



DRAFT

**REPORT¹ OF THE SECOND REGIONAL
WORKSHOP
OF THE BAY OF BENGAL
LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM
PROGRAMME (BOBLME)**

**25-29 October, 2004
Colombo, Sri Lanka**



¹ Provisional report issued pending finalization, printing and distribution of formal report

DRAFT
REPORT OF THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP OF THE
BAY OF BENGAL LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM PROGRAMME
Colombo, Sri Lanka, October 25-29, 2004

Executive Summary

The ultimate goal of the BOBLME Programme is the sustainable management of the living marine resources and an environmentally healthy BOBLME. To achieve this, the participating countries will develop regional institutional collaborative mechanisms, processes and activities to promote an integrated and comprehensive approach to the management of the BOBLME as well as an agreed Strategic Action Programme (SAP) consisting of a series of investment, technical assistance and capacity-building interventions that complement and build on relevant existing national and regional activities.

The Second Regional Workshop of the BOBLME Programme is the culmination of the Programme's Preparatory Phase. The objectives of the Workshop are:

- elicit views and comments of the eight participating countries on the draft Project Brief;
- reach consensus on the final version of the Project Brief that will be submitted through official channels to all the participating countries for formal endorsement;
- discuss and provide feedback on the draft Framework Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis.

The Project Brief and the Framework Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) are the final outputs of the Preparatory Phase. Once formal endorsement is received, the final draft Project Brief will be submitted to GEF and other donors for financing. The TDA will be finalized during the first implementation phase of the BOBLME Programme.

The process leading to the development of the draft framework TDA and the Project Brief since the 1st Regional Workshop in Pattaya, Thailand, 17-21 February 2003, at which the Preparatory Phase was formally launched, achieved:

- the establishment of communications and coordination mechanisms through a Programme Steering Committee and an International Scientific Review Group with a representative from each member country, as well as National Coordinators, National Task Forces and National Scientific Review Groups in each member country; stakeholder consultation
- the synthesis and assessment of extensive regional and national information on the (i) oceanography and marine environment; (ii) living marine resources; (iii) estuarine and coastal habitats; (iv) coastal zone development; (v) socio-economics; (vi) law; and (viii) pollution in the BOBLME, including 5 Thematic and 8 National Reports, the Report of the 1st Regional Workshop, the Technical Preparation Workshop and the Workshop to develop a Project logical framework. All are available on the BOBLME web site (<http://www.fao.org/fi/boblme/website/index.htm>).
- a shortlist of candidate regional and sub-regional activities from which initial pilot projects would be selected and prepared during the formulation of the draft Project Brief.

The Workshop was attended by representatives from the Fisheries and Environment Ministries of the BOBLME member countries, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand, FAO, the World Bank, the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA); observers included representatives from IUCN-TheWorld Conservation Union, South Asian Seas/South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SAS/SACEP), Indian Ocean Marine Affairs Cooperation (IOMAC), and the Embassies of Italy and Norway.

The principal Recommendations of the Workshop are set out in paragraphs 102-110 of this Report and are summarized as follows:

- ❖ Full endorsement of the Project Brief as presented with agreed amendments (Appendix 6).
- ❖ Facilitation by countries of the **national endorsement process** to meet the agreed deadlines for submission of the draft Project Brief for inclusion in the February 2005 Inter-sessional Work Programme to be considered by the GEF Council. The deadline for endorsement by the National GEF Focal Points is 14 January. The deadline for firm co-financing commitments, both on the part of the participating countries (in kind and in cash) and bilateral donors and other partners, is by the time of CEO endorsement (August 2005).
- ❖ Endorsement of **national co-financing arrangements** (Appendix 6).
- ❖ Acceptance of US\$32 million budget at a 1.2:1 (co-finance:GEF) ratio (Appendix 7).
- ❖ Acceptance of the Work Plan and Next Steps (Appendix 8).
- ❖ Revision by FAO of the **Project Brief** in accordance with comments received and amendments proposed in the workshop.
- ❖ Preparation by FAO of the supplementary PDF-B request for additional GEF resources and preparation of the new/revised project components and subcomponent, in particular those on fish refugia, ecosystem health indicators and the Gulf of Mannar.
- ❖ Comments in writing on the **draft preliminary framework TDA** to be sent, preferably via email, to the BOBLME Secretariat as soon as possible, but no later than July 2005.

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP OF THE BAY OF BENGAL LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM PROGRAMME Colombo, Sri Lanka, October 25-29, 2004

OPENING SESSION OF THE MEETING

1. The Second Regional Workshop of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Programme was kindly hosted by the Government of Sri Lanka and held at the Hotel Taj Samudra, Colombo, Sri Lanka, 25-29 October 2004. The 40 participants included representatives from the Fisheries and Environment Ministries of the BOBLME member countries, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Thailand, representatives from the FAO Headquarters (FAO HQ) in Rome, Italy, from the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO RAP) in Bangkok, Thailand, and from the FAO Representative Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives, a representative from the World Bank in Washington, D.C., a representative from the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), a representative from the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in Washington, D.C., and the Regional Coordinator and the Administrative Assistant of the BOBLME Programme from the BOBLME Programme Office in Chennai, India. The list of participants is given as Appendix 1.

2. The opening ceremony was initiated by the lighting of the oil lamp by delegates from each of the eight participating countries as well as from FAO, Sida, and the World Bank. Mr. N. Bambaravanage, Secretary of Fisheries, Sri Lanka, then welcomed the participants on behalf of the Government of Sri Lanka. He stressed that because the Bay of Bengal was so important to its bordering countries, there was an urgent need for sustainable management of the Bay in a holistic manner. He wished the participants every success and also wished them a pleasant stay in Sri Lanka. His opening statement is given as Appendix 2. Mr. Mazlan Jusoh, FAO Representative for Sri Lanka and the Maldives, welcomed the participants on behalf of FAO. He also stressed the importance of the Bay of Bengal and the need for sustainable management. He thanked the two major donors for their support over the development phase of the BOBLME Programme and the active inputs of the participating countries, especially through the national consultation process. He provided a brief review of the recent history of the BOBLME initiative leading to the development of the Project Brief to be considered in the workshop. He expressed the hope that this would lead to a long-lasting Programme of at least 12 years, to be executed in two phases. He outlined the objectives of the workshop and highlighted the tight deadlines that would need to be observed. He expressed confidence that these would be met, based on the very impressive performance of the progress to date. His opening statement is given as Appendix 3.

3. Mr. Malcolm Jansen from the World Bank and Mr. Peter Funegard, representative of Sida, both welcomed the participants on behalf of their organizations. Mr. Jansen explained that the World Bank was now moving from single country support to supporting broader regional initiatives. He also announced that GEF was willing to consider providing further resources in support of the fish refugia/critical habitat/protected area management component of the Programme, provided that the BOBLME Programme could be agreed and developed further. He stressed the importance of this workshop from the Bank's point of view and wished the participants every success in the workshop. Mr. Funegard also

supported the importance of this workshop and said that he was looking forward to seeing the outcomes of the workshop.

4. Participants then introduced themselves to others in the workshop.

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

5. Mr. A. Hettiarachchi, Director-General, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Sri Lanka, was elected Chairperson for the workshop sessions.

CONCLUSION OF THE OPENING SESSION OF THE MEETING

6. The opening session of the meeting concluded with the taking of a group photo.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. Mr. Hettiarachchi introduced the Provisional Agenda for the meeting. It was adopted by the workshop without change. The final Agenda is given as Appendix 4. The list of documents placed before the meeting is given as Appendix 5..

HISTORY AND CURRENT STATUS OF THE BOBLME PROJECT

8. The Regional Coordinator of the BOBLME Programme, Dr. Philomène Verlaan, welcomed the participants and briefly reviewed the excellent progress of the BOBLME Programme over the last 2 years. By way of background, she explained that the BOB supports about 1.5 billion people, many of whom live in the coastal region. The livelihoods of many communities depend on the marine resources in the region. She described the activities undertaken since the 1st Regional Workshop in Pattaya, Thailand, 17-21 February 2003. These were (i) establishment of communications and coordination mechanisms; (ii) synthesis and assessment of information; (iii) preparation of a synthesis document for transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA); and (iv) development of the Project Brief for GEF funding.

9. The process leading up to the development of the draft framework TDA and the Project Brief was described. To facilitate communications and coordination a Programme Steering Committee (PSC), National Coordinators (NCs), National Task Forces, National Scientific Review Groups and an International Scientific Review Group have been established.

10. The importance of the 5 Thematic and 8 National Reports, as well as the Report of the 1st Regional Workshop, the Technical Preparation Workshop and the Workshop to develop a Project logical framework as a basis for the development of the draft synthesis TDA and the draft Project Brief were highlighted. These Reports address, *inter alia*, aspects of the (i) oceanography and marine environment; (ii) living marine resources; (iii) estuarine and coastal habitats; (iv) coastal zone development; (vi) socio-economics; (vii) law; and (viii) pollution in the BOBLME and are all available on the BOBLME web site (<http://www.fao.org/fi/boblme/website/index.htm>).

11. Noting that the Programme was now at the stage of the final Project Brief, the final output of the present PDF-B Phase, she explained that the main objective of the Second Regional Workshop was to review the Project Brief and the draft framework TDA, and plan future steps for their implementation.

OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT AND INTRODUCTION OF THE DRAFT PROJECT BRIEF

12. Dr. Random DuBois (Senior Environmental Adviser, FAO) introduced the draft Project Brief. He began by outlining how the structure of the brief follows the GEF/WB guidelines, highlighting the fact that some of the annexes are yet to be completed. He suggested that this be discussed further in the workshop. He explained that the Brief was a synthesis of many inputs. The more detailed Project activities are given in Annex 4 of the brief, which is itself a synthesis of the theme and national reports, the draft framework TDA, past workshops and the work of several consultants over the past few months.

13. Several overarching inputs guide the Project preparation. These are (i) GEF International Waters Criteria including Operational Programme #8 (Waterbody-based Programme), key gaps, and strategic priorities and (ii) guidance received from BOBLME countries through their representatives' participation. He further elaborated on the GEF Operational Program #8 which requires projects to (i) serve as a catalyst to implement a more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approach to managing international waters; (ii) build capacity of new institutional arrangements; (iii) implement priority trans-boundary issues; and (iv) stabilize and reverse fisheries depletion through ecosystem-based approaches. The importance was emphasized of the catalytic financial support and the need for foundational capacity-building designed to address the gaps.

14. He summarized the process, critical steps, venue and dates leading to the current Project draft. He emphasized the importance of the process in reaching consensus on major issues and activities to address them, especially the logical framework planning process that was conducted in Bangkok, Thailand, 27-29 April, 2004. Following this, a short field preparation was conducted that provided final technical input. The approach involved technical consultancies, review of theme and national BOBLME Programme documents, survey questionnaires, follow-up national country visits, technical reports, internal review by FAO and consolidation.

