



**United Nations
Environment Programme**



**UNEP/GEF South China Sea
Project**



**Global Environment
Facility**

***Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends
in the
South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand***

REPORT

**Fifth Meeting of the Regional Working Group for
the Mangroves Sub-component**

Trat Province, Thailand, 26th – 30th September 2004



First published in Thailand in 2005 by the United Nations Environment Programme.

Copyright © 2005, United Nations Environment Programme

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit purposes without special permission from the copyright holder provided acknowledgement of the source is made. UNEP would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication that uses this publication as a source.

No use of this publication may be made for resale or for any other commercial purpose without prior permission in writing from the United Nations Environment Programme.

UNEP/GEF
Project Co-ordinating Unit,
United Nations Environment Programme,
UN Building, 2nd Floor Block B, Rajdamnern Avenue,
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel. +66 2 288 1886
Fax. +66 2 288 1094
<http://www.unepscs.org>

DISCLAIMER:

The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of UNEP or the GEF. The designations employed and the presentations do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP, of the GEF, or of any cooperating organisation concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, of its authorities, or of the delineation of its territories or boundaries.

Cover Photo: Banpu Resort built in mixed *Phizophara*, *Avicennia* mangrove forest, Nongkansong, Trat Province, Thailand, by Dr. John C. Pernetta.

For citation purposes this document may be cited as:

UNEP, 2005. *Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/3.*

Table of Contents

1.	OPENING OF THE MEETING	1
1.1	WELCOME ADDRESS.....	1
1.2	INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS	1
2.	ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING	1
2.1	ELECTION OF OFFICERS.....	1
2.2	DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE TO THE MEETING	2
2.3	ORGANISATION OF WORK	2
3.	ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA.....	2
4.	BRIEF REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS ON THE STATUS OF THE PREPARATORY PHASE OUTPUTS DUE 30TH JUNE 2004	2
5.	STATUS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS AND EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.....	3
5.1	STATUS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES (SEAs) FROM THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES, FOR THE MANGROVE SUB-COMPONENT	3
5.2	EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES WITHOUT APPROVED DEMONSTRATION SITES (CAMBODIA AND VIET NAM)	4
5.3	EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES WITH APPROVED DEMONSTRATION SITES	5
6.	PROJECT EVALUATION.....	6
6.1	REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT	6
6.2	SPECIALLY MANAGED PROJECT REVIEW (SMPR) BY THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION UNIT OF THE GEF SECRETARIAT	8
7.	REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND DISCUSSION REGARDING INPUTS TO THE REGIONAL STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME	12
7.1	REVIEW OF THE CONTENTS OF THE DRAFT NATIONAL ACTION PLANS WITH A VIEW TO IDENTIFYING COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES.....	12
7.2	DISCUSSION ON THE INPUTS FROM THE MANGROVE SUB-COMPONENT TO THE REGIONAL STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP), REVIEW OF THE SAP TARGETS AND GOALS AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROCESS OF INTEGRATING NAP AND SAP DEVELOPMENT.....	16
8.	IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES	18
8.1	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DEMONSTRATION SITE ACTIVITIES	18
8.2	REGIONAL CO-ORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES IN THE APPROVED DEMONSTRATION SITES	19
9.	WORK PLAN OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON MANGROVES FOR THE PERIOD 2004-2007	19
10.	DATES AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ...	20
11.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS.....	20
12.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING	20
13.	CLOSURE OF THE MEETING	20

List of Annexes

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| ANNEX 1 | List of Participants |
| ANNEX 2 | List of Documents |
| ANNEX 3 | Agenda |
| ANNEX 4 | Draft Second Amendment of the Memorandum of Understanding |
| ANNEX 5 | Analysis of the Contents of the National Action Plans for Mangroves |
| ANNEX 6 | Analysis of National Action Plans with Respect to Targets, Timeframes, Costs and Implementing Agency Information |
| ANNEX 7 | Framework Work Plan and Time Table for Mangrove Component to June 30th 2007 |

Report of the Meeting

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome Address

1.1.1 Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director opened the meeting, at 08:30 am on 27th September 2004 and welcomed participants on behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP, Dr. Klaus Töpfer; and the Assistant Executive Director, and Director of the UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Co-ordination, Dr. Ahmed Djoghla. He noted that since this was the first meeting to be convened during the full operational phase of the project there were a number of important items on the agenda not least of which was the finalisation of the MoUs and demonstration site proposals. Completion of these would necessitate setting some time aside for working individually and in small groups.

1.1.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that this was an important meeting with a very full agenda, and one critical item was the review of the draft National Action Plans (NAPs). Members needed to consider how these might be modified, based on the discussion of contents during the meeting where a comparison of the contents of the NAPs from the various countries would be undertaken. The revision and expansion of the draft Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the South China Sea would also need to be considered during this meeting, and the relationship between the process for NAP and SAP development and finalisation would need to be elaborated.

1.1.3 The Project Director expressed the hope that, even though a considerable amount of work was before the working group, the meeting would be enjoyable and successful in completing the agenda and meeting its objectives.

1.2 Introduction of Members

1.2.1 Dr. Pernetta noted that there were a number of observers at the meeting, including the GEF Specially Managed Project Review (SMPR) team consisting of Mr. Jarle Harstad, Dr. Sara Graslund, Mr. Takashi Otsuka and Dr. Juha Uitto; and the wetlands focal point from Cambodia Mr. Sok Vong. Consequently he proposed that participants briefly introduce themselves to the meeting.

1.2.2 There followed a *tour de table* during which members and observers provided a brief description of their involvement with the project. The SMPR panel members also provided some background to the monitoring and evaluation activities in which they were involved and Mr. Vong noted that he had been invited to assist in finalising the Peam Krasop portion of the co-managed Cambodian and Thai transboundary mangrove and wetland site. The List of Participants is attached as Annex 1 to this report.

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

2.1 Election of Officers

2.1.1 Dr. Pernetta noted that, at the first meeting of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves (RWG-M) held in Phuket, Thailand, 29 April – 1 May 2002, Dr. Sonjai Havanond, Focal Point from Thailand, Dr. Hangqing Fan, Focal Point from China, and Mr. Florendo Barangan were elected as, Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur respectively. It was further noted that the Rules of Procedure state that, the Regional Working Group shall elect, from amongst the members, a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur to serve for one year, and that, officers shall be eligible for re-election no more than once.

2.1.2 The third meeting of the RWG-M convened in Bali, Indonesia, 3rd – 6th March 2003 had re-elected the same officers who had served to the present time. The present meeting is the fifth meeting convened, two years three months after the first meeting, the extended interval between the fourth and fifth meetings results from the reduced frequency of RWG meetings during the second phase of the project. The meeting recognised that the present officers, had served in excess of two years and were therefore not eligible for re-election to the same posts, though they were eligible for election to different positions. It was noted that both the Focal Points for mangroves and the regional experts were eligible for election.

2.1.3 Dr. Pernetta called for nominations for the positions of Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves. Dr. Sonjai nominated Mr. Nyoto Santoso as Chairperson, and Professor Gong Wooi Khoon seconded this nomination. Dr. Nguyen Hoang Tri nominated Dr. Gong as Vice-Chairperson, and Dr. Do Dinh Sam seconded the nomination. Mr. Florendo Barangan nominated Dr. Tri as Rapporteur. Mr. Santoso, Professor Gong, and Dr. Tri were duly elected by acclamation, as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur respectively. Mr. Santoso assumed the Chair, and expressed his appreciation to the group for their confidence in his abilities.

2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting

2.2.1 Dr. Pernetta provided a brief introduction to the documentation available for the meeting, contained in the document folder, and also available on the project website. He noted that the documents included a number of information documents including the full text of the mid-term review and the near final text for two of the demonstration sites. Included in the discussion documents are the drafts of the national action plans, which would be an important item for discussion and for inclusion in the further development of the Strategic Action Programme. The full list of documents is attached as Annex 2 to this report, which also includes a list of documents tabled during the meeting.

2.3 Organisation of Work

2.3.1 Dr. Pernetta introduced the draft programme for the conduct of business contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.3 and noted that the meeting would be conducted in English and in plenary although he hoped that sufficient time could be set aside to work in small groups or individually on the revision of the Memoranda of Understanding and the demonstration site proposals.

2.3.2 He noted that the PCU was proposing in the programme that item 6.2 be taken immediately following agenda item 3, in order to fit in with the schedule of the SMPR team, two of whom were leaving on Monday afternoon, and two of whom would leave on Tuesday afternoon.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

3.1 The Chairperson introduced the Provisional Agenda (UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/1) prepared by the Project Co-ordinating Unit, for the meeting and the Annotated Provisional Agenda, document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/2. He invited members to propose any amendments or additional items for consideration, and to adopt the agenda.

