey Dereliev, AEWA
- 10:30 East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership, Jennifer George, EAAFP
- 10:50 History of Americas Flyway and other relevant initiatives in the Americas, Rob Clay, WHSRN
- 11:10 Q&A

Session2. New Initiatives & gaps identified  
(Moderator: Nina Mikander, BirdLife International)

- 11:30 Central Asian Flyway: Situation Analysis – key recommendations; Initiative - draft resolution and decisions expected at COP14, Taej Mundkur, Wetlands International
- 11:40 Learning from the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan – how to progress a successful conservation agenda for landbirds?, Olivier Biber, AEMLAP
- 11:50 Seabird Flyways – finding a place for migratory seabirds at a global scale, Nina Mikander, BirdLife International
- 12:00 Eurasian-African Bird Migration Atlas, Fernando Spina, CMS COP Appointed Councillor Connectivity Ecological Networks
- 12:10 WWF - Wetlands for Asian Flyways, Vivian Fu, WWF
- 12:20 Innovative approaches to Flyway Finance: Regional Flyway Initiative for the East-Asian Australasian Flyway, Duncan Lang, ADB
- 12:40 Q&A and Discussion
- 13:00 Introduction to break out groups (commencing following lunch), each focusing on a specific question with an emphasis on discussing challenges identified, possible solutions as well as opportunities for collaboration with an emphasis on providing advice to CAFI as well as on landbirds and seabirds beyond the region.
- 13:10 Lunch

Session3. Break-out groups  
(Moderator: Spike Millington, ICF)

- 14:00 Small Group Discussions (\*self-nominated moderators and rapporteurs for each group)
- Preliminary agenda: 4 groups
- Key issues emerging from earlier discussions could further refine these topics



- How to build engagement and inclusiveness: Engaging key stakeholders?
- How to strengthen on-ground implementation and impact?
- How to increase resources from all sources?
- How to encourage collaboration and communication among various initiatives?

- 16:00 Present back from groups  
- 15mins presentation from each group
- 17:00 Recommendations and Next Steps
- 17:30 End of meeting  
- Closing remark, Bernhard Seliger, HSF
-

## ANNEX 2 – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Duncan Lang, ADB, dlang@adb.org
2. Jacques Trouvilliez, AEWA, jacques.trouvilliez@un.org
3. Sergey Dereliev, AEWA, sergey.dereliev@un.org
4. Olivier Biber, AEMLAP, o.biber@bluewin.ch
5. Elizabeth Yohannes, AEMLAP, elizabeth.yohannes@vogelwarte.ch
6. Eduardo Gallo-Cajiao, Colorado State University, e.gallocajiao@colostate.edu
7. Reto Spaar, AEMLAP, reto.spaar@vogelwarte.ch
8. Alain Jacot, AEMLAP, alain.jacot@vogelwarte.ch
9. Rob Clay, WHSRN, rclay@manomet.org
10. Nicola Crockford, RSPB, nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk
11. Nina Mikander, BirdLife International, nina.mikander@birdlife.org
12. Vicky Jones, BirdLife International, Vicky.Jones@birdlife.org
13. Osama Al Nouri, Birdlife International, osama.alnouri@birdlife.org
14. Spike Millington, ICF, spike@savingcranes.org
15. Vivian Fu, WWF-Hong Kong, vivianfu@wwf.org.hk
16. Colman O Criodain, WWF International, cocriodain@wwfint.org
17. Chaudhry Muhammad Jamshed Iqbal, WWF-Pakistan, jichaudhry@wwf.org.pk
18. Fernando Spina, CMS Connectivity Ecological Networks, fernaspina2022@gmail.com
19. Taej Mundkur, Wetlands International, Taej.Mundkur@wetlands.org
20. Stephen Garnett, Charles Darwin University, stephen.garnett@cdu.edu.au
21. Ivan Ramirez, CMS, ivan.ramirez@un.org
22. Umberto Gallo-Orsi, CMS, umberto.galloorsi@un.org
23. Jennifer Geroge, EAAFP, chief@eaaflyway.net
24. Kyle Zuleta, EAAFP, programme@eaaflyway.net
25. Wen Qing Ng, EAAFP, communication@eaaflyway.net
26. Ruslan Urazaliyev, ACBK, ruslan.urazaliyev@acbk.kz
27. Jeremie Berlioux, Ornithology Society KG, jeremie.belieux@posteo.net
28. Katherine Hall, Ornithology Society KG, katherine.hall.oskg@gmail.com

29. Adinai Akhmatova, Ornithology Society KG, adbft91@gmail.com
30. Ingrid Coetzee, ICEI, Ingrid.coetzee@iclei.org
31. Ivana Del Rio Benitez Landa, ICEI, Ivana.b-landa@iclei.org
32. Nyambayar Batbayar, WSCC Mongolia, nyambayar@wscc.org.mn
33. Max Meier, HSF Central Asia, meier-m@hss.de
34. Javkhar Dustov, HSF Uzbekistan, Dustov-J@hss.de
35. Shakhrizoda, HSF Uzbekistan, usbekistantpraktikant1@hss.de
36. Felix Glenk, HSF Mongolia, gelnk@hss.de
37. Bernhard Seliger, HSF Korea, seliger@hss.or.kr
38. Hyun-Ah Choi, HSF Korea, hachoi@hss.or.kr
39. Minjae Baek, HSF Korea, mjbaek@hss.or.kr

For more photos:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1FKss1ZstC\\_r6V1AQckxPVvZW5zf6x0bn?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1FKss1ZstC_r6V1AQckxPVvZW5zf6x0bn?usp=sharing)

For further information and session3 discussion minutes, please contact:

Hanns Seidel Foundation Korea

401, Sooyoung Bldg., 13 Hannamdaero 20-gil, Yongsan-gu, Seoul, 04419, Korea

Office: +82-2-790-5344/5, E-mail: [mjbaek@hss.or.kr](mailto:mjbaek@hss.or.kr), [info@hss.or.kr](mailto:info@hss.or.kr), Website: <https://korea.hss.de/en/>