15. Several key assumptions had to be made in the process. These included:
- BOBLME would be a multi-phase effort
 - 6-year Project (defined as the first phase of the BOBLME Programme)
 - US\$ 20 million Project
 - GEF would require 1:1 US\$ matching. This would consist of a mixture of country in-kind and cash contributions coupled with other sources of co-financing
 - Country contributions in cash to the project were based on a review of other similar past and on-going regional initiatives
 - The Government of India as the host country would agree to contribute additional resources in support of the Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU)
 - Project start-up in the World Bank's fiscal year 2006 (1 July 2005 - June 30, 2006).

16. In the discussion following this presentation, the startup date was clarified as being at the beginning of the bank's fiscal year 2006 (i.e., 1 July 2005). It was also pointed out that the current estimated project budget was US\$27 million (i.e., greater than the original US\$20 million envisaged). Dr. DuBois suggested that a Working Group might look at the costs and suggest ways of either reducing it or finding further funding.

17. The timing needed for the national Government process in the countries to endorse and approve the Project was discussed, especially the time needed to secure contributions in cash. The different countries outlined the separate procedures required for endorsement by the National GEF Focal Point and for approval of financial commitments in their respective countries. While most countries noted that the GEF endorsement would take 2-3 months, the financial commitments normally required between six months to one year for inclusion in national budget planning processes. The difference between Project endorsement and Project approval and signing was clarified.

Step 1 - *Endorsement*: Time needed (2-3 months) for all Ministries (including Finance, Foreign Affairs Ministries and in some countries, the State Secretary) of a country to consider and endorse the Project in principle, without any financial commitments, so that the Project proposal can be forwarded to GEF

Step 2 - *Approval and signing*: Financial provisions need to be arranged according to timing of budget process and fiscal year of the respective countries and the Project's approval and signature.

18. The nature of the contribution was also discussed. The difference between contributing to the Regional Project in foreign currency compared with providing in-country support for local activities was highlighted. The regional contribution (when a foreign currency contribution is involved) normally had to be approved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Finance.

19. After presenting the process and assumptions, Dr. DuBois moved on to describing the results. This is based on a GEF "Results framework", which in turn was based on the logframe outputs. The goal, objective, project development objective (PDO) and global environmental objective (GEO) were agreed. The PDO was:

"to support a series of strategic interventions which will provide critical inputs into the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) whose implementation will lead to enhanced food security and reduced poverty for coastal communities in the BOB region"

The GEO was:

"to formulate an agreed-on SAP whose implementation over time will lead to an environmentally healthy BOB"

20. Dr. DuBois explained that the draft Project Brief is organized into five main components and each has a variable number of sub-components:

1. Coastal/marine natural resource management and sustainable use
2. Improved understanding and predictability of the BOBLME environment
3. Maintenance of ecosystem health and management of pollution
4. Project sustainability
5. Project management.

1. Coastal/Marine Natural Resource Management and Sustainable Use

A. Community-based integrated coastal management

21. Considerable activities in the past have been directed towards community-based management, alternative livelihoods and coastal management. However, in developing the project it was reported by many countries that many of these were stand-alone activities with little documentation, generally on a small scale and that alternative livelihoods interventions had mixed success. It was felt that gender aspects have been ignored to date and, most importantly, outcomes have rarely been sustainable. The main focus of this sub-component, therefore, is to do a stock-taking of past projects/activities and feed lessons learnt into mainstream actions, through incorporating them into national policies. Activities include:

1. literature review and synthesis of findings
2. stakeholder consultations through focus groups encountered
3. site visits and development of pre-selected case studies/demonstration sites
(suggested sites across the BOB provided)
4. completion of the analysis.

B. Improved Policy Harmonization

22. All countries in the region have national policies but these are generally sector-based. Reviews are generally carried out about every 5 years but these often take 2-3 years. The differences between formal policy and informal policy were noted, with the informal policy being particularly important in the region. The main objectives of this sub-component are to promote better understanding of the processes and promote “mainstreaming” of selected policies. Activities in this sub-component include:

1. policy studies
 - a. regional analysis of policy and legislative processes
 - b. national institutional analysis and assessment of policy objectives, processes and implementation
 - c. community-level policies and sociological aspects of policy
2. national technical workshops
 - a. key lessons learnt
 - b. consensus and agreement on mainstreaming
3. regional policy meetings
4. strengthening of capacity in local policy formulation
 - a. possible grants for NGOs and other stakeholders
5. national policy interventions
 - a. support for unspecified policy interventions
6. creation of a normative documents portal
 - a. portal linking to national legislation and national policies

C. Collaborative Regional Fishery Assessments and Management Plans

23. Dr. Derek Staples, Senior Fisheries Officer, FAO, introduced Fisheries subcomponent 1C: Collaborative Regional Fishery Assessments and Management Plans. This sub-component focuses on sharks at the regional (all 8 BOBLME countries) and national levels. At the sub-regional level, activities are proposed for Indian mackerel ([Bangladesh], India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar and Thailand) and *Hilsa* (Bangladesh,

India and Myanmar). Bangladesh stated it was ready to participate in the Indian mackerel plan, permitting removal of the []. Dr. Staples also presented a plan for the design and implementation of a common fishery data and information system in the BOBLME and for the development of a Geographic Information System.

24. For sharks, the proposal includes:

- i. establishment of coordination mechanisms
- ii. assessment of threats to shark populations
- iii. development of a regional plan of action
- iv. facilitation of:
 - a. improved data collection and monitoring
 - b. research/biological studies for major species
 - c. development of national plans of action
 - d. collaborative assessments of shark fisheries and stocks
 - e. monitoring and evaluation of the regional and national plans of action.

25. For Indian mackerel and *Hilsa*, the proposal includes:

- i. review of existing fisheries
- ii. establishment of 8 National Task Forces and 1 subregional Technical Working Group
- iii. development of community-based subregional and national fishery management plans
- iv. design of monitoring and evaluation plan
- v. facilitating biological studies
- vi. collaborative assessment of stocks.

26. For the design and implementation of the common fishery data/information system the proposal includes:

- i. review of existing systems (funded under the FISHCODE project)
- ii. form national statistics sub-committees
- iii. inventory major fisheries resources
- iv. survey of vessels
- v. stakeholder analyses of information needs
- vi. identify common constraints and problems
- vii. design and implement new data system
- viii. institutionalize data and information exchange
- ix. dissemination of data and information to users.

27. With regard to the GIS, many of the project components require basic mapping data (i.e., fish refugia, habitat conservation & protection, fisheries management and land-based sources of pollution) and it is necessary to get as much information as possible into the GIS for BOBLME as a unit with increased intensity in the Mergui Archipelago.

28. The activities in summary include:

- i. coordination arrangements
- ii. reviews
- iii. regional, subregional and national planning
- iv. routine data collection and analyses
- v. targeted biological and social research
- vi. dissemination of results to stakeholders.

29. The associated budget items are institutional strengthening and governance, training and human resource development, research, monitoring and data analyses and communication.

30. A streamlined version of the modality outlined in the draft project document was also proposed as follows:

- i. One regional fisheries body to address statistics, sharks, Indian mackerel, *Hilsa*
- ii. One national Fisheries Task Force per country to address these topics as relevant
- iii. Streamlined data collection by region
- iv. Combined stakeholder consultation and participation
- v. Collaborative research and publications.

This version has the additional advantage of a savings of US\$1 million over the 6-year project period.

31. In the discussion the following points were made:

31.1. Although sharks migrate in and out of the BOBLME, initially the focus will be on inside the BOBLME and interactions outside it will be identified and assessed as necessary. The International Plan of Action for Sharks will be assessed for its regional and national implications for the BOBLME project. The national plans already being developed by BOBLME countries will be integrated into and help inform the regional plan.

31.2 In all cases the need for balance between resource conservation and the needs of communities dependent on the resource for food and livelihood, especially if they are dependent on a single fishery, will be borne in mind. One of the objectives of the BOBLME Programme is to develop a workable balance. It was noted that the a shark fishing ban proposal was put to CITES, which was unable to decide and subsequently referred it to SEAFDEC which was also unable to decide. FAO is forming a scientific panel to assess the implications for the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES) of a restriction or limitation on exploitation of commercially important species. The Project will also need to assess which species are included for the action plan for sharks, because some species may be local and not appropriate for regional management. There is a possibility for eventual dialogue with ASEAN/BIMSTEC. A review of statistical systems in the region is being conducted under the FISHCODE project.

31.3 With regard to the proposed regional fisheries body, it was recalled that one of the objectives of the BOBLME Programme was to set up sustainable institutional arrangements. An in- depth regional analysis of the existing regional and subregional institutions found no single institution already in place that could facilitate this project: either the geographical representation or the mandate, or both were insufficient. Initially, it is suggested to begin as an informal regional coordinating body and use this to develop a formal Regional Fisheries Body at a later stage. The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) are the only two formal Fishery Management Organizations in the region.

32. The meeting approved the proposal to combine the shark, mackerel, *Hilsa* and statistics into one regional and eight national fisheries coordinating groups.

D. Collaborative critical habitat and management

33. It was agreed to select a few representative sites in promoting multi-national approaches to manage and address issues affecting trans-boundary coastal/marine ecosystems within the broader BOBLME, *viz.* Mergui Archipelago (MA) and the Gulf of Mannar (GOM).

34. In the case of the GOM, further work is required to develop an acceptable project, and it was suggested that further discussion be carried out during the workshop. In the case of the MA, Thailand stressed the importance of the area in terms of national parks and World Heritage status. Thailand thought that oceanography was the highest priority and underpinned the formulation of management plans in this area, incorporating fisheries, tourism and other activities. Thailand also highlighted the possibility of using the tourist operators to help collect data and information and their willingness to share experiences with Myanmar. Myanmar also stressed the importance of the area in terms of fishing as well as biodiversity, and stressed that the area was relatively pristine and required protection. Considerable biological studies have taken place in the past and many new species have been discovered but there is no overall understanding and assessment of the area as a whole. They suggested that the area may be an important spawning area for several important fish species in the BOBLME.

35. It was pointed out that not only these two countries were involved, but that the impact of other neighbouring countries suggests that they should also be included. The opportunities for co-financing were noted and the importance of developing permanent institutional arrangements, strengthening management plans and reducing fishing pressure were highlighted. Activities include:

1. contribute to the updating of the existing environmental baselines;
2. update management plans
3. develop a systematic monitoring program based on current best practices
4. develop and pilot alternative livelihood activities designed to mitigate existing non-sustainable fishing practices
5. increase public awareness of the existence and significance of the ecosystem
6. increase planning capacity and the development of bi-national management plans.