3.2 Members agreed with the earlier suggestion to reschedule item 6.2, immediately following Agenda item 3, and the agenda was adopted with no substantive additions or amendments. The agenda is attached as Annex 3 to this report.

4. BRIEF REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS ON THE STATUS OF THE PREPARATORY PHASE OUTPUTS DUE 30TH JUNE 2004

4.1 Dr. Pernetta requested members to refer to Document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/4 "*Status of the Substantive Reports of the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) for the Mangrove Sub-component from the Participating Countries*", which provides an overview of the current situation with regard to these outputs from the perspective of the Project Co-ordinating Unit.

4.2 Dr. Pernetta asked the National Focal Points to provide the meeting with a brief report regarding the status of the outputs, including national reports, national action plans, GIS data, and metadata. He also asked for clarification from participants on whether the documents listed as being held by the PCU were the latest versions available of these outputs. He further noted that these outputs were to have been finalised before June 30, 2004.

4.3 Dr. Fan informed the meeting that the 4th December 2003 version of the National Report was the latest version available. He also said that the report on National Legislation was to be combined with those for the wetland, and seagrass sub-components and that this would be formally published by SEPA in China. He further informed the meeting that the versions of the GIS data and metadata held by the PCU were the latest available.

4.4 Mr. Vongwattana and Mr. Vong, from Cambodia, informed the meeting that the National Report, including Past and Ongoing Activities, Data and Information, and National Legislation, had been completed, and had been submitted together with the National Action Plan at the end of June. The GIS data and metadata had also been updated, and had been submitted, though apparently had not been received by the PCU. Electronic copies were submitted to the PCU during the meeting.

4.5 They noted further that the National Report was considered final, and had been agreed by the inter-ministry committee. Publication was waiting for the final English editing, that would be conducted through the PCU, as it was proposed to publish the report initially in English in Cambodia, and later on in Khmer.

4.6 Mr. Santoso noted that the 13 individual Provincial reports from Indonesia had been published in both English and Bahasa Indonesia. The report on legislation may not be compatible with the format required by the project, and therefore some revision was required. The draft NAP has not yet been cleared by all stakeholders, in particular the 4 Government agencies involved in mangrove management. Metadata and GIS data had not yet been finalised, and Mr. Santoso sought further clarification on exactly what was required. Dr. Pernetta, and Mr. Passfield referred Mr. Santoso to the original formats provided for the GIS database, and metadata, developed at the GIS workshop in 2002, and presented on several subsequent occasions electronically. It was also suggested that he look at the Indonesian Seagrass Metadata publication for further guidance on producing the meta-database.

4.7 Mr. Barangan said that the Philippines National Report should be ready within two months while the report on legislation was awaiting comment from Mr. Conception, and clearance by the Philippines National Technical Working Group. It was hoped this would be published by December. The draft NAP still required some modification before finalisation while no changes had been made to the meta-database. The GIS data may be up-dated based on more recent satellite data in the near future.

4.8 Dr. Sonjai indicated that the Thai National Report and National Legislation Report had been checked through carefully, and finalised approximately 3 months ago. The GIS data has been completed in Thai, though translation to English had not yet been finalised.

4.9 Dr. Sam noted that there were two small changes to be made to the Viet Nam National Report, which were required following careful checking by two experts. It was now his intention to publish the National Report and NAP at the same time. The National Legislation report needed some changes based on comments from the legal task force and the NAP has been completed, and presented at a National Workshop. The NAP for all 6 components will be summarised into a single NAP document in Viet Nam.

4.10 Dr. Pernetta noted that delaying publication of the national report to produce it simultaneously with the NAP could result in excessive delay and noted further that the NAP was an evolving document, and it may be a considerable time before it received final Government approval. The National Reports on the other hand were outputs from the first phase of the project, and these should be published as soon as possible.

4.11 Dr. Pernetta reminded participants that the NAP was to have been produced as a draft by 30th June, for initial discussion at the regional level. As an evolving document, they were likely to be modified and revised several times over the next 3 years. He noted for example, that the draft NAPs submitted so far generally lacked concrete proposals for action that had been costed and prioritised.

5. STATUS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS AND EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING

5.1 Status of the Administrative Reports of the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) from the Participating Countries, for the Mangrove Sub-component

5.1.1 Mr. Santoso invited the Project Director, to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/5, "*Current status of budgets and reports from the Specialised Executing Agencies in the participating countries*". Dr. Pernetta referred participants to Table 1 on page 2, which detailed dates of submission of the audit reports and administrative and financial reports from the participating

countries. He noted that all 2002 audit reports had been received, but that the 2003 reports, due March 31 2004, were still outstanding from China and Thailand. He informed the focal points from these countries that no further funds could be dispersed to them until these reports had been received.

5.1.2 Regarding the 6 month progress reports, Dr. Pernetta noted that only 3 had been received and that one of these was incomplete. Those from Cambodia, China and Thailand remained outstanding and it was noted that these were due by 31st July.

5.1.3 The Project Director then drew the attention of the meeting to the contents of Table 2 of the document, which detailed the disbursements and cash still currently held by the Specialised Executing Agencies. He noted that the figures for cash in-hand were probably over-estimates since they included unaccounted cash advances much of which had probably been spent during the first half of the year. Dr. Pernetta noted that interest on funds held should also be reported, and encouraged focal points to submit their outstanding reports as soon as possible in order that the actual situation with respect to cash on hand was reflected in the project records.

5.1.4 The Project Director went on to note that the progress and expenditure reports served more than one purpose and that in addition to the regular financial information, which they provided, the reports were also used to compare estimates and actual co-financing in-kind through meeting participation at the national level. He noted that Table 3 indicated that in-kind co-financing based on information from the six-month reports, showed that several countries had exceeded the co-financing estimates by a considerable amount. Overall co-financing for the mangrove component had reached 236% of the original estimate, despite the fact that three six month reports were still outstanding and hence the corresponding co-financing figures could not be included. He requested all members to provide outstanding 6-month reports before the closure of the meeting.

5.1.5 Mr. Santoso subsequently provided a hard copy of the required 6-month progress report and Dr. Sonjai provided the reports for Thailand in both hard and electronic copy. Dr. Fan noted that his institute was having some internal administrative difficulties, which had made it very hard to complete the reports on time. He noted that these difficulties were currently being resolved, and it was expected that the reports would be available by the end of October. Mr. Vong informed the meeting that he had the required reports with him, and would submit them to the Secretariat.

5.2 Extension of the Memoranda of Understanding for the Specialised Executing Agencies without Approved Demonstration Sites (Cambodia and Viet Nam)

5.2.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to inform the meeting about the process of extension of the MoUs between UNEP and the SEAs. In regard to those that currently do not have approved demonstration sites, Dr. Pernetta referred members to document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/6. Dr. Pernetta noted that the preference of the PCU was to extend the existing MoUs rather than closing the existing ones and opening new ones due to the amount of work involved. New MoUs would need to be cleared through Nairobi, and the balance of funds from the existing MoUs would have to be returned to UNEP. The meeting agreed that the second amendment was preferable to a new MoU.

5.2.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that regardless of whether or not an SEA was responsible for, or executing, a demonstration site during the second phase of the project there were a set of actions at the national level that would be carried out by all SEAs. These focussed essentially on national level co-ordination actions that were defined in the tasks listed as (i) to (xix) in the draft amendment attached to the discussion document.

5.2.3 The Project Director drew the attention of the meeting to the report of the Project Steering Committee contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3 and specifically the decisions of the Project Steering Committee with respect to the budgets for national co-ordination under the extension of the MoUs. He noted that the decision had been taken to phase out the GEF grant support and replace this with government re-current funding over the period to December 2007. The operative paragraph of the Project Steering Committee report is as follows:

8.2.8 Regarding the progressive percentages to be used in phasing out the GEF support to national co-ordination, he further suggested that the committee could agree on the proposed percentage on a trial basis and review the situation at its next meeting in December 2004. Should it prove necessary the committee could make any necessary adjustments once the government departments had reviewed both the costs and the frequency of meetings. The meeting agreed with the suggestion made by Mr. Gerochi and decided that:

- (i) A combination of scenarios 2 and 3, as proposed by the PCU in the document UNEP/GEF/SCS.3/9, should be used in calculating allocations;
- (ii) The overall level of support from the GEF grant should be 100% in 2004-2005; 50% in 2005-2006; and 25% in 2006-2007.

