Flyway-level conservation requires attention to site networks, not just individual sites. Such wide-scale consideration (sometimes at continental scales) provides a practical challenge to planners and managers. Among other problems and constraints are limited resources, patchy data, restricted opportunities for new designations of protected sites, and the wide distributions of migratory species in space and time. Especially in response to the latter, with the advent of climate-mediated distributional shifts, approaches to the creation of site-networks are required that have a dynamic quality: with processes that allow regular assessment of effectiveness – and adaptation to ‘fine-tune’ effectiveness.

The symposium reviewed and discussed different approaches to: identifying key sites; building a coherent ecological network; linking site networks with the Convention on Biological Diversity’s ‘ecosystem approach’; recognition and practical conservation of site networks. Examples of national (or wider) networks were reviewed from the UK (Baker & Stroud), the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network (Duncan), as well as in the context of the specific needs of individual species such as for Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus* and Red-breasted Goose *Branta ruficollis* (Dereliev), Greater Flamingo *Phoenicopterus ruber* (Bechet et al.), as well as for Siberian Crane *Grus leucogeranus* (Prentice et al.).

Pritchard stressed that the objectives of a site network must foster a synergy of the functions and values of its parts. The objectives (and strategies) of key site networks should have a sound scientific basis, so that it can be a credible statutory objective and a yardstick for measuring success. Pritchard challenged the workshop to be more specific about the ecological meaning that underpins our network concepts, including as related to site network coherence within existing legal frameworks.