2. Understanding the predictability of the BOBLME environment

A. Role of fish refugia in conserving regional fish stocks.

36. In a survey used to help develop this sub-component, problems exist with terminology, confusion about the concept, lack of legislation and regulations, lack of monitoring and evaluation. Given these issues, it was agreed that the objective of the sub-component would be to provide the enabling environment for the selection and formulation of one or more sub-regional fish refugia network. Activities include:

1. regional technical expert workshops, including developing agreed terminology
2. inventory, classification and eventual mapping of fish refugia
3. field-based case studies
4. establishment of common regional data requirements and protocols
5. institutional arrangements to support a regional approach to management of fish refugia

6. development of a regional action plan
7. training and capacity building
8. awareness and outreach activities
9. supporting studies.

37. In discussion on the possibility of broadening the range of this sub-component to incorporate additional GEF funding, **it was agreed that further work to develop the sub-component was needed and that this should be the topic of another small working group.**

B. Improved predictability

38. A major gap was identified in terms of the overall understanding of the BOBLME. This sub-component, therefore, aimed to link and partner with existing regional and global environment assessment and monitoring programs. Activities include forming partnerships with:

1. Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)
2. Sustainable fisheries and marine diversity associated with the Indian Ocean Global Ocean Observing System (IOGOOS)
3. Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN)
4. Global Plan of Action in the South Asian Seas
5. UNEP's East and South Asian Seas Programs
6. South Asia Co-operative Environmental Program (SACEP)

39. In addition, the project should link with other relevant GEF-supported projects and use the capacity of the IW:LEARN initiative to monitor developments.

40. In discussion on this sub-component, it was agreed that an activity to review and provide some analyses of existing datasets (e.g. oceanographic surveys, remote satellite data) should be included. This could lead to modeling and indicator development. This could also be linked to GIS development for the BOB as a whole. **It was suggested that the “Sea around Us” project be included in the list as they are planning to conduct ecosystem modeling in the BOBLME.**

3. Maintenance of Ecosystem Health and Management of Pollution

A. Coastal Pollution Loading and Water Quality Criteria

41. The overall objective of this sub-component was to support activities leading to the development of a collaborative approach to identifying important coastal water pollution issues, including identifying pollution hotspots and developing harmonized criteria across the region. Activities include:

1. Facilitate regional meeting of experts (think tanks) to investigate and propose ambient water quality criteria, develop approaches to addressing identified pollution hotspots, and provide background documentation to support regional monitoring
2. Address capacity needs
3. develop a systematic coastal water quality program capable of identifying pollution hotspots in relation to agreed criteria, including pilot monitoring at selected hot spots
4. annual technical meetings to discuss results

5. increased public awareness, particularly among decision-makers and the public, of the pollution problems in the BOBLME and impacts on the region's shared ecosystem and its resources.

42. The lack of any activities dealing with the maintenance of ecosystem health (e.g., indicator species) was noted. **It was suggested that further activities might be able to be incorporated into other components and recommendations could be brought back to plenary.**

4. Project sustainability

43. The overall aim of the component is to ensure the long-term institutional and financial sustainability of the BOBLME.

A. BOBLME institutional arrangements

44. The overall objective of this component is to identify and establish agreed permanent institutional arrangements to ensure the long-term management of the BOBLME. In the interim, it has been agreed that the Project implementing office will be based in Chennai while the longer-term arrangements are agreed by the countries. Activities needed to develop the long-term institutional arrangements by the end of the first phase of the Project are:

1. comprehensive national and regional institutional analyses
2. consultative workshops
3. regional meetings
4. an inter-ministerial conference

45. In discussion following this item, **it was suggested that an additional inter-ministerial conference be held, one to endorse the arrangements and another later to reinforce the agreement.**

B. Strategic Action Programme preparation

46. This sub-component is to prepare an agreed Strategic Action Programme (SAP). Activities include:

1. review of previous experience associated with SAPs
2. establish national (and a regional) SAP teams
3. finalize the TDA
4. engage in political consultations
5. preparation of the draft SAP
6. public consultations and national endorsements
7. adoption of BOBLME governments (early part of 6th year of the Project)
8. publication and dissemination

47. It was suggested that some of the regional bodies (e.g., SAARC, ASEAN, BIMSTEC) should also endorse the SAP. The practical difficulties of this were discussed in terms of mandate and membership and it was agreed that this would be difficult to implement.

C. Financial sustainability

48. The aim of this sub-component is to design and establish a financing mechanism to fund the annual recurrent costs of an agreed long-term BOBLME management and to assist BOBLME countries to prepare for the mobilization of financial resources and development of financial mechanisms for implementing the specific action of the SAP. This would involve:

1. establish an ongoing dialogue and relationship with potential donors and partners
2. establish appropriate regional and national institutional mechanisms to generate and administer funds
3. test activity-specific financing mechanisms designed to cover their respective recurrent costs.

49. It was explained that in the first phase of the Project, pilot activities would be conducted with a view to introducing successful activities into the second phase of the Project, with associated financial support. At the regional level, again experience gained during the first phase would be built into the second phase. The aim is to incrementally move towards self-sufficiency.

5. Project management

A. Establishment of the regional coordination unit

50. To implement the Project, it is proposed to form a regional coordinating unit (RCU) whose responsibility is to ensure the cost-effective coordination of all BOBLME-supported activities leading to the finalization of the SAP. Activities required are:

1. recruit a mixed international and national staff including a Coordinator, a Chief Technical Advisor, a Monitoring and Information Specialist, an office manager, a financial manager and an information officer.
2. complete arrangements with the host government to support the RCU office
3. purchase necessary equipment
4. move into full operation.

It was pointed out that this is a minimal staffing arrangement, but that this low level of support was necessary to keep costs within budget.

B. Monitoring and evaluation system

51. In conformity with existing FAO and World Bank policies and procedures, the Project will develop a cost-effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. Activities under this sub-component include:

1. recruit a monitoring and information specialist
2. design (or purchase) software to support a computer-based M&E programme
3. provide training to national coordinators to facilitate accurate data collection, formatting, and reporting to the RCU
4. a mid-term and a final external project evaluation.

52. It was recommended that M&E should be in conformity with GEF requirements and that the national GEF operational focal point should be kept well informed and involved with the project. It was also proposed that in the 4th or 5th year

of the Project, an analysis be carried out to quantify the benefits being received by the BOBLME countries.

C. Project Information Dissemination System

53. To disseminate information to regional and global stakeholders, activities include:

1. contract a monitoring and information specialist
2. establish a dedicated website
3. press releases
4. development of promotional materials
5. design and dissemination of country-specific audio-visual materials.

54. In addition, the BOBLME Project could participate in the IW:LEARN Project through providing learning exchanges associated with their website. Initial contact with IW:LEARN has been made and it was suggested that this collaboration be pursued. The developments of key indicators for M&E were also discussed as presented in Annex 3 of the draft Project Brief. It was noted that further modification would be needed to fit in with final Project specifications.

D. Proposed financing plan

55. The proposed Project costs were presented by Dr. DuBois. In presenting the costs by component and sub-component, he explained that the base-line cost was US\$21,759 million. With the addition of the administrative costs, physical and price contingencies, this comes to US\$27,677 million. He also mentioned that the collaborative regional fishery assessments and management plan component represents 35% of the total costs. A process of consolidation is under way to reduce these costs. The other major cost is the establishment of the RCU.

56. When considering these costs as they apply to major expenditure categories, the relatively small equipment costs were noted. The largest category is for studies and workshops. The other major costs are in Recurrent Costs in salaries, office, travel and other. It was advised that it might be more convenient to include these other costs within the existing categories.

57. The sources of finance were also presented. These include GEF, Government of India, FAO, Co-financers and BOBLME Countries (both in-kind and cash, including salaries for “technical officers” and secretaries to support the National Coordinators). This represents US\$1.7 co-financing:1 US\$ GEF. All figures (apart from the FAO contribution) require confirmation, especially the amount of co-financing available from other donors.

58. In discussion of the cost details, it was noted that with reference to the costs by component, the Project management costs did not include the contribution of the BOBLME countries, especially the National Coordinators and PSC members. **It was suggested that national coordination activities be included under this component. In response, it was pointed out that this would be the country contributions that were included as part of the other components, but this issue could be considered by the small working group.**

59. It was noted that total contingencies were about 24% of the total cost and the extent of this amount was questioned and it was requested that this amount be reduced. It was pointed out this amount of contingencies was standard and required for all Projects and that the contingencies could be used later on the Project.

60. **One country pointed out that to ensure Government endorsement, some countries need a breakdown by country. It was suggested that an additional table be prepared with this information.**

61. **It was agreed, in principle, that the mix of costs across components reflected BOBLME issues and actions to address them as agreed in previous workshops and consultations.** To address the issue of increased costs over that originally planned, four possible scenarios were presented that looked at other options for costing based on a possible further contribution by GEF. These were:

1. Status quo (US\$27 million Project)
2. Extra GEF funding for an increased fish refugia component or re-distributed across the other component (US\$32 million Project).
3. Same as Scenario 2 but reduced country cash contribution ((US\$32 million Project).
4. Reduced co-financing from countries and donors (taken out of existing fish refugia component) (US\$30.4 million Project).

62. The allocation of cash contributions across countries for the BOBP and the BOBP-IGO (draft) were also presented as a possible model for calculation of the BOBLME countries' contribution. The exact criteria on which the BOBP allocations were based are unknown, while those for the BOBP-IGO are based on GDP by country. The use of other formulae was discussed (e.g., IOTC, SACEP). It was agreed that these may be relevant to developing a formula for the longer-term arrangements, whereas for a Project such as Phase 1 of the BOBLME, a simpler approach would be more appropriate.

63. **Two working groups were formed:**

1. **Financial Group - Project costs and allocation across countries**
2. **Technical Group – Additional GEF financing : how best to use these resources**

E. Proposed Management Structure

64. Amendments to the diagram of the management structure are agreed to replace the arrows by uniform thickness and remove the double margins around the boxes and to reflect reporting mechanisms and feedback loops. **FAO will remain the Project Executing Agency with the World Bank being the GEF Implementing Agency.**

65. The overall management structure is similar to that in place for the Phase B stage (e.g., Project Office, National Task Forces (NTF), Project Steering Committee (PSC), Regional and National Scientific Panels), except for:

1. Increased staffing of the project office (now called the Regional Coordinating Unit)
2. Regional Sub-Contractors to execute some activities

66. The terms of reference for the PSC, the RCU, the NTFs, the NSAP and the RSAP were also provided for feedback from the BOBLME countries.