5.2.4 These conditions apply to all future MoU extensions regardless of whether or not the focal point and Specialised Executing Agency are responsible for a demonstration site and the implication is that each focal point should approach the focal Ministry for the balance of funds required to complete the meetings and co-ordination activities. Dr. Pernetta noted that the reduction in GEF budget allocation for meetings of the National Mangrove committees does not mean that committees meet less often, but that the participating governments assume an increasing responsibility for the costs of meetings, as the GEF funds are decreased. From July 2005 to June 2006 the governments should provide funds equivalent to the GEF grant and three times the GEF grant should be provided to the SEA during the subsequent year.

5.2.5 In the light of these discussions the Chairperson proposed, and the meeting agreed, to review the tasks of the SEAs listed in the draft MoU. The Chairperson therefore went through the text of the draft second amendment, paragraph by paragraph. The paragraphs were discussed individually and clarification sought on several points.

5.2.6 Dr. Gong asked why SEAs would agree to provide the data as indicated in paragraph (vi) considering that the funds would be transferred to a third party as executing agency of the demonstration sites. Dr. Pernetta noted that as clarified above some funds would continue to be made available to the SEAs to cover co-ordination and NAP development costs but that the costs to the SEAs consequent upon their involvement in the demonstration sites should be funded through the demonstration site budget. It was not unreasonable to expect that the original SEA would continue to maintain the databases that they had established under the first phase of the project, as these were of obvious benefit to the country, which is why they were initiated under the project in the first place.

5.2.7 Mr. Barangan pointed out a minor omission from the text of the second amendment, where paragraph (xv) was missing, and this was duly added. Despite substantial discussion on how some of the tasks related to particular paragraphs may best be executed, no substantive changes to the intent of the MoU were suggested, and the draft second amendment to the MoU was agreed by all members as it appears in Annex 4 of this report.

5.2.8 It was noted that some of the points raised during discussion regarding the mode of execution of the tasks would need to be re-visited under agenda item 9 when the work plan and timetable for the Regional Working Group was discussed and agreed. Following acceptance of the tasks by the SEAs a corrected electronic version was made available to all members for their finalisation.

5.3 Extension of the Memoranda of Understanding for the Specialised Executing Agencies with Approved Demonstration Sites

5.3.1 Dr. Pernetta noted that the amendments to the MoU discussed under the previous agenda item contained generic paragraphs that would need to be finalised individually according to the arrangements for the execution of each individual demonstration site. Again he noted that it would be simpler, from the point of view of administration for the PCU, to issue amendments to the MoUs with the existing MoU's with the SEAs rather than negotiate entirely new MoUs with an independent third party. If an SEA did not wish to be responsible for transferring funds to a third party under a sub-contract then the MoUs would need to be tri-partite, with the local executing agency undertaking the work and UNEP transferring funds to them. The current SEA, would then have responsibility for ensuring the proper execution of activities and prompt reporting to the PCU.

5.3.2 Mr. Barangan indicated that at a meeting of the NTWG on this issue in the Philippines, all parties had agreed that the existing SEAs would remain the "prime contractors" since monitoring the activities of local Government executing agencies would be very difficult for UNEP. Funds would be transferred from the existing SEAs to the local or provincial government, as required in an agreed budget associated with the MoU.

5.3.3 The Project Director proposed that the draft amendments to the existing MoUs contained in UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/6 be finalised and signed, if possible, during the meeting. To date only the Fangchenggang and Trat Province demonstration sites had been reviewed, revised and were in near final form. Copies were provided as documents UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.4 and UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.5 for information of the focal points responsible for the remaining mangrove demonstration sites and these would be discussed further under a subsequent agenda item.

6. PROJECT EVALUATION

6.1 Report of the Independent Mid-term Evaluation of the Project

6.1.1 The meeting took note of the fact that the mid-term evaluation of the project had been conducted between February and July 2004 by two independent evaluators Dr. Mike Bewers and Professor Su Jilan. Their report had been finalised and accepted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Executive Director of UNEP and a copy was included in the documents for the meeting.

6.1.2 Referring to the annotated agenda, Dr. Pernetta drew the attention of the meeting to the report, and to extracts contained in the annotated agenda that related directly to the Mangrove component and the work of the Regional Working Group. Dr. Pernetta asked for reactions or comments on the evaluation, and also invited members to discuss the section relating to co-financing.

6.1.3 Dr. Uitto informed the meeting that all GEF funded projects are required to have a mid-term evaluation and a final evaluation, which are carried out by independent consultants. The mid-term evaluation is a management tool, weighted towards assessing whether the project is on track to achieving its objectives. He noted that very well qualified personnel had undertaken this evaluation, and that the report was of very high quality. He noted further that the project had been ranked very highly on all the GEF criteria, and he congratulated the project management and all participants on the results of the mid-term evaluation.

6.1.4 Dr. Pernetta supported the point raised by Dr. Uitto that the high rating for the project in the mid-term evaluation reflected the strong commitment of everyone involved in the project, and that all members should be very proud of this result. Dr. Uitto added that evaluations are submitted to the Monitoring and Evaluation unit of the GEF, in Washington, and this is very valuable for the project, as the ratings would not go unnoticed by the GEF Council. He added that of course this puts added pressure on the project to work hard in order to maintain these ratings during the next three years.

6.1.5 Mr. Takashi added that the limited number of personnel working at the PCU made the ranking even more creditable. Dr. Gong agreed, and asked what were the intentions of the Project Director with regard to the filling of vacant posts in the PCU.

6.1.6 Dr. Pernetta provided background information regarding the two current professional vacancies. He noted that during 2003 when both the associate expert positions had been advertised UNEP had been successful in filling the associate expert Social Sciences post, but that it had not been possible to fill the Natural Sciences post. He explained that the process of recruitment within the UN system was not simple and that an immediate re-advertisement was unlikely to attract suitably qualified personnel. He felt that sufficient time had now elapsed to make such a re-advertisement worthwhile.

6.1.7 Dr. Pernetta noted that following the resignation of the Senior Expert, Mr. Jiang to take up the post of Chief Technical Advisor to the UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project, he had initiated procedures to fill the post as soon as possible. He noted further that the Division of GEF Co-ordination in UNEP had agreed to provide half of the salary for this position such that the Senior Expert would now work full time on the South China Sea Project rather than half time for the East Asian Seas Action Plan and

half time for the South China Sea. He also invited any members who had suggestions for a senior scientist who could assume responsibility in the short-term for managing the editing of the national reports or who would be interested in the post to provide him with their contact details as soon as possible.

6.1.8 Dr. Pernetta requested guidance from the group regarding tracking co-financing in each country, and in particular how much cash co-financing had been received by the SEAs over the first two years of project implementation. He cited the China mangrove sub-component as an example where cash co-financing had been provided by the Central and local governments and formally reported by Dr. Fan to meetings of the Regional Working Group. In other cases no such reports had been made and consequently it was not possible to quantify the extent of additional support to the project. He asked if there was a simple, informal way in which countries could report cash co-financing to the PCU.

6.1.9 The Chairperson then requested that each focal point provide information regarding cash co-financing provided to the SEAs to date. Dr. Sam stated that cash co-financing in Viet Nam was not large but totalled US\$5,741 from the Central Government for coordination meetings and for field visits to potential demonstration sites in the north and south of Viet Nam.

6.1.10 Mr. Vong stated that the government of Cambodia had supported fieldwork financially, but that it was difficult for him to provide exact figures retroactively.

6.1.11 Dr. Fan stated that co-financing received between January 2002 and September 2004 totalled 920,000 Yuan from the central government; 330,000 Yuan from Guanxi Provincial Government; and 250,000 Yuan from Fangchenggang Municipal Government.

6.1.12 Mr. Santoso noted that from 2000 to 2003, there had been money from the Forestry Department and the Coastal and Marine department, in support of the development of NAPs and the demonstration site proposals totalling approximately US\$100,000. For 2004, 500 million rupiah was committed to co-financing in the demonstration site and the Home Affairs Department had also committed money in 2004, approximately 250 million rupiah were expected. Financial support from the Coastal and Marine department for public awareness of the NAP is expected, though he was unsure of the amount. Private sector support to date was limited, though some was being received for support to research in silviculture. In 2003, 100 million rupiah were received from the department of co-operatives as capital for development of the charcoal industry at the demonstration site. JICA has also provided funds, perhaps more than 250 million rupiah in support of workshops associated with development of the National Action Plan. Co-financing from local government had also been received, and more can be expected, but he could not give exact figures.

6.1.13 Dr. Sonjai indicated that most of the co-financing budget in Thailand was from the Department of Coastal and Marine Resources. Estimates for what had been received as co-financing to June 2004 were not high, and he could not give exact figures at this time. He would provide information to the PCU in the near future.