67. It was suggested that the terms of reference (TORs) should reflect the responsibility of the PSC to initiate steps to mainstream project findings into national policy. It was also suggested that the relationship between the NC and PSC be further elaborated in the TORs. It was clarified that the RCU would be responsible for implementing and coordinating the activities but not actually involved in the execution of the activities themselves.

68. A number of specific changes to the TORs were requested by the workshop. These included:

1. The need to highlight the use of national/regional expertise in implementing the Project as much as possible.
2. World Bank should be a member of the PSC and an observer in any NTF where the World Bank has a country presence.
3. Members of the PSC or their representatives are expected to participate in NTFs
4. The relationship between the NC and PSC should be further elaborated in the TORs, to reflect the need for close coordination between the two.

Working Group Reports

Report from the country finance working group

69. It was agreed that the total combined in cash and in kind contribution to the BOBLME Programme would be US\$5.5 million over the 6 years of the first phase. The cash contribution from the countries would be US\$2 million. This would include US\$20,000 per year per country for 6 years for the in-country costs of the national workshops for national (not foreign) participants. There is no need to develop an allocation formula. The countries will also cover the cost of a full-time contracted technical assistant and secretary to the National Coordinator, plus the *pro rata* portion of the salary of the National Coordinator and associated communications and facilities costs for the work on the programme. Either financial source scenario 1 (US \$ 27.7 Million) or 2 (US\$ 32 Million) will be acceptable.

70. There will also be a full-time coordinator and deputy each for Thailand and Myanmar for the Mergui component and, if and when it is agreed, for the Gulf of Mannar component, from India and Sri Lanka. The contribution in kind of US\$3.5 million from the countries will cover all counterpart salaries for workshops and training and local travel, but not international travel, and time of National Task Force members, as well as staff time and office space for the Mergui component and if and when worked out, the staff time and office space for the Gulf of Mannar component.

Report from the additional GEF financing group

71. The supplemental PDF Block B to develop this component would be developed as soon as possible and merged with the existing proposal for submission for GEF CEO endorsement in August 2005. It was decided to enhance and build on the existing components, mainly 1D (Collaborative Critical Habitat and Management) and 2A (Role of Fish Refugia in Conserving Regional Fish Stocks), rather than developing a new component. It would be essential to include links between critical habitats and fish refugia. The group took note of the need to highlight the marine conservation area concept to satisfy donor requirements. Fish refugia should to be assessed for their effectiveness and economic value and existing MPAs and refugia would be inventoried and hotspots identified. The

transboundary dimension should be included. The multiple uses, especially from the fisheries point of view, should be emphasized. There is a need to establish a network with built-in connectivity eventually, but this is probably too ambitious at this stage. Biodiversity aspects need to be included in the fishery plans.

DRAFT PRELIMINARY FRAMEWORK TRANSBOUNDARY DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS

72. Dr. Verlaan provided a summary of the draft preliminary framework transboundary diagnostic analysis (PFTDA). She explained that the draft PFTDA:

- (i) provides a background of issues, proximate and root causes.
- (ii) allows an analysis of issues that have transboundary dimensions.
- (iii) highlights information gaps and constraints on interventions.
- (iv) provides a scientific background for the development of the SAP and also assists in designing and implementing regionally coordinated activities addressing these issues and their causes.

73. Dr. Verlaan then provided definitions for the concepts used in the draft PFTDA, *viz*: “transboundary”, “common”, “shared”, “cross-cutting”, “root causes” (i) socio-economic (e.g., survival needs – food, livelihoods, shelter); (ii) legal, including existence of adequate legislation and adequacy of implementation/enforcement activity; (iii) institutional, including ability of government to enforce legislation, “information gaps”, e.g., actual and perceived lack of information (i.e., the latter is present but not accessible), and “intervention constraints”, including the inaccurate perception that environmental problems are a government issue and the lack of political commitment to enforcement of legislation.

74. Dr. Verlaan explained that the two crosscutting issues of (i) traditional systems of ownership and customary rights and (ii) livelihoods and food security are difficult to build into the TDA as they operate at all levels: proximate and root causes, information gaps and intervention constraints.

75. The sources for the PFTDA were:

- (i) National Reports and Regional Thematic Reviews
- (ii) Reports and comments from:
 - a. First Regional Workshop
 - b. Regional Preparatory Meeting for Second Regional Workshop
 - c. Regional Technical Meeting for the preparation
 - d. National Review Groups on the National Reports
 - e. International Scientific Review Group on the Regional
 - f. National Task Force (NTF) meetings
 - g. National Workshops

76. Dr. Verlaan summarized the structure of the draft PFTDA as:

- (i) the scope of the BOBLME
- (ii) physical setting
- (iii) socio-economic context
- (iv) priority transboundary environmental issues
 - a. Overexploitation of living marine resources
 - b. Degradation of critical habits

- c. Land-based sources of pollution
- (v) Consideration of the transboundary issues in terms of
 - (i) Analysis of priority transboundary environmental issues: status, proximate causes, information gaps, constraints on interventions
 - (ii) Root cause analysis: socio-economic, institutional, legal.
- (vi) Conclusions.

77. Following the presentation, the plenary asked when the final TDA would be completed. It was explained that it would be finalized in the second year of the first phase of the Project and feed into the SAP. It was further explained that this product would be modified as requested and then provided as an output of the PDF-B phase. This would then form the basis for the development of the final TDA, the development of the SAP and activities of the Project. It was suggested that the document should be viewed as a “living document”. At the moment it is a snapshot, without the process for review and updating. A small amount of Project funds could be included in the Project Brief to review and update the TDA. **A short Executive Summary was requested, to assist donors and others in becoming familiar with the issues and causes that were to be addressed in the next phase of the Project.**

78. It was noted that there were many information gaps and it was asked whether these gaps were covered in the activities of the Project Brief, and, in particular, whether an information network was planned. It was explained that an information network was included in the Project Brief as well as by using existing networks such as IW:LEARN. The draft PFTDA also attempts to list the information gaps in order of priority, but that needs to be reviewed further as well.

79. One country asked how the TDA was to be implemented. In response, it was outlined that the implementation would be carried out through the Project activities as specified in the Project Brief and through the SAP.

80. The workshop agreed that there were no major comments to be made on the Draft PFTDA at this stage; however, **the countries were invited to provide informal, preferably written, comments to the BOBLME Secretariat at the beginning of the first main phase of the Project (July 2005) if not earlier..** More formal consideration of the document would occur during the early stages of the main phase of the Project.

MEETING WITH DONORS

Welcome by the Government of Sri Lanka, World Bank, FAO

81. The Donors’ and Partners’ meeting was held on Wednesday, 27 October 2004 as part of the Second Regional Workshop of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme (BOBLME). The meeting opened with welcoming statements from the Government of Sri Lanka, World Bank and FAO. Mr. Hettiarachchi welcomed the donor community and partners to the meeting and explained that the eight BOB countries had been meeting over the past two days and welcomed the opportunity to share our work.

82. Mr. Malcolm Jansen from the World Bank expressed the Bank’s commitment to reducing poverty and improving food security, especially in developing countries. He

pointed out that the Bank was broadening its efforts from a national focus to a more regional focus. He stressed the need to form partnerships and invited the participants to join together to solve the issues. The Bank is one of the implementing agencies of GEF and works closely with FAO as a partner to execute the Programme. He stated that the expectation of the World Bank is that the programme would improve its dialogue at the country level and eventually lead to future investments to the mutual benefits of all involved.

83. Ms. Barbara Cooney, FAO GEF Focal Point, Rome, welcomed the participation of donors and partners in the meeting. She gave an overview of FAO extensive involvement with the BOB over the past 25 years, starting from fisheries development interventions through to conducting environmental assessments and improving fisheries management. She explained that this led to the broader BOBLME Programme with subsequent funding from GEF and SIDA.

OVERVIEW OF THE BOBLME PROGRAMME AND PDF-B PROCESS

84. Dr. Verlaan, Regional Coordinator of the BOBLME Programme, provided an overview of the history leading up to the development of the BOBLME Project Brief and the Draft Preliminary Framework Transboundary Analysis (draft PFTDA). She pointed out that the PDF-B phase is aimed at establishing the basis for the future sustainable management of the BOBLME. She provided some socio-economic background that highlighted the importance of BOBLME to its bordering eight countries. She also described the activities and outputs of the PDF-B phase that included: (i) eight national reports and summaries; (ii) five regional thematic reports; (iii) preparatory meeting report; (iv) draft logical framework; (v) draft framework Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis; and (vi) draft Project Brief.

85. She informed the meeting that, following considerable consultation and participation of the BOBLME countries, the following priority transboundary issues had been identified:

- (i) Overexploitation of living marine resources
- (ii) Degradation of critical habitats
- (iii) Land-based sources of pollution

PRESENTATION OF THE DRAFT PROJECT BRIEF

86. Dr. DuBois, Senior Environmental Officer, FAO, Rome, provided a review of the draft Project Brief. He first outlined some of the key assumptions that were being discussed during the workshop, including the size of the project and the need for 1:1 co-financing with GEF.

87. He further elaborated on the process leading up the Project Brief stage, including more recent activities for the development of the logframe, field preparation (team of consultants) and FAO project preparation and review.

88. As presented earlier in the report of the present workshop, he explained that the project had been divided into:

- 1. Coastal/marine natural resource management and sustainable use
- 2. Improved understanding and predictability of the BOBLME
- 3. Maintenance of ecosystem health and management of pollution
- 4. Project sustainability

5. Project management

89. He also presented the estimates of project costs by components and sources of funding. The base-line project is presently costed at \$US27.7 million. Some cost savings have been identified in the present workshop and the budget will be re-worked. The possibility of further funding from GEF to support biodiversity and conservation was also tabled. This extra dimension is currently being fitted into the existing Project structure, especially in broadening out the work on fish refugia to consider more multiple-use aspects.

VIEWS OF COUNTRIES

Bangladesh

90. Bangladesh stressed the importance of fisheries in Bangladesh with a current production of 25 million tonnes. About 17 million people are dependent on these resources, especially the artisanal fisheries. The country is facing many problems, including assessment of the resources, over-exploitation, catching of non-targeted species and collecting juvenile shrimps. Many of the resources are shared by neighbouring countries. Considerable conflicts exist between the artisanal and the commercial sub-sectors. Degradation of the environment and changing water flow are further aggravating the issues.

91. In common with other countries, water pollution is also on the increase. The major issues include lack of enforcement of regulations and existing policies. Over the past 30 years only a small percent (4%) of development funding has gone to the marine environment and its resources. The BOBLME Programme is a good initiative that is needed to address the issues. Regional cooperation is also needed for the management of shared resources and the harmonization of country policies. Human resources development and capacity building of institutions are urgently needed. Bangladesh expressed its appreciation for all the past efforts and welcomed further support.

India

92. India has a very long coastline and the largest EEZ in the BOBLME. Marine fisheries potential is assessed as 3.9 million tonnes and 11 million people are dependent on fisheries either part- or full-time. Most of the fishery populations live below the poverty line and there are few alternative livelihoods. This has resulted in over-exploitation of the resources. Other issues include the impact of coastal aquaculture and the safety issues resulting from the need for fishers to fish further offshore. Large-scale urbanization and industrialization have also led to degradation of the environment and critical habitats. Increased pressure is occurring to increase exports of marine products. These have all contributed to increase conflicts and difficulties in enforcement. Looking forward to the BOBLME Project to assist in providing some solutions, India has been greatly encouraged by the efforts of FAO, especially the BOBLME Programme's Regional Coordinator.

93. India will continue to support the Project Office up until the end of the PDF-B phase and in the initial stages of the next phase. India encouraged support for the new efforts and investments that are needed to manage the marine resources on a sustainable basis.

Indonesia

94. Indonesia is committed to the BOBLME and its sustainable management and is supportive of the present initiatives. Indonesia highlighted the importance of the Malacca Straits within BOBLME and the need for a collaborative effort for its future management. It is hoped that the Project can assist in resource assessment and management of fisheries. It is also important to reverse the degradation of critical habitats in the Malacca Straits. Indonesia believes that the BOBLME is an important initiative and encouraged future support.

Malaysia

95. Malaysia is grateful for the support of the BOBLME Project. Any activities that affect positively the fisher folk in the Straits of Malacca are welcomed. The Straits of Malacca are a very busy area and heavily affected by many uses, resulting in issues such as land-based pollution. Malaysia shares several highly migrating fish stocks with other countries (e.g., Indian mackerel). Malaysia is very happy to participate in and contribute to the Project. The Project depends very much on the support of the World Bank, FAO and donors.

The Maldives

96. In the Maldives, tourism and fishing are the main economic activities, with tourism becoming increasingly important. Coral reefs are very important to the region and tourism is very dependent on the health of these reefs. Many reef resources are overexploited, including giant clams, beche-de-mer, shark, groupers. Multiple uses result in many conflicts and trade-offs e.g., shark fishing vs. shark watching (with the latter being far more profitable); aquarium fishing vs. recreational diving (ditto); grouper fishing vs. baitfish collection. At the moment, fishery management interventions are inadequate, especially through the lack of enforcement capacity. Although the Maldives is on the edge of the BOBLME it is linked through many ecological mechanisms. The Maldives believe that the BOBLME Project can help in: (i) community-based integrated coastal management; (ii) improved policy harmonization; (iii) collaborative regional fishery assessments and management plans; and (iv) institutional strengthening and capacity building. The BOBLME Project is very important for the Maldives, and donor support would be highly appreciated.

Myanmar

97. Myanmar has a long shoreline in the BOBLME and has many islands. Fishing is the second most economic activity and important for poverty alleviation and food security. The annual catch of 5 million tonnes is close to the sustainable yield. The coastal region has been negatively affected by urbanization, increasing population, industry, aquaculture and tourism. In the sea the resources are being exploited by a large range of gears and methods, many of which are operated by small-scale fisheries. These small-scale fisheries are protected from industrial fishing. Issues include over-exploitation and IUU fishing that are increasing. There are major challenges in conserving the resources as well as increasing food security. Myanmar is highly appreciative of the BOBLME Project. Because it is a truly integrated process based on transparency and hard work by participating countries it could reach its goal given sufficient support.

Sri Lanka

98. In Sri Lanka marine fisheries contribute about 80% to 85% of the total fish production. It is therefore very dependent on marine resources for protein needs. Some coastal resources are overexploited. Government policy is to improve management and expand fishing to off-shore fisheries and inland fisheries. In the BOBLME Project the priority on sharks is very important for Sri Lanka, including exports of shark fins. Some species are threatened. The Gulf of Mannar sub-component is also very important, both in terms of fisheries and biodiversity. On the Indian side the area is declared as a Biosphere reserve and Sri Lanka is considering declaring it as a marine protected area (M.P.A) or biosphere area. Sri Lanka needs information to make this happen and hopes the BOBLME project can be supported to fill this gap.

Thailand

99. In the case of Thailand, the long coast line along the Andaman Sea is very important. Thailand is the tenth largest fish producing country in the world, with 30% of this coming from the Andaman Sea. It supports a wide range of fishing gears and vessels. Issues include over-exploitation (including transboundary species - small pelagics and squids). Biological studies exist to show important linkages among stocks across neighbouring countries. Degradation of coastal habitats is also important as well as land-based development effects on coastal waters. Enforcement of the law and regulations is a major issue. To address these will require a wide range of collaborative actions and we could all learn from successful interventions such as in Phang Nga Bay.

100. Thailand also stressed the importance of the Mergui archipelago sub-component in terms of the integrated management of its many uses including tourism, transport and fishing. This will require collaboration with Myanmar and other countries of the Bay of Bengal as they start to work together to solve the many issues of the region. Donor support is also needed in this cooperative effort.

OVERVIEW OF NEXT STEPS

101. The next steps include:

- (i) National Coordinators to provide baseline information for completion of the Incremental Cost Analysis (by 8 November 2004)
- (ii) Revision of Project Brief to incorporate comments and suggestions (by 18 November 2004)
- (iii) Send to World Bank and Sida for review (18 November 2004)
- (iv) Final endorsement process by countries (to be completed by 14 January 2005)
- (v) Provide brief to donors by end November 2004
- (vi) World Bank to submit proposal for upstream consultations with the GEF Secretariat (by December 2004)
- (vii) Submit to February 2005 Intersessional Work Programme for consideration of the GEF Council.

FINAL DISCUSSIONS IN PLENARY AND COMMENTS

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

102. Dr. Verlaan presented an overview of the outcomes of the BOBLME Programme Steering Committee meeting. These outcomes included:

- Acceptance of the revised budget
- Need for baseline information as input into the incremental cost analysis
- Agreement that the planned demonstration activities would not be carried out during the PBF-B phase. Both activities are being carried forward, one into the Supplemental PDF and one into the main phase Project.
- Agreement that the Project Brief could be submitted to the February GEF Council session
- Acceptance of the revised work plan
- Agreement to next steps
- Countries will provide nominations for the IW:LEARN workshop to be held in Brazil
- Agreement that activities involving monitoring ecosystem health through indicator species would be included in the Project

INCREMENTAL COST ANALYSIS

103. Dr DuBois explained that it is critical that countries provide him with the baseline cost information by 8 November 2004. A meeting of National Coordinators was held during the coffee break to discuss any constraints preventing meeting this important deadline.

NOAA CONTRIBUTION

104. Dr. Cyr (NOAA) pointed out that the Project Brief did not fully cover indicators of ecosystem health. A new activity, costing approximately US\$100k, will be included in the Project under Component 3 (Maintenance of Ecosystem Health and Management of Pollution). Dr. Cyr (NOAA) offered to provide international technical assistance as an in-kind contribution, estimated at US\$ 0.4 million.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PROJECT BRIEF

105. The outputs from the Workshop in terms of changes to the Project Brief were tabled (Appendix 6). **The Workshop agreed with all the changes as presented and with an additional change discussed in plenary to strengthen the authority of the NCs. With respect to the Gulf of Mannar, it was agreed to include this sub-project, along with suggested activities for further development based on mutually agreed actions.**

REVISED BUDGET

106. The revised budget was presented, including possible further funding from the GEF, countries in-kind and cash contributions, NOAA in-kind support, Government of India contribution to host the Project office, FAO and co-financiers. The total cost of the Project

is US\$32 million with a 1.2:1 (co-finance:GEF) ratio. The revised budget is presented as Appendix 7.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO COMPONENT 2

107. Dr DuBois explained that as discussed earlier in the workshop, component 2 was to be modified to allow further development of the component under a Supplemental PDF process. This involves broadening the fish refugia sub-component by building on the activities originally presented in the Project brief. This includes: (i) terminology; (ii) inventory of existing fish refugia/M.P.A and status of critical habitats (including how representative they are); (iii) if gaps are identified, then these areas be brought into multiple use, including a conservation component. In terms of connectivity, linking of one or more habitats in terms of some “flag-ship” species is one possible idea. The deadlines for this process are given under the “Next steps” agenda item.

ENDORSEMENT OF PROJECT BRIEF

108. All countries fully endorsed the Project Brief as presented plus the agreed amendments.

NEXT STEPS

109. The next steps and work plan are included as Appendix 8. These were agreed by the Workshop. A table of the endorsement and agreement process requirements is included as Appendix 9.

ADOPTION OF WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS

110. Recommendations of the Second Regional Workshop

1. FAO will revise the **Project Brief** in accordance with comments received and amendments proposed during the course of the workshop. FAO will continue to lead the further development of the project, including **preparation of the supplementary PDF-B request** for additional GEF resources and the preparation of the new/revised project components.
2. Countries will provide the requested information to produce the **Incremental Cost Analysis** no later than 8 November 2004. This information is essential in order for the draft Project Brief to be finalized and transmitted to BOBLME countries on 18 November. Without this information, there is a risk that the document, and the subsequent national approval process, will not be completed by the deadline for submission of documents to GEFSEC for Work Programme inclusion.
3. The **Gulf of Mannar** will remain as a sub-project to be prepared early during Project implementation. For cost purposes, the proposed activities that it will be described in the Project Brief along the lines of the Mergui Archipelago sub-project. The provision will be included in the description that all activities eventually undertaken will be mutually agreeable to the Government of India and to the Government of Sri Lanka.

4. The workshop participants endorsed the recommendations of the working group on **national co-financing arrangements** that had been set up to consider country co-financing (in cash and in kind). Estimated total cash and in kind contributions amount to US\$5.5 million over the 6 years of Phase I. It was agreed that the participants would seek formal approval through their respective internal processes for the proposed in kind and in cash co-financing arrangements:

- i. The cash contribution from the countries would be US\$2 million over 6 years. This will include:
 - the cost of a full-time contracted national technical advisor and secretary for the NC;
 - the pro rata portion of the salary of the NC;
 - associated communications and facilities costs for work on the Project;
 - US\$20,000 per year per country of 6 years to cover the in-country costs of national workshops and national (not international) participants;
 - Thailand and Myanmar will support the cost of a full-time coordinator and deputy each for their country for implementation of the Mergui sub-project.
- ii. The contribution in kind from the countries will be US\$3.5 million over 6 years. This will include:
 - all counterpart salaries for workshops, training and local travel, but not international travel;
 - the time of the National Task Force members;
 - staff time and office space for the Mergui component.