6.1.14 Mr. Barangan said that for the Philippines cash co-financing was very limited but that there had been significant co-financing in kind received from various entities along the SCS coastline, including Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) and local government units. He promised to try and keep track of any cash co-financing in future, as it was obviously of some significance to the project. Mr. Barangan added that the financial difficulties faced by the Philippines may make it difficult for his SEA to increase financial commitment to the project, as recommended by Mr. Gerochi to the PSC, but they would certainly do their best to fulfil this commitment.

6.1.15 Dr. Pernetta concluded by saying that he believed that cash co-financing to the project was being significantly under reported, though in-kind co-financing estimates were probably reasonable. He expressed the view that Focal Points should start recording the cash expended on activities reported in the 6 monthly progress reports such as for example, cash support to convening large stakeholder meetings to discuss the NAPs.

6.1.16 It was proposed, and the meeting agreed that, the 6-month report format should be modified to include in each box relating to meetings or outputs, space for recording cash co-financing and the source.

6.2 Specially Managed Project Review (SMPR) by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the GEF Secretariat

6.2.1 The meeting took note of the fact that the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit in consultation with the GEF Secretariat has selected the UNEP/GEF South China Sea project as one of two International Waters projects from the GEF portfolio, to be included in the Specially Managed Project Review for 2004; that the outputs from this process are reported directly to the GEF Council; that the SMPR is a specific GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) modality, which is complementary to the existing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in the GEF.

6.2.2 The Chairperson welcomed the SMPR team to the meeting and invited Mr. Harstad to inform the members of the information requirements of the SMPR panel for undertaking their review. Mr. Harstad expressed his appreciation to the group for the invitation to attend this meeting, and said it was a great opportunity to see a project in action in the field, rather than from behind a desk. He was particularly impressed with the documentation available to this meeting.

6.2.3 Mr. Harstad provided some background on the Monitoring and Evaluation unit of the GEF and noted that it was important to pass information on important lessons learned from successful, or less than successful projects, to other projects as soon as possible, in order to learn from past practice and avoid repetition of mistakes. He referred participants to the questionnaire which had been distributed, entitled "Interview Guide for National Representatives", and outlined to the meeting the background to the questions listed under the 5 categories in the questionnaire.

6.2.4 Mr. Harstad then invited Mr. Uitto to introduce the initial set of questions. Mr. Uitto said that the team hoped to learn lessons, through gaining an appreciation of the problems and successes experienced by this project to date, and invited very frank discussions on any project related issues. He further explained what kinds of issues they hoped to review under the 5 categories of question, in relation to the whole project, but with particular regard to the Mangrove sub-component. He noted that threats to mangroves come from a wide range of sources, and they would like to know how cross-sectoral issues are incorporated into a project such as this, which is headed, by environment Ministries and Departments. He hoped they might hear from each country on the issues included in the questionnaire.

6.2.5 Mr. Santoso stated that in Indonesia this project was considered to be very important. There are four government departments, Environmental Office, Forestry, Marine and Fisheries, and Home Affairs, which are directly involved with mangrove resources and they had worked out how each department could be involved. He noted the differences associated with state forests and non-state forests; protected areas and production forests under forestry department control, while other forests are under the jurisdiction of the Marine and Fisheries department. He provided further information on the issues involved with sourcing co-financing from local government and the departments of Forestry and Marine and Fisheries, for the Batu Ampar demonstration site, and also input from the private sector, particularly with regard to black and white charcoal production, in the demonstration site.

6.2.6 Dr. Sonjai then proceeded to provide an historical overview of Thailand's efforts at mangrove conservation, noting there had been a shift from the conversion of mangroves for shrimp farming which had dominated the seventies and eighties such that mangrove in the Gulf of Thailand was reduced to a mere 20% by 1991. Efforts at management included land use planning, but as so much land was private land, it was hard to manage. Re-forestation efforts concentrated around river mouths and abandoned shrimp farms following the King's policy statements of around 15 years ago, regarding the national importance and significance of the mangrove ecosystems. From the year 2000, no further concessions to cut mangroves have been issued, community and NGO participation in mangrove conservation has increased, as has public participation in mangrove replanting. He noted the importance of the dialogue initiated through this project between Cambodia and Thailand on the transboundary management of mangrove resources near the border. It is hoped that similar dialogue may start with Myanmar.

6.2.7 Mr. Barangan then provided the Philippines perspective noting that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources is responsible for natural forests, including mangroves and that this project is considered to be an important supporting effort for these responsibilities. The demonstration site in Palawan, occurs in the areas of richest remaining mangrove in the Philippines, which is now a National Mangrove Reserve area. Some authority for mangrove management has been transferred to the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. He noted that: lobbying has been going on to reverse the amendment to the law, which bans the cutting of mangroves; the present Secretary for DENR is very interested in mangrove resources; and, that recent satellite data suggests that mangrove area has increased, in the Philippines but ground truthing is required to verify this information.

6.2.8 Dr. Fan proceeded to provide the Chinese perspective noting that from around 10 years ago, at a meeting on biodiversity conservation, mangrove protection had become increasingly important to the Chinese government, and funding had increased accordingly. The Chinese Government has co-financed this project by nearly 2 million US\$ and Fangchenggang Local Government has provided an additional US\$30,000. They have selected the demonstration site according to criteria determined by the Regional Working Group on mangroves and local government inputs had been utilised, although this was not always easy. Local government participation has been found to be very useful in gaining local support for the demonstration site proposal and the project activities in Fangchenggang are very well known at both the Central and local Government levels, as well as among universities and other institutions. People have become aware that mangrove resources in China are limited, in comparison with other countries of the region, and important to the livelihood of many people.

6.2.9 Dr. Sam provided his views regarding some of the issues in the questionnaire from the perspective of Viet Nam. He noted that the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources is responsible for the project and has established a National Committee that includes a number of ministries. This committee meets regularly to discuss all components covered under this project, including the 4 marine habitat sub-components, land based pollution, and fisheries. He said that one action plan covering the 6 components will be prepared for Viet Nam, and this will be presented to the Government for endorsement. Dr. Sam noted that Viet Nam has declared 2 national parks, and some national reserves for mangroves and numerous civil society groups are involved in mangrove replanting. He considered that the project had benefited Viet Nam in a number of ways including in stimulating cross-sectoral approaches to marine and coastal habitat management.

6.2.10 Mr. Vongwattana provided the Cambodian perspective noting that Cambodia is attempting to increase allocation to the environment sector. He noted that the International Monetary Fund and Asian Development Bank have provided some financial resources, but that generally funds are not available for cash co-financing, but in kind co financing is available. He noted that the demonstration site selection process has been strongly supported by the national mangrove committee and local government. He noted that the project provides a good opportunity for Cambodia to be involved in a regional network from which they can learn much on mangrove management. Mr. Vong, added that the project provides an opportunity in Cambodia for country ownership of the in country activities and facilitates vertical and horizontal communication within government departments, and also with NGOs, down to the community level. He noted that there are 6 protected areas along the coast, but the Government has limited funds for their effective management.

6.2.11 Mr. Harstad then asked Dr. Grasland if she could introduce the question on sustainability and invite those members who had not yet commented on sustainability to address this question, and in particular how regional cooperation might be continued following the completion of project activities.

6.2.12 Mr. Santoso noted that the inclusion of local government, private sector, and communities in project activities and capacity building of local expertise through the period of the project would help with the sustainability of the demonstration site and other project activities in the longer term.

6.2.13 Dr. Sonjai informed the meeting that the support of the Royal Family for mangrove related projects serves as an important cornerstone in maintaining the momentum of the activities initiated under this project. A National Mangrove Ecosystem Seminar on mangrove research and management involving four to five hundred people will be convened next year, and proposals for sustainability will be developed at this meeting for submission to Cabinet. Other habitat sub-component representatives will also be invited to this meeting, to facilitate cross-sectoral communication. Information on the

demonstration site will also be posted on GLOMIS ensuring wider appreciation of the activities and hence potentially attracting additional external support.

6.2.14 Mr. Barangan provided some information on support for mangrove activities in the Philippines, which could also be utilised in ensuring sustainability. Other government agencies, local governments, and universities are involved in mangrove and coastal area management, and NGOs, all of which should facilitate sustainability of project activities.

6.2.15 Dr. Fan informed the meeting that sustainability in China was supported by annual budget allocations from central government. He noted that the budget for the Beilun Estuary protected area was for salaries only, and not for activities. Therefore to sustain activities, additional funds would need to be raised from the local government who had already provided 600,000 Yuan to construct an educational and awareness centre in Fangchenggang. He noted further the possibility of securing part of the sea use fees as regular income for sustaining project activities at the site.