5. FAO will continue its efforts to mobilize **donor co-financing**. As soon as the revised draft Project Brief is available, it should be presented to potentially interested donors and partners. The World Bank will also approach potential partners.

6. Countries will make every effort to facilitate the **national endorsement process** to meet the agreed deadlines for submission of the draft Project Brief for inclusion in the February 2005 Inter-sessional Work Programme to be considered by the GEF Council. The deadline for endorsement by the National GEF Focal Points is 14 January. The deadline for firm co-financing commitments, both on the part of the participating countries (in kind and in cash) and bilateral donors and other partners, is by the time of CEO endorsement (August 2005).

7. Comments in writing on the **draft preliminary framework TDA** will be sent, preferably via email, to the BOBLME Secretariat as soon as possible, but no later than 1 July 2005.

CLOSING REMARKS

111. In closing, Dr. Verlaan, the Regional Coordinator, announced that she would be leaving the Project in December. Dr. Verlaan expressed her great appreciation in particular to the representatives of the 8 BOBLME member countries for their wholehearted support and cooperation and stated that it had been a pleasure and a privilege to serve as their Regional Coordinator. FAO, the World Bank, The Chair of the Workshop, and the

BOBLME member countries commended her efforts over the past two years to bring the project to fruition and thanked her warmly. The workshop closed by a representative of the BOBLME countries thanking the Chair for his able leadership and for the help of the Secretariat. The BOBLME Programme Secretariat's Senior Secretary, Ms. Cheryl Verghese, was specifically thanked for her excellent work. The Government of Sri Lanka provided excellent support in hosting the meeting – an effort appreciated by all involved.

CLOSING OF MEETING

112. The participants expressed their great appreciation to the Department of Fisheries, Government of Sri Lanka, for the excellent arrangements for the Second Regional Workshop, as well as for the fascinating field trip, a most welcome break from a very challenging agenda. The meeting was adjourned on 29 October 2004.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1	List of Participants
Appendix 2	Opening Statement by Mr. N. Bambaravanage, Secretary of Fisheries, Sri Lanka
Appendix 3	Opening Statement by Mr. Mazlan Jusoh, Representative of FAO to Sri Lanka and the Maldives
Appendix 4	Agenda
Appendix 5	List of Documents
Appendix 6	Recommendations and Suggestions for the Project Brief
Appendix 7	Revised Financing Scenario
Appendix 8	Next Steps and Work Plan
Appendix 9	National Endorsement Process

**Report of the Second Regional Workshop of
the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Programme
Colombo, Sri Lanka
25-29 October 2004**

Appendix 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BANGLADESH

Dr M A Mazid
Director General
Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute
Mymensingh 2201, Bangladesh
Tel: 880 91 54874
Mobile: 880 91 71544919
Fax: 880 91 55259/54221
dgbfri@bdonline.com

INDIA

Mr. P.K. Pattanaik
Joint Secretary (Fisheries)
Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying,
Ministry of Agriculture
Room No. 221, Krishi Bhavan
New Delhi 110 001
Tel : 91 11 23381994
Fax: 91 11 23070370
Email: pattu@nic.in

INDONESIA

Mr Mian Sahala Sitanggang
Deputy Director of Planning and Foreign
Cooperation
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Jalan Medan Merdeka Timur No 16
Jakarta, Indonesia
Tel: 62 21 3520337
Fax: 62 21 3520337
Email: miansahala@yahoo.com

Mr Parlin Tambunan
Chief, Fisheries Resources Management
Directorate Fisheries Resources
Directorate General of Capture Fisheries
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Jl. Harsono RM No 3, Building B
Ragunan, Jakarta, Selantan, Indonesia
Tel: 62 21 7811672
Fax: 62 21 7980464
Email dfrmdgf@indosat.net.id

Ms Lakshmi Dhewanthi
Acting Head of Bureau for Planning And
International Cooperation
Ministry of Environment
Jalan D.I. Pangaitan Kav 24
Jakarta 13410, Indonesia
Tel: 62 21 8580110
Fax: 62 21 8580110
Email: ldhewanthi@menlh.go.id

MALAYSIA

Mr Junaidi bin Che Ayub
Director General
Department of Fisheries Malaysia
Ministry of Agriculture
Wisma Tani Jalan Sultan Salahuddin
50628 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: 60 3 26980523
Fax: 60 3 26710305
Email: tkpp01@dof.moa.my

Mr. Ismail b. Awang Kechik
Director of Research
Fisheries Research Institute
Department of Fisheries ,
11960 Batu Maung,
Penang, Malaysia
Tel: 60 4 626 2231
Fax: 60 4 6262210
Email: ismawa01@dof.moa.my

Mr Khairus Masan bin Abd. Khalid
Principal Assistant Secretary
Department of Environment and National
Resources and Environment
Conservation and Environment Management
Division, Level 5, Parcel C
Federal Government Administrative Centre
62662 Putrajaya, Malaysia
Tel: 60 3 88858024, 88858262
Fax: 60 3 88884070
Email:

MALDIVES

Dr Abdullah Naseer
Director, Reef Resources
Marine Research Centre
Ministry of Fisheries Agriculture
and Marine Resources
Ghazee Building, Male
Tel: 960 313681
Fax: 960 322509
E-mail: anaseer@mrc.gov.mv

Dr Mohamed Shiham Adam
Director, Fisheries Research
Marine Research Centre
Ministry of Fisheries Agriculture and
Marine Resources, Ghazee Building
Male, Republic of Maldives
Fax No: 960 320720
Tel No: 960 322509
Email: msadam@mrc.gov.mv

Mr Mohamed Inaz
Senior Environment Analyst
Ministry of Home Affairs and Environment
Huravee Building,
Ameer Ahmed Magu, Male
Tel: 960 324861
Fax: 960 322286
Email: mohamed.inaz@environment.gov.mv

MYANMAR

Mr U Hla Win
Deputy Director General
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries
Sinmin Road, Alone T/S
Yangon, Myanmar
Tel: 95 1 228621
Fax: 95 1 228258
Email: hlawindof@myanmar.comm

Mr. Mya Than Tun
Senior Fisheries Biologist
Department of Fisheries
Sinmin Road, Alone Township
Yangon. Myanmar
Tel;95-1 661721, 652187(Res:)
Fax: 95-1 680746,680748 (Office)
Email;mttun@myanmar.co.mm

SRI LANKA

Mr A Hettiarachchi
Director General
Ministry of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources
Mattakkuliya Secretariat
Colombo – 15, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2329666
Fax: 94 11 2541184
Email: ahettiarachchi@fisheries.gov.lk

Mr. H.S.G. Fernando
Director, Ocean Resources
Ministry of Fisheries & Ocean Resources
6th Floor, Maligawatta
Colombo – 10, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2329440
Fax: 94 11 2472192
Email: hsgfernando@fisheries.gov.lk

Dr. D.S. Jayakody, Director
National Aquatic Resources Research and
Development Agency
Crow Island Mattakkuliya
Colombo – 15, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2521000
Fax: 94 11 2521932
Email: dsjayakody@yahoo.com

Mr. R. S. A. Ranasinghe
Research Assistant
Ministry of Environment & Natural
Resources Environmental Economics &
Global Affairs Division
No. 104, Parisara Piyasa
Robert Gunawardena Mawatha,
Battaramulla, Sri Lanka.
Tel: 094-(0)112-887452
Fax: 094-(0)112-887456
Email: airmac@sltnet.lk

THAILAND

Mr Sakul Supongpan
Marine Fisheries Expert
Department of Fisheries
Kasetsart University , Phaholyothin Road,
Jatujak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 66 2 5620540
Fax: 66 2 5620561
Email: sakuls@fisheries.go.th

Dr. Praulai Nootmorn
Chief of Survey and Analysis of Aquatic
Resources and Fisheries Status Unit, Andaman
Sea Fisheries Research and Department Center
7 Sakdidej Rd. Muang District
Phuket 83000 Thailand
Tel: 66 76 391138
Fax: 66 76 391139
Email: praulain@fisheries.go.th

Dr Somkiat Khokiattiwong
Senior Fishery Biologist
Phuket Marine Biological centre
Department of Coastal and Marine Resources
P O Box 60, Phuket, Thailand
Tel: 66 76 391128
Fax: 6676 391127
Email somkiat@e-mail.in.th

FAO

Ms. Barbara Cooney
FAO GEF Focal Point
Policy Assistance Division (TCA)
FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 57055478
Fax: 39 06 57054657
Email : barbara.cooney@fao.org

Dr Random DuBois
Senior Environment Advisor
Investment Centre Division, FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 57055409
Fax: 39 06 57054657
Email: random.dubois@fao.org

Dr Derek Staples
Senior Fishery Officer
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific,
Maliwan Mansion, 39 Phra Athit Road
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: 66 2 6974333
Fax: 66 2 6974499
Email: derek.staples@fao.org

WORLD BANK

Mr. Malcolm Jansen
GEF Coordinator, South Asia Region
World Bank, 1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C. 20443, U.S.A.
Tel: 202 473 4355
Fax: 202 522 1666
Email: mjansen@worldbank.org

SIDA

Mr Peter Funegård
Senior Fisheries Officer
National Board of Fisheries/Consultant
Swedish International Development Agency
(Sida), Box No 423, 40126 Goteborg, Sweden
Tel. 46 31 7430325
Fax: 46 31 7430444
Email: peter.funegard@fiskeriverket.se

NOAA

Dr. Ned Cyr
Chief, Marine Ecosystem Division
NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Hwy
Silver Spring
Maryland 20910 USA
Tel: 1 301 713 2363
Fax: 1 301 7131875
Email: Ned.Cyr@NOAA.gov

OBSERVERS

Mr Mahboob Elahi
Director General
South Asian Seas, South Asia Co-operative
Environment Programme, SACEP
No 10 Anderson Road
Colombo - 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2589787
Fax: 94 11 2589369
Email: SACEP@eureka.lk

Mr Prasantha Dias Abeyegunawardene
Interim Co-ordinator
South Asian Seas, South Asia Co-operative
Environment Programme
10 Anderson Road
Colombo 10, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2546442
Fax: 94 11 2589369
Email: pd_sacep@eureka.lk

Mr Hiran W Jayewardene
Secretary General
Indian Ocean Marine Affairs Co-operation (IOMAC)
4.212 BMICH
Colombo 7, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2686329
Fax: 94 11 2699691
Email: iomac@lanka.com.lk

Dr Champa Amarasiri
Head/Marine Biological Resources Division,
National Aquatic Resources Research and
Development Agency
Crow Island Mattakkuliya
Colombo – 15, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2521914
Fax: 94 11 2521932
Email: champa@nara.ac.lk

Ms Lucy Emerton
Regional Group Head, ELG Asia
IUCN-The World Conservation Union
53 Horton Place
Colombo 7, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2694094
Fax: 94 1 2682770
Email: LAE@iucnsl.org

Mr Jerker Tamelander
Coordinator
Regional Marine Programme
IUCN – The World Conservation Union
53 Horton Place
Colombo 7, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2694094
Fax: 94 1 2682770
Email: Jer@iucnsl.org

Ms Agostina Palestro
Embassy of Italy
55 Jawatte Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 250388
Fax: 94 1 250388
Email agostena.palestro@vilgilio.it

Ms Ruwanthi Ariyaratne
Programme Officer
South Asia Cooperative Environment
Programme (SACCP)
10 Anderson Road Off. Dickmans Road
Colombo 05, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2552761
Email: po2_sacep@col.lk

Ms Charmini Kodituwakku
Programme Officer
SACEP (South Asian Cooperative Environment
No 10 Anderson Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 11 2589789/2552761
Fax: 94 1 2589369
Email: po_sacep@col.lk

Ms Roumany Rasouinho
Indian Ocean Marine Affairs Cooperation (IOMAC)
BMICH
Colombo 7, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94 1 268639
Fax: 94 11 2699691
Email: faunasl@sri.lanka.net

Ms. Vidya Perera
Senior Advisor
Royal Norwegian Embassy
34 Ward Place
Colombo 7
Sri Lanka
Tel: 2469611
Fax: 2695009
Email: E-mail vipe@mfa.no

BOBLME Secretariat

Dr. Philomène Verlaan
Regional Coordinator
Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem
Programme, Post Bag 6902
Chennai 600 018, India
Tel: 91 44 24620761, 24936387
Fax: 91 44 24620761
E-mail: boblme@vsnl.net

Ms. Cheryl Verghese
Senior Secretary/Administrative Assistant
Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem
Programme, Post Bag 6902
Chennai 600 018, India
Tel: 91 44 24620761, 24936387
Fax: 91 44 24620761
E-mail: boblme@vsnl.net

**REPORT OF THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP OF THE
BAY OF BENGAL LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM PROGRAMME**

Colombo, Sri Lanka, October 25-29, 2004

Appendix 2

**Opening Address by Mr N. Bambaravanage,
Secretary of Fisheries, Government of Sri Lanka**

Distinguished Delegates
Ladies and Gentlemen

I consider that it is a privilege and honour associated to be at the opening of the Second Regional Workshop on the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme. I would like to express my appreciation, on behalf of the Government of Sri Lanka, to the organizers for selecting Sri Lanka as the host country for this very important workshop.

The Bay of Bengal, as you all know, has been identified as one of the world's sixty-four Large Marine Ecosystems. It is bordered by eight countries – Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand. As I understand, about one-quarter of the world's population reside in the countries bordering the Bay of Bengal. Approximately 400 million people live in the Bay catchment areas.

I have been made to understand that Large Marine Ecosystems are regions of ocean space encompassing coastal areas from including river basins and estuaries to the seaward boundaries of continental shelves and the outer margins of the world's major current systems.

I also came to know that the large marine ecosystems are responsible for 95% of the marine fishery yields.

This indicates clearly the need to maintain the ecological health of ecosystems. You are here today to elaborate a vision and to finalize an action plan for the responsible and sustainable management of our Large Marine Ecosystem – the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem.

It has been pointed out that Large Marine Ecosystems of developing countries are often subject to stress from increased population pressure on the coastal areas. Our prime concern is to increase fish harvests to meet the growing nutritional needs, especially the protein needs. Food security and the socio-economic well-being of the poor coastal communities are the major concerns in this regard.

I also like to recall FAO's continued and closed association since 1979 with the landmark Bay of Bengal Programme which reached out to millions of small-scale fisherfolk in the eight countries bordering the Bay.

I am pleased to hear that the Global Environment Facility has agreed to finance the formulation of a much larger and wider project to cover the entire Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem. It is very much timely to implement this type of a project addressing the transboundary issues of living marine resources of the Bay. It will help in the management process of marine stocks.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the governments of all participating countries, the Global Environment Facility, the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, the Swedish International Development Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the United Nations Environment Programme for their support in various ways to make this project a success.

I wish you all the best for a most productive meeting and the foreign participants a pleasant stay in Sri Lanka.

**REPORT OF THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP OF THE
BAY OF BENGAL LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM PROGRAMME**

Colombo, Sri Lanka, October 25-29, 2004

Appendix 3

**Opening Address by Mr. Mazlan Jusoh,
FAO Representative for Sri Lanka and Maldives**

Honorable Secretary

Distinguished delegates from the eight BOBLME participating countries

Distinguished delegates from the World Bank, SIDA and NOAA

Distinguished Observers

Fellow colleagues from FAO

Ladies and Gentlemen

I should like to welcome you all to the Second Regional Workshop of Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme, hosted by the Government of Sri Lanka here in the most agreeable venue of the Taj Samudra in Colombo.

I should like to recall briefly the most recent history of the BOBLME Programme. As you are all aware, this initiative grew out the experience gained and the close collaboration that was established during the longstanding Bay of Bengal Programme. In view of the increasing recognition of the environmental threats to the coastal and marine resources, the importance of the fisheries resources of the Bay for the livelihood of fishers, and the need to address these issues through an integrated and coordinated manner, the Bay of Bengal Advisory Committee requested FAO to assist in approaching the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The GEF subsequently approved a project preparation grant to develop a Programme for the sustainable management of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem – the BOBLME Programme. The GEF is in a unique position to build on and strengthen existing programmes and partnerships through promoting a transboundary perspective and approach to addressing the critical issues confronted by the Bay of Bengal countries. In addition to in kind contributions provided by the eight participating countries, this preparatory period has also been supported by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), the World Bank as the GEF Implementing Agency, FAO as Executing Agency, and the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

During this preparatory period, you have produced and delivered on a most challenging work plan and produced a wide range of excellent outputs. Even more importantly, you have fostered national and regional team-building, essential components for carrying out the preparatory activities and designing the BOBLME programme and the project for the first implementation phase. This could not have been achieved without the excellent inputs from the wide range of stakeholders at the national level, including the National Coordinator, the Programme Steering Committee Member, the National Task Force, the National Review Group, the National Workshop and the National Consultant. I believe that this broad consultation process at the national level has strengthened the capacity of a

core group of stakeholders in the eight participating countries to understand and address the complex national and regional issues surrounding the sustainable management of the Bay of Bengal.

In Bangkok in April 2004 you developed and reached consensus on the Logical Framework that has guided the development of the Project Brief. At that time, you also identified a shortlist of candidate regional and sub-regional activities from which initial pilot projects would be selected and prepared during the formulation of the draft Project Brief. The document that you are considering this week is based on this logframe and on comments that were subsequently received following your internal review processes.

As agreed at the various workshops and meetings over the last two years, the BOBLME initiative is envisaged as the first phase of a long-term, 12- to 15-year programme, which will be implemented in two phases. The ultimate goal of the overall programme is the sustainable management of the living marine resources and an environmentally healthy BOBLME. To achieve this, the first phase project will develop an agreed Strategic Action Programme (SAP) which will consist of a series of investment, technical assistance and capacity-building interventions that complement and build on relevant existing national and regional activities. The first phase project will furthermore support the development of regional institutional collaborative mechanisms, processes and activities that would promote an integrated and comprehensive approach to the management of the BOBLME.

The draft Project Brief and the draft Framework Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), which you have before you, are the ultimate outputs of the preparatory phase of this programme. The purpose of this Second Regional Workshop is to elicit your views and comments on the draft Project Brief and reach consensus on the final version that will be submitted through official channels to all the participating countries for formal endorsement. Once formal endorsement is received, the final draft Project Brief will be submitted to GEF and other donors for financing. I understand you are aiming to submit the document for consideration by the GEF Council in the February 2005 Intersessional Work Programme. This is a very ambitious deadline which I am sure you will meet given the tremendous progress you have made so far in such a short period of time.

On Wednesday, you will also have the opportunity to discuss and provide feedback on the draft Framework Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis. The TDA will be finalized during the first implementation phase of the BOBLME Programme.

FAO is privileged to collaborate with the BOBLME countries in this important task. Once again, you have a challenging agenda to accomplish in the upcoming week. I am confident that you will achieve the objectives of this workshop with the same efficiency as you have achieved all the other objectives of the BOBLME initiative so far.

I wish you all the very best for a most productive meeting and a pleasant stay in Colombo.

Appendix 4
Report of the Second Regional Workshop of
The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme
25-29 October 2004, Colombo, Sri Lanka

AGENDA

Monday, 25 October 2004

Opening of the Meeting
Lighting the Oil Lamp
Welcome by Mr N Bambaravanage, Secretary of Fisheries, Government of Sri Lanka
Welcome by Mr Mazlan Jusoh, FAO Representative for Sri Lanka and Maldives
Welcome by Mr Malcolm Jansen, Representative of World Bank
Welcome by Mr Peter Funegard, Representative of Sida
Introduction of Participants
Election of Chair
Group Photo
Adoption of Agenda
History and current status of BOBLME Project (P. Verlaan, Regional Coordinator)
Overview of development and introduction of the draft Project Brief (R.DuBois, Project Team Leader)
Question and Answer Session
Presentation of Draft Project Brief (by component/sub-component)
Closure of day's meeting by Chair
Welcome dinner hosted by the Government of Sri Lanka

Tuesday, 26 October 2004

Presentation and discussion of components
Presentation and discussion of components
Presentation and discussion of components
Presentation and discussion of components
Closure of day's meeting by Chair

Wednesday, 27 October 2004

Overview of development and introduction of the draft Framework Transboundary
Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) (P.Verlaan)
Discussion and comments on draft framework TDA

Donors Meeting

- Welcome by the Government of Sri Lanka, FAO, World Bank
- Introduction of participants
- Overview of BOBLME Programme and the PDF-B process
- Presentation of Project Brief
- Views of the BOBLME Member Countries
- Discussion/Question and answer period
- Overview of next steps
- Closure of day's meeting by Chair

Welcome dinner hosted by FAO

Thursday, 28 October 2004

Field Trip – *Hosted by the Ministry of Fisheries, Government of Sri Lanka*

Friday, 29 October 2004

- Presentation of Results and Recommendations of the PSC meeting (P.Verlaan)
- Incremental Cost Analysis (R.DuBois)
- Proposed amendments to Component 2 (R.DuBois)
- NOAA contribution (N.Cyr)
- Recommended Changes to the Project Brief (P.Verlaan)
- Revised budget (R.DuBois)
- Supplementary PDF-B (R.DuBois)
- Next steps (B.Cooney)
- Adoption of Workshop Recommendations (Chair)
- Endorsement of Project Brief (subject to incorporation of any agreed amendments): Chair
- Any other business (Chair)
- Closing remarks
- Closure of the Meeting (Chair)

Appendix 5
Report of the Second Regional Workshop of
The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme
25-29 October 2004, Colombo, Sri Lanka

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

1. List of documents
2. Agenda
3. Draft Project Brief
4. Draft Framework Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
5. Summary of the PDF-B Phase of the BOBLME Programme
6. Summary of the Presentation of the Draft Project Brief
7. Summary of the Presentation of the Draft Framework TDA
8. List of Participants

**Report of the Meeting of the Second Regional Workshop of the BOBLME Programme,
October 25-29, 2004, Colombo, Sri Lanka**

Appendix 6: Recommendations and Suggestions for the Project Brief

1. Coastal/Marine Natural Resource Management and Sustainable Use

- It was agreed to approve the proposal to combine the separate groups for Indian mackerel, sharks, Hilsa and statistics into one regional and eight national coordinating groups.
- Bangladesh will be included in the Indian mackerel sub-regional activity.
- Move GIS activities to component 2.