6.2.16 Dr. Fan further noted that natural shrimp from mangroves was increasing in price, and therefore some of this increased value should be incorporated into the valuations of mangrove lands. Increases in land value due to the appreciation of natural environment and resources could result in increased government financial allocation to the management of mangroves in the future. He noted further potential sources of revenue including companies making donations to conservation initiatives, which is being encouraged by government through certain preferential considerations being provided to such companies. He noted that these ideas regarding sustainability would need to be explored more fully during the next three years.

6.2.17 Mr. Vongwattana informed the meeting that there is growing Government support in Cambodia for mangrove activities, which should assist in sustainability. Mr. Vong added that user rights should be provided to the community through sub-decree and commune council decisions, although no direct funding would be available in support of these decrees a development plan prepared in conjunction with these rights could result in generation of income for future management. There is also an environmental trust fund, which can be used in future support whilst ecotourism activities may also generate income in the future.

6.2.18 Dr. Sam stated that in Viet Nam a decision to provide support from Government had been taken and the activities of institutions in research on mangrove management should assist in future sustainability. A growing awareness of the damage caused to mangroves from shrimp pond conversion should also assist since there were moves towards imposing sustainable management systems for mangroves. Policy and planning for future benefit in Viet Nam is starting to take into consideration the value of the ecosystem, rather than the merely the value of the timber products.

6.2.19 Dr. Gong provided her personal impressions of the project, noting that the approaches adopted were novel for a regional project and were developed through group discussions. She noted that issues regarding sustainability are very relevant at this point in project execution and that some answers to these questions will probably be forthcoming under agenda items 7 and 8.

6.2.20 Using the Matang sustainable mangrove forestry site in Malaysia as an example of a tropical forest where sustainable use has been ongoing, for the past 100 years, she noted that this management regime was self sustaining, and could be a useful demonstration site for this project. Regarding sustainability, Dr. Gong noted that Kung Kraben Bay would also be a useful demonstration site, which did not require GEF funding. This site is guaranteed sustainability, as it is supported as a royal project.

6.2.21 Finally she noted that some of the remaining questions could probably be better answered later, as the project continues. She noted that: the causal chain analysis conducted under this project has been useful in identifying the root causes of the problems; regional cooperation under this project has helped at levelling the playing field in regard to the state of knowledge of the different habitats in each country; and that the management system of the project, facilitates communication between scientists and policy makers at the national level.

6.2.22 Mr. Barangan added that the Philippines is introducing tenurial instruments for up to 25 years, renewable for a further twenty five years, and it is hoped that this will help communities to sustainably use mangrove resources through provision of legal rights to resource users.

6.2.23 Dr. Tri noted that before this project commenced, not all countries had a national mangrove committee or an action plan and that now all countries have at least a draft NAP and a functioning national committee. He noted that many of the issues are common to each country, but that each had different policies and procedures for addressing them. He noted further that efforts at conducting economic valuation were of considerable benefit to the countries in justifying the NAPs, and that there had been good progress to date but there that there were still some constraints to be overcome.

6.2.24 The Chairperson then invited the representative from the Trat demonstration site to make a presentation on the demonstration site at Trat. In response to a question on the view of the local people he stated that the local communities welcomed the wider participation of people from other countries in learning from their experiences and that the people would be proud and happy to show the site activities to other people. Transboundary activities should enhance the overall success of the project, as Peam Krasop was very close to Trat, though he was unsure of the logistics involved in day-to-day liaison between the sites. Dr. Sonjai indicated that the logistics were being taken care of under a ministerial declaration to be signed between the 2 countries.

6.2.25 In concluding the discussions Mr. Harstad said that he was impressed by the obvious commitment and enthusiasm for the project among the members, and thanked them for their valuable inputs.

6.2.26 Dr. Pernetta took the opportunity of this discussion to inform the meeting that the SMPR was the third Monitoring and Evaluation exercise that the project had been subjected to this year. These reviews consumed considerable staff resources within the PCU. He noted that only on Friday last had the outputs of one of these reviews been brought to his attention. This was the output from the 2004 programme study of the IW portfolio. He noted that the evaluator Dr. Laurence Mee had visited Bangkok for three days and that the PCU had organised the meeting of the Executive Committee of the RSTC to coincide with this visit to provide the evaluator with an opportunity to talk to representatives of some of the participating countries.

6.2.27 Dr. Pernetta noted that the second draft of the report had been acquired by the PCU only recently, and only by indirect means; that the PCU had not had a chance to review the text of the first draft, despite the fact that a number of project initiatives had been cited in the report. This second draft had been distributed quite widely, and there were some inaccuracies that should have been corrected before the second draft was produced.

6.2.28 Dr. Uitto informed the meeting that the first draft of the evaluation had been received by UNDP and UNEP in Nairobi approximately 2 months ago, and they had been given approximately one month to solicit comments and submit them to the evaluators. Comments made by UNDP had been incorporated into the second draft.

6.2.29 Dr. Fan studied the text of the box concerning the Fangchenggang site, and noted some serious inaccuracies and misunderstandings that if they received wide circulation in China would be politically damaging. For example, the reasons quoted for stopping the 1994 plans to remove the urban mangroves in 1998 was incorrect as was the timing; the US\$ 30,000 co-financing from the Fangchenggang municipality was not for a GIS system as reported in the review, but for preliminary baseline investigations on biological, socio-economic, and other aspects of the site and establishment of a management committee, support for the GIS had come from Central Government. Thirdly, the urban mangroves are only a small part of the total site, which includes the Beilun Natural Reserve, a large area established for biodiversity conservation purposes rather than ecotourism. The main reason for establishing the urban mangrove management area was not for ecotourism, but as an urban marine park and educational centre. He noted further that the company had no ownership rights over the mangroves, but did have management responsibility for them. The text in the box implies that the site was established for economic reasons, and not for conservation, which is also not correct. The purpose of the site is to determine how to use mangroves wisely, and the main purpose of the reserve is for conservation, restoration, and for the improvement of management capacity.

6.2.30 Dr. Pernetta suggested that Dr. Fan correct and rewrite the text for the box, and that this would be transmitted to the author by facsimile and e-mail as rapidly as possible to ensure that the corrections could be made before the text was finalised and published.

6.2.31 In the light of this discussion Dr. Pernetta noted that it was very difficult to "quality control" the accuracy of the contents of second hand reports regarding the project and its outcomes. He was aware for example that newspaper articles are published in participating countries concerning project activities and cited the example of an English language article published in Viet Nam regarding the Mangrove National Action Plan.

6.2.32 Dr. Pernetta proposed, and the meeting agreed that, focal points would scan electronically any newspaper articles, provide a few words of brief translation if the article was not in English, and send these to the PCU so they can be included on the project website. It was further agreed that focal points would send a note to the PCU advising of any other media coverage of the project, such as television or radio interviews.

6.2.33 With regard to increasing the media coverage of the project in the region, and hence the profile of the project, Dr. Sonjai suggested that a press conference should be held at the launch of each demonstration site, followed by another 1 year later to report on the progress. Mr. Santoso suggested that all future RWG meetings should be publicised through convening a press conference in conjunction with the meeting. Members discussed these recommendations with respect to the possibilities in their own countries, and unanimously supported the recommendations for immediate implementation.

7. REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND DISCUSSION REGARDING INPUTS TO THE REGIONAL STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME

7.1 Review of the Contents of the Draft National Action Plans with a View to Identifying Commonalities and Differences

7.1.1 Dr. Pernetta informed the meeting that updated drafts of the NAPs had been received only recently, and there had therefore been insufficient time for the PCU to undertake an in depth review of their contents. A brief review was included as document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/7, which includes a tabulated review of the contents of the coral reef action plans as a potential model for consideration by the meeting.

7.1.2 Dr. Pernetta suggested that it might be helpful to review the reasons why the large number of NAPs prepared in many parts of the world in the past had not resulted in sufficient action on the ground to reverse environmental degradation trends. He stated that from his perspective the major reasons why many plans had not resulted in action was that they did not provide adequate guidance to operational level managers on what should be done, where it should be done, who should do it when it should be done, what the costs would be and what were the priorities for intervention. He noted that most "Action Plans" were in fact little more than statements of policy and principle, without the necessary guidance as to how the plan should be implemented.

7.1.3 Dr. Pernetta pointed out that a SAP prepared with funding support from the GEF needs to include a targeted and costed set of prioritised actions and if the NAPs were in fact to be consonant with the SAP then it was necessary that the NAPs should include an indication of the prioritised actions, targets and timeframes if these were to be used as the basis for action at the regional level. He stressed that a regional SAP must be based upon a set of targeted and costed NAPs if it were to be an effective instrument for change.

7.1.4 Dr. Pernetta outlined the ideal overall contents of the document, in terms of the background information that should be included in, or be made available in supporting documentation to the NAP, noting that much of this information had been assembled by the focal points during the last two years. In addition to information on the overall distribution of mangroves nationally, there should be detailed information as to where actions should take place, why they should be implemented in those locations, when they should be executed, who is responsible for the various actions, and the costs of alternative forms of intervention.

7.1.5 Dr. Pernetta added that the value of mangroves as carbon sinks may be an additional reason for both conserving and restoring them and that potentially the value of the carbon credits could be used to establish a regional trust fund in support of the regional co-ordination and implementation of the SAP. A mangrove based carbon credit fund may be a good idea for the region. Some discussion followed and there was obvious interest in the concept, though there was insufficient time to develop the idea further during the meeting.

7.1.6 Dr. Pernetta proposed, and the meeting agreed, to undertake an analysis of the content of the draft NAPs, and develop a table similar to that completed during the Coral Reef working group meeting two weeks earlier. It was agreed that as an introduction to this analysis each focal point would briefly present their own NAPs to the meeting, so that the group could see what were the similarities and differences between them.

7.1.7 Mr. Santoso proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation of the NAP for Indonesia. The first draft had been developed before the SCS project commenced, back in the period from 1993-1996. This was revised in 1997, and further revised in 2003 and 2004, when responsibility and a timetable for actions, greater stakeholder consultation, and provincial level support were included in the actions at site level. Mr. Santoso said he could foresee that it would be difficult to determine the costs of the actions associated with the NAP in Indonesia. He added that provincial level action plans are easier to develop in a country as diverse and of such geographic dispersion as Indonesia. Dr. Pernetta said he was aware of the difficulties faced by Indonesia, but a generic set of actions without indicating the location of the actions would not achieve a great deal.

7.1.8 Mr. Santoso followed this with a brief presentation of the contents of a publication containing information on the Mangrove Ecosystem in Indonesia, which was essentially the Indonesian National Report.

7.1.9 Dr. Pernetta requested that focal points provide some indication of the legal status of the NAP and whether it had already started going through the approval process within the government, as this would dictate how to proceed with a revision of the documents. Mr. Santoso replied that the plan has not yet passed through the approval stage, and can still be modified before final approval. There were many steps still required before the NAP can be approved.

7.1.10 Mr. Santoso noted that Indonesia wanted the NAP to emphasise potential multiple use of mangroves, including fisheries, charcoal production, and eco-tourism. Dr. Gong asked whether due to limited funds, activities under the NAP would be restricted to only one site, or several sites, in the initial period. Mr. Santoso indicated that they would need to prioritise the sites for more immediate action.

7.1.11 Dr. Fan then presented the outline of the Chinese NAP, which had been completed in Chinese, and was being translated into English. Following the presentation, and in reply to a question from Dr. Tri, Dr. Fan stated there were some issues to be dealt with regarding who will finally approve the National Action Plan, since use of the term "National" means that very high level approval from Central Government would be required. The fact that mangroves come under Forestry in Forestry law and the Marine Department in Marine law means that some arguments over jurisdiction occur between these departments, and these would probably have to be resolved at a higher level. Thus the NAP has not yet moved into the final approval stage.

7.1.12 Dr. Sam then presented the Vietnamese NAP, based on the document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8 Vie. Again the issue of who would approve the NAP had been raised at the national level and it had been decided that the NAP would come under the Wetland Management Strategy, and would be approved by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, together with the NAPs for the other 5 components or sub-components under the SCS project. This linking with the other components would also contribute to delays in the approval process, as it must wait until all NAPs have been completed. Dr. Tri added that the Vietnamese NAP has been developed in four priority areas for intervention in Viet Nam, i.e. Northern Viet Nam, Can Gio, Mekong Delta, and Minh Hai.

7.1.13 Dr. Sonjai added that the Biosphere Reserve in Can Gio is a very good example of management in Viet Nam, and this could be a good example for the other sites, as it included core zone, buffer zone, and transition zone in the management strategy.

7.1.14 Dr. Uitta thanked the meeting for allowing the SMPR team to participate, and apologised they now had to leave for their flight to Bangkok, and on to Indonesia tomorrow. Mr. Takashi added his appreciation for the opportunity to learn about the project through observing the meeting and added that his main role at present in Nairobi was in the development of the MSP demonstration projects.

7.1.15 Mr. Barangan made a PowerPoint presentation of the NAP for the Philippines. He pointed out that all the information he was presenting was included in expanded form in the NAP included in the meeting documents. Dr. Tri asked if the sites had been prioritised, and in reply, Mr. Barangan said they would like to prioritise the sites, but this had not yet been done. Most areas identified were in southern and central Philippines, with Palawan having the most mangrove forests. There followed some discussion on disputes between people occupying the land, around abandoned shrimp and fishponds for example. Mr. Barangan said they hoped that the issue of tenurial agreements for people with a historical presence in the area would help minimise these disputes, but at the same time did not want this to encourage more people to move into the area, making the problem worse.

7.1.16 Mr. Barangan added that this NAP as presented was extracted from the larger forest management plan, and that the approval process had been going on for a considerable period for this wider document. The mangrove portion of that plan can still be modified, based on deliberations in the Regional Working Group meeting, and to conform with the priority programme of the new Secretary of the DENR.

7.1.17 Mr. Vongwattana then presented the NAP for Cambodia, as included in the meeting documents. Mr. Vong said that funding was not available at the moment to prepare a costed action plan, and therefore this document was more in the form of a strategy. The document had been screened and agreed in principle by the Committee and there were some funds available for enforcement and conflict resolution in the protected areas. It was possible that site level action plans would be scaled up to the National Level.

7.1.18 Dr. Sonjai presented the NAP for Thailand. Population increase, particularly in the coastal areas, has led to an increase in mangrove destruction, as mangroves have been cleared for timber, salt production, and shrimp farms. Only 20% of the mangroves in 1961 were still present in 1991. The intervention of the King in 1991 had led to an increase in mangrove conservation and restoration. Included in the NAP for Thailand were specific targets for increasing the area of mangroves within 5 years, and also for increasing areas as non-hunting areas and mangrove reserves.

7.1.19 Dr. Tri asked whether it would be an easy process to integrate the King's project and other projects into the NAP and in response Dr. Sonjai noted that the Biosphere Reserve project and the King's project were quite similar in concept, and could easily be integrated into the NAP. If other projects followed a similar strategy as the King's project and Biosphere Reserve, there should be no problem with integration into the NAP. Dr. Sonjai provided an historical overview of a community based mangrove rehabilitation project at Sawi Bay, Chumporn Province that he had been involved in, which was very successful with a budget that was very small. However, the success was not maintained in the longer term since after several years, some of the people had accepted money from developers to take over the replanted areas for shrimp farm development.

7.1.20 Mr. Barangan asked Dr. Sonjai about plans to train resource personnel, and whether this had been done before. Dr. Sonjai stated that previous experience with training had involved only limited numbers of people, mainly government officials. In reply to a further question, Dr. Sonjai added that many of the people trained had left the mangrove area, and gone to work elsewhere. He hoped that, by training people from the community rather than Government officials, these people would remain in the mangrove area.

7.1.21 Following all the NAP presentations, Dr. Sam asked the Project Director, whether they all satisfy the requirements of the project, or should they be re written following an agreed format. Dr. Pernetta stated that the requirement of the project was that there would be an approved NAP in each country, the format was not critical, and should be one that is acceptable and appropriate for the country concerned. It was important however to ensure that the agreed contents were all present in the document or in supporting documents related to the Action Plan.

7.1.22 Dr. Pernetta suggested however that a more in depth analysis was required to see whether the information suggested in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/7 was included in each of the NAPs, and if not, was this a deliberate omission based on some National requirements, or just an oversight. Dr. Gong and Dr. Tri volunteered to prepare an initial tabulation of the contents of several of the NAPs, and then each country could inform the meeting which of these are included in their own NAP.

7.1.23 Dr. Gong noted that financial considerations might be a limiting factor for some countries in realistically being able to achieve the targets of their NAPs. Dr. Pernetta stated that financial limitations would definitely play an important role in executing the NAPs, and this was one reason for prioritisation of the sites and the interventions included in the NAP. A NAP should be achievable, and should not therefore be overly ambitious. One type of activity that should be the first to be culled from NAPs where funding was limited would be research activities, unless these were critical to answering questions required for management interventions. Priority actions should be those that address the problems identified.