2. Understanding the Predictability of the BOBLME Environment

- Further Project development work will occur to broaden the range of this sub-component to incorporate additional GEF funding.
- An activity will be included to review and provide some analyses of existing datasets (e.g., oceanographic surveys, remote satellite data, biological studies). [Secretariat note: This will be included in supplementary PDF Block B proposal.]
- The “Sea Around Us” project will be included in the list of collaborators as they are planning to conduct ecosystem modelling in the BOB.

3. Maintenance of Ecosystem Health and Management of Pollution

- Include activities dealing with the maintenance of ecosystem health (e.g., indicator species).

4. Project Sustainability

- M&E should be in conformity with GEF requirements and the national GEF operational focal point should be kept well informed and involved with the project.
- In the 4th or 5th year of the Project, an analysis would be carried out to quantify the benefits being received by the BOBLME countries.
- The “Other” budget category would be further defined and reallocated as much as possible into the other budget categories. [Secretariat note: has been addressed]
- To ensure Government endorsement, some countries need a breakdown of costs by country. It was suggested that an additional table be prepared with this information. [Secretariat note: This is a costly and time-consuming exercise that cannot be carried in the time frame available.]
- The institutional structure diagram should reflect reporting mechanisms and feedback loops, with lines (no arrows) and boxes of equal value.

5. Changes in Implementation Arrangements and Terms of Reference (Annex 6 to the Project Brief)

- TORs should reflect the responsibility of the PSC members to initiate appropriate steps for mainstreaming project findings into national policy.
- The relationship between the NC and PSC should be further elaborated in the TORs, to reflect the need for close coordination between the two.
- The RCU role would be clarified to reflect that the RCU would be responsible for implementing and coordinating the activities but not be actually involved in the execution of the activities themselves.

- National/regional expertise should be used in implementing the Project as much as possible, including in recruitment for the RCU.
- The World Bank should be a member of the PSC and an observer in any NTF where the WB has a country presence.
- Members of the PSC or their representatives are expected to participate in the NTFs.
- The TOR for the NCs will include the following sentence: "The National Coordinator is expected and shall be able to contact and coordinate as necessary with other relevant governmental ministries and departments and state and local authorities whose input is important to the BOBLME Programme, consistent with appropriate governmental communications channels.

Financial working group recommendations

- The cash contribution from the countries would be US\$ 2 million over 6 years.

This will include:

- the cost of a full-time contracted national technical advisor and secretary for the NC
- the *pro rata* portion of the salary of the NC
- associated communications and facilities costs for work on the Project
- US\$ 20,000 per year per country for 6 years to cover the in-country costs of national workshops and national (not foreign) participants.

In addition to amount above, countries participating in the Mergui (Thailand and Myanmar) and Gulf of Mannar (Sri Lanka) sub-projects, will support the cost of a full-time coordinator and deputy, respectively.

- The contribution in kind from the countries will be US\$ 3.5 million over 6 years.

This will include:

- all counterpart salaries for workshops and training and local travel, but not foreign travel
- the time of National Task Force members
- staff time and office space for the Mergui component.
- There is no need at present for an allocation formula.
- Either scenario number 1 or 2 is acceptable.
- In addition, for the Mergui and Gulf of Mannar sub-projects, the participating countries will be making both cash and in-kind contributions.

In addition to the amount above, countries participating in the Mergui (Thailand and Myanmar) and Gulf of Mannar (Sri Lanka) sub-projects, will support the additional cost associated with provision of required office/laboratory space to achieve the desired outcomes.

APPENDIX 7 to the Report of the 2d Regional Workshop of the BOBLME Programme, October 25- 29, Colombo, Sri Lanka

BOBLME Revised Provisional Financing Scenario

US \$ 32 M Project (assumes additional US\$ 4.3 M GEF Contribution)

Source	Classification	Type of Finance (US \$M)		Total (US \$M)	Status
		Cash	In-kind		
GEF		10.0 + 4.3		10+ 4.3	TBC
BOBLME Countries		2.0	3.5	5.5*	Provisional
NOAA			0.4	0.4	Confirmed
Other Co- financiers		10.4		10.4	TBC
GOI		0.6		0.6	TBC
FAO	Executing Agency		0.8	0.8	Confirmed
Total		23+4.3	4.7	32.0	
Ratio	1.2 US\$ (co-financing): 1 US\$ GEF				

* In addition, for the Mergui and Gulf of Mannar sub-projects, the participating countries will be making both cash and in-kind contributions.

BOBLME Programme: Report of the Second Regional Workshop
25-29 October 2004, Colombo, Sri Lanka
Appendix 8: Next Steps

February 2005 Inter-sessional Work Program

<u>Step</u>	<u>Date</u>
Submission for Internal Review in Implementing Agency*	14 December 2004
Initial Submission of Projects to GEFSEC	14 January 2005
Final Submission of Project to GEFSEC	14 February 2005
Circulate to Council	25 February 2005

* Assumes one month prior to initial submission to GEFSEC.

Key Steps in the Process	Dates/Venue
Second Regional Workshop	25-29 October 2004
Revision of Project Brief	1-15 November 2004
Transmit document to BOBLME countries for formal endorsement	18 November 2004
Transmit document to WB for internal clearance, Sida, NOAA	18 November 2004
Transmit document to other potential donors and partners	30 November 2004
STAP Review (GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)	November/December 2004
Final revision of draft Project Brief	December 2004
Submission to Implementing Agency (World Bank)	15 December 2004
Receipt of endorsement letters from National GEF Focal Points	13 January 2005
Submission to GEF Secretariat	14 January 2005
GEF Council Work Programme Approval	February 2005
Preparation of Supplementary PDF-B request	15 November 2005
Submission of supplementary PDF-B to WB	15 November 2005
GEFSEC approval of supplementary PDF-B request	mid-December
Preparation of revised/supplementary project components	February-May 2005
Regional Workshop to approve revised/supplementary components (mid preparation)	April 2005
Submission of revised/supplementary components to WB	June 2005
Submission of consolidated Project Appraisal Document (PAD) to GEF CEO Approval	August 2005
Project Negotiation/Final Country Clearance	June-August 2005
Submission to World Bank Board for Approval	September 2005
Signing of Letter of Agreement between World Bank (the GEF Implementing Agency) and FAO.	September 2005
Project start-up	October 2005

Report of the 2d Regional Workshop of the BOBLME Programme, October 25-29, 2004 Colombo, Sri Lanka
BOBLME WORKPLAN September 2004 – December 2005

[illegible]

• STAP Review			X	X												
Activity	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
• Submission of Project to GEFSEC for Work Programme inclusion					X											
• GEF Council consideration						X										
• Project Appraisal and final approval/signature							X	X	X	X	X					
Management and Co-ordination																
• Regional Co-ordination	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						
• Administrative Support	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						
• Scientific and Technical Review of Thematic Papers																
• Project Progress Reports (for WB, SIDA)		X						X								
• Supplementary PDF-B Preparation of Supplementary PDF-B request			X													
• Approval of request				X												
• Preparation of new/modified Components						X	X	X								
• Regional workshops																
• Submission to WB and GEFSEC										X						
• CEO Endorsement - August 2005 of Integrated Project Appraisal Document (PAD) August 2005																

**Appendix 9 to the Report of the 2d Regional Workshop of the BOBLME Programme, 25-29 October 2004, Colombo, Sri Lanka;
BOBLME Programme National Endorsement Process**

COUNTRY	GEF Requirement National GEF Operational/Political Focal Point ¹	Time Required	Country Approval Requirements for financial contribution ²	Time Required		Country Approval Requirements for in kind contribution	Time Required	Fiscal Year
				Local Currency				
BANGLADESH	Secretary Ministry of Environment & Forest	About 2 months	Cabinet Division of the Council of Ministers Ministry of Finance	2 months		No problem	2 weeks	July to June
INDIA	i)Ministry of Environment& Forests (Operational Focal Point) ii) Dept of Eco.Affairs Ministry of Finance (Political Focal Point)	About two months	GEF Empowered Committee (meets once in 3 months) It requires approval of the Ministry of External Affairs and the Planning Commission GEF Empowered Committee met on 17/8/2004	About 2 months total		Same as cash. In addition to Besides the Ministries described earlier it requires a Cabinet decision	About 3 months	1 April to 31 March
INDONESIA	Ministry of Environment Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1-2 months	Ministry of Finance	2 months				2005
MALAYSIA	Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture + Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	About 2 months	Ministry of Finance	3 months		Department of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture	1 month	January To December
MALDIVES	Before making endorsement GEF focal point needs recommendation from the Ministries	2 weeks	Foreign Affairs Policy Committee (sometimes Cabinet approval is required)	2 months				
MYANMAR	GEF Focal Point Ministry of Foreign Affairs NCEA	3 months	GEF Focal Point Ministry of Finance Ministry of Livestock & Fisheries	3 months		GEF Focal Point Ministry of Finance Ministry of Livestock & Fisheries	3 months	1 April to 31 March
SRI LANKA	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (ME&NR)	One month	1. GEF Steering committee- (ME&NR) 2. Ministry of Finance 3. External Resources Department	1 month		Cabinet approval	One month	January To December
THAILAND	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Two months	1. Ministry of Agriculture & Cooperative 2. Ministry of Finance	Two months January		1. Ministry of Agriculture & Cooperative 2. Ministry of Finance	Two months January	Oct.

¹ GEF requires the endorsement of the National GEF Operational Focal Point. Some countries, in addition, require that the National Political GEF Focal Point and/or other Ministries also endorse the project.

² Countries may require approval of other Ministries, such as Ministry of Finance/Planning and/or an Inter-Ministerial Committee, or other Institutions, for all projects.