7.1.24 In order to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the actions included in the NAPs from each country Professor Gong and Dr. Tri presented two tables they had prepared overnight. The first was based on the Thailand NAP, and the second adapted from the table prepared at the 5th meeting of the Coral Reef Working Group, and included in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/7. It was left to the group to decide which one they preferred to proceed with. Dr. Pernetta pointed out that this exercise would help countries determine what expertise one country might be able to offer to others in areas where capacity was lacking. It would also prove useful in determining how the national actions could contribute to a regional SAP. Referring to the table based on the Thai NAP, he pointed out that many of the actions listed for Thailand were not actually specific actions, but more generic in nature hence it might be difficult for other members to identify whether or not such actions were included in their own plans.

7.1.25 The table prepared by China was also presented by Dr. Fan as a possible framework. Following extensive discussion it was finally agreed that an adaptation of the table prepared at the coral reef meeting would be the most appropriate to use in this exercise. Rather than simply providing a yes or no answer as to whether the action was included in their own NAP, each country was asked to rank the actions with a code indicating the priority of those actions in their country. If an action was not included in the country's NAP, then an X would be entered into the cell.

7.1.26 Dr. Pernetta pointed out that this exercise did not necessarily mean that any existing NAPs that were well on their way towards government approval would need to be changed. Where these NAPs were found to be deficient in any important aspect, then the relevant focal point could prepare additional supporting documents for the NAP which could be used in executing the plan.

7.1.27 Commencing with Cambodia, focal points proceeded to provide the required information, which was entered into the table. During discussion Focal Points indicated where in their NAPs the information was contained that, supported the assignment of the priority code to each action. Mr. Santoso provided the information from the revised Indonesian NAP, which was unfortunately only available to the meeting in Bahasa Indonesia, resulting in other members not being able to contribute to the analysis of the document.

7.1.28 The table was completed in draft, and subsequently revised after members scrutinised their NAPs more closely in relation to their initial responses. The finalised version of the table is attached as Annex 5 to this report (see paragraph 7.1.31 below).

7.1.29 Having completed the analysis of the NAPs, the Chairperson asked what members felt was the next step in developing the NAPs. Dr. Pernetta pointed out that there were a number of cells in the completed table that did not have a priority code, indicating they were not included in the NAP. He suggested members may like to consider whether there were components of other NAPs that they would like to include in their draft NAPs.

7.1.30 Mr. Vong said that while there may be components of the other NAPs that should be included in their NAP, the Cambodian focal point could not unilaterally commit to those modifications, but would need to take the suggestions for change back to the National Committee. Dr. Gong noted that

this was likely the case for many countries but suggested that some other countries may be able to commit now to changes they wished to make to their NAPs or would be recommending to their National Committees.

7.1.31 The Chairperson invited other focal points to comment and Mr. Barangan noted that he had found the discussion very helpful and that where Xs were present, indicating those actions were not included in the draft NAP for the Philippines, he would like to amend the plan to include each of these items, as he considered these were useful in the context of the Philippines NAP. He said he would present these proposed changes to the National Mangrove Committee in the Philippines.

7.1.32 Focal points agreed to take a copy of the table containing the actions analysed previously as rows and columns relating to the implementing agency, timeframes, finances etc and complete the cells overnight with a yes or no depending on whether the required information was included in their own NAPs. These tables are presented in Annex 6 of this report.

7.1.33 Dr. Tri projected the review of contents of the NAPs, in which the priority scores had been included by each country. Following a brief discussion, all focal points agreed that they would be undertaking some modifications to the existing drafts and agreed a timeframe for completing second drafts and final drafts of the NAPs. It was further agreed that these deadlines would be incorporated into the work plan and timetable to be discussed under agenda item 9 and that this table would be followed to develop the targets for the SAP, although the formats for individual country NAPs would not necessarily be the same.

7.2 Discussion on the Inputs from the Mangrove Sub-component to the Regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP), Review of the SAP Targets and Goals and Discussion of the Process of Integrating NAP and SAP Development

7.2.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Pernetta to introduce this agenda item and Dr. Pernetta referred participants to the Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea (Draft Version 3, 24 February 1999) included in the meeting documents. He stated that the document was originally produced in 1998 and it provided justification for taking action to reverse the environmental degradation in the region, resulting in this project being approved by the GEF.

7.2.2 He further stated that the targets and goals established in this document, based on information available in 1999, are now out-dated. It will be necessary to review the contents of the SAP in the light of more current and up-to-date information including that contained in the National Reports. In particular a review of the target for mangroves set in that draft SAP, i.e. To maintain the area of mangroves in the region at not less than 90% of the 1998 level, needed to be undertaken, and modified if it was now deemed unrealistic, indeterminable, or unachievable.

7.2.3 The Chairperson stated that at the present time in Indonesia 67% of mangroves are contained in state forests. He invited input from the other members in reviewing the target of the SAP. Professor Gong asked whether the information that had been included in the booklet "Mangroves in the South China Sea" produced by the RWG mangroves earlier this year might be of use. Dr. Pernetta provided the figures on mangroves for each country from that booklet, which he said were from the FAO based on information supplied by the Governments of each country. These figures indicate that the total area of mangroves in the countries participating in the Project had declined from 30% to 27% of the worldwide total over the last decade.

7.2.4 Dr. Gong stated that the target of maintaining the percentage of mangroves at 90% of the 1998 level was probably not realistic. She thought that setting a target area to be under sustainable use may be more appropriate. Dr. Pernetta presented the relevant section from the draft RWG-CR meeting report to show how the revised targets for the coral reef group were developed. The coral reef targets included a quality as well as a quantity related target. The meeting agreed that this was a useful approach and Dr. Tri proceeded to prepare the table for input of the relevant information. Members provided the most recent information on the total mangrove area in their country, and the percentage of this currently under management for sustainable use.

7.2.5 Dr. Gong noted that, if officially a number of countries had 100% of their mangroves under management for sustainable use, and yet mangroves were still decreasing, it was apparent that the

management was not always effective. Dr. Pernetta stated it was obvious that there could not be 100% of mangroves under management for sustainable use, as the coverage was still decreasing. While it may be that there was a ban on cutting, he asked whether there was a management body that managed each of the mangrove areas. Mr. Barangan said that although there was a management body for all areas in the Philippines, the management was not always effective, and bans on cutting were not always enforced.

7.2.6 There followed extensive discussion about management for sustainable use, management for multiple uses, and the obvious lack of enforcement of current management regulations. Based on this discussion, it was agreed to add another row to the table, for the percentage of mangroves effectively managed at the present time. The National targets were then revised to be 90% of the total mangroves for all countries to be placed under effective management, except for Indonesia, which proposed 60%. When these National targets were totalled and compared to the regional total area of mangroves, it was determined that the regional target would be that 64% of mangroves in the participating countries would be placed under effective management regimes by the year 2010.

7.2.7 Mr. Vong stated that in line with the coral reef group, a target concerning the quality of the mangroves should also be set. Professor Gong agreed with the suggestion, though the group had difficulties in determining measurable quality criteria for mangroves.

7.2.8 It was realised by the group that the figures they were working with were total areas of mangrove for the whole country, and these would have to be replaced, in the cases of Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand, with the areas of Mangrove bordering the South China Sea. Dr. Pernetta also asked for the areas that were currently under protection in the South China Sea. Focal Points then provided these data and it was calculated that 27% of mangroves were currently under protection, 52% under management for production, and 13% were designated for conversion, leaving 8% with no stated purpose or management regime. Dr. Pernetta asked whether it was possible to target this 8% for protection?

7.2.9 Mr. Santoso explained that the situation in Indonesia was quite complicated, with the production forest consisting of fixed production and non-fixed production forests. The total area covered by fixed production forests could be expected to remain the same, while the non-fixed production forest areas may decrease depending on the uses to which they were subject. Dr. Gong noted that the group had had some informal discussions on the issue of biodiversity, and asked whether this was also considered in areas of mangroves under protection. It was also important to know how much of the production forests was sustainable production, i.e. not resulting in a loss of overall area.

7.2.10 The definition of "effectively managed at the present time" was questioned. Since no clear definition could be provided, and based on the fact that the group had now included the areas under protection in the table, it was agreed that this row was redundant and could be deleted. The table indicates that 27% of the current mangrove area bordering the South China Sea is under protection. The individual percentages currently under protection in each country were calculated, and a target percentage was then set for each country. Some discussion followed as to how each country thought they might be able to achieve these targets, and whether they were in fact realistic. For example, how much could Indonesia realistically move out of production and conversion forests, and place under protection. Mr. Santoso said it was very difficult for him to make a statement committing his Government to a target at this meeting.

7.2.11 Dr. Tri stated that Indonesia had already made a commitment under the CBD, and Mr. Santoso may be able to use this to help establish a target. Dr. Pernetta pointed out that Indonesia had a higher area designated for conversion than for protection, and this would not be viewed favourably internationally.

7.2.12 There followed a discussion of the targets during which Dr. Sonjai said that targets should be established, as this provides something to aim for, even though they may not be achieved. Dr. Pernetta said that in his opinion, targets that are not achievable should never be set and added that the targets set here should be based on science, rather than political considerations. If the targets are set with sufficient justification, this may help convince the politicians that the targets should be

adopted. Mr. Santoso stated that based on scientific considerations he would set a target of 60% to be protected.

7.2.13 It was finally agreed that national targets be set, for the purpose of arriving at a provisional target for the SAP, with the concession that they may be changed in the future if required. The provisional target for the SAP was that 66% of the present area should be brought under protection by the year 2010. It was also agreed that an email discussion would be required after this meeting to further refine the targets, if any progress was to be made before the next meeting.

Table 1 Areas of Mangrove under different forms of management and potential targets for mangrove protection to be included in the SAP.

	Cambodia	China	Indonesia	Philippines	Thailand	Viet Nam	Total	Percent
Total area (ha)	72,350	23,446	934,000	24,783	34,677	156,608	1,245,864	
Production	0	0	610,800	0	0	40,000	650,800	52
Protection	13,558	15,772	158,200	23,143	11,520	115,000	337,193	27
%	19	67	17	93	33	73	27	
Target (%)	90	90	60	95	70	80	66	
Area (ha)	65,115	21,101	560,400	23,544	24,274	125,286	819,721	
Conversion area	0	0	165,000	0	0	0	165,000	13
Under-management (Regulated in laws)	13,558	15,772	769,000	23,143	11,520	155,000		
Fixed production			343,800					
Non-fixed production			267,000					

8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES

8.1 Progress Report on the Demonstration Site Activities

8.1.1 The Project Director introduced this agenda item, drawing the attention of members to the revised proposals for Fangchenggang and Trat contained in documents UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M/Inf.4 and UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M/Inf.5 of the meeting documents. He noted that to date no demonstration site operational document had been approved but that in the case of Fangchenggang activities were proceeding using the available co-financing.

8.1.2 In order to show what was required in finalising the other proposals, Dr. Pernetta presented to the meeting the steps that the PCU had undertaken in order to develop the latest version of the Trat proposal for Thailand. He said that there were a number of problems with the initial Trat proposal, which had to be addressed, for example, some objectives had no activities, and there were some activities that did not relate to the objectives. Following re-organisation and rewording of the activities these had been individually costed using defined parameters such as numbers and size of meetings, costs of travel, equipment etc. Sufficient detail was provided to permit an external observer to see exactly where the funds from Government and the GEF would be spent. The budget was present in two formats by component and activity, and by object of expenditure (UNEP format).

8.1.3 The PCU had worked with the focal points for China, Thailand, and Cambodia on the improvement of the proposals and put them into a format and condition to satisfy the requirements of UNEP/GEF before the funding could be provided. Dr. Pernetta urged focal points working on other demonstration site proposals to take note of the amount of work, which had been undertaken in getting these proposals into an acceptable condition, and to immediately work on their own proposals. He further added that he would be in Nairobi on 24th October, where he intended to seek approval for any proposals that were in the final acceptable format by that time.

8.2 Regional Co-ordination of Activities in the Approved Demonstration Sites

8.2.1 The Chairperson introduced this agenda item by informing members of the decision taken at the Third Meeting of the Project Steering Committee, regarding the co-ordination of regional activities associated with the execution of the demonstration sites, namely that:

“the concerned Regional Working Group be given responsibility for co-ordination of activities at all demonstration sites within each component and that the RWG continue to report to, and be advised by the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee regarding overlap, potential collaboration and/or synergy that might be foreseen between the demonstration sites in each component”.

8.2.2 The Project Director provided a summary of the contents of Annex 8 of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3 *“Report of the third meeting of the Project Steering Committee”*, which was included in the documents for this meeting. He noted that the Regional Working Group should discuss and agree on how they wished to proceed, based on the relevant recommendations contained in that document. He further noted that there was a budget included in Table 1 of annex 8 of the report of the third meeting of the Project Steering Committee, which covered the costs associated with the exchange programme and therefore the RWG need not concern themselves with financial matters.

8.2.3 Prompted by a comment from Dr. Pernetta, Dr. Tri said that language difficulties associated with exchange visits need to be carefully considered. He added that it was also very important to consider what was to be demonstrated at the demonstration site, so that the appropriate personnel could be sent. Dr. Pernetta added that a list of what can be demonstrated at each site should be generated, which included an estimate of how long would be required for exchange personnel to adequately benefit from the learning exercise. Also important was information on the expertise lacking in demonstration sites, so that this could be matched against expertise available at other sites.

8.2.4 Dr. Tri said that after these lists are developed, they should be consolidated into a single document, and translated into each language for dissemination to the demonstration sites, so that people at the site level can see what is available.

8.2.5 Dr. Fan stated that English language was likely to be a significant problem for staff at Fangchenggang. He suggested that, as he has access to some students who can speak English, they may be able to assist in translating for people who visit the site. He also said that in future, when they graduated, these students would probably be working at the demonstration site, and therefore these individuals may be selected to go on the exchange programme.

8.2.6 Discussion continued on the possible language difficulties that may be faced, and it was agreed that although the issue was important, each country would need to find their own way to ensure the difficulties were overcome. Dr. Pernetta pointed out that there was group training and individual training covered under the budget, and in the case of group training it might be possible to include translators/interpreters in the group.

8.2.7 A table was prepared of the potential "demonstration elements" at each site and it was noted that these broad categories were not sufficiently well defined to provide clear guidance regarding exactly what was to be demonstrated through exchange visits study tours and other mechanisms and what was the potential value to potential candidates. It was agreed that members would prepare a brief statement regarding what could be offered by each demonstration site, what the needs were for personnel training at the site, and details of optimum timing and duration of visits by exchange personnel at the site. It was agreed that this would be done within one month of the closure of the meeting.

9. WORK PLAN OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON MANGROVES FOR THE PERIOD 2004-2007

9.1 Based on the discussion and agreements reached under the previous agenda items, the Regional Working Group considered its work plan for the period 2004 – 2007. This includes the timetable for finalising and securing high level government approval of the National Action Plans, and the publication of national reports in local language in those cases where the SEAs have not

completed them. The plan also considered the further development of the NAPs, and contributions to the regional SAP, as well as the finalisation of demonstration site proposals.

9.2 The work plan was discussed, revised, and agreed, as contained in Annex 7 of this report. It was noted that this work plan would be appended to each amendment to the Memoranda of Understanding.

10. DATES AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP

10.1 Members of the Regional Working Group were reminded that, according to the decision of the Project Steering Committee, all future Regional Working Group meetings will be convened at one or other of the demonstration sites. They were also reminded that each Regional Working Group will have only one meeting each year from 2004 to 2007.

10.2 Mr. Santoso suggested that the sixth meeting could be held at the Batu Ampar demonstration site in Indonesia. The meeting accepted this offer, and following consideration of the dates already set for the Coral Reef and Seagrass meetings in 2005, and their other commitments, decided that the meeting would be convened between August 1st to 5th. Dr. Pernetta requested that all members ensure that they keep those dates free when planning their activities for the next 12 months.

10.3 It was further agreed that in the unfortunate event that it proved impossible to convene the meeting in Batu Ampar it would be convened in Busuanga, in the Philippines.

10.4 The Project Director drew to the attention of members the fact that, in addition to the decision regarding the location of future meetings the Project Steering Committee had also agreed that no meeting could be convened in a country which had failed to deliver its agreed outputs by the due date.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 No additional items were raised by members for consideration of the meeting.

12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

12.1 The Rapporteur presented the draft report of the meeting, prepared by the PCU during the meeting, for consideration and adoption by the members. The report was discussed, amended and approved as it appears in this document.

13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

13.1 In calling for a motion of closure the Chairperson thanked participants for their hard work, the PCU staff for their support and Dr. Sonjai for his excellent arrangements for the boat trip to Trat and visit to the demonstration site.

13.2 Dr. Sonjai invited all participants to visit the demonstration site again in the future and thanked participants for their support. Mr. Barangan thanked the hosts and remarked on the excellent visit to the King's project in Kung Kraben. Dr. Fan thanked everyone for the congenial atmosphere and Mr. Vong expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work with the members of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves.

13.3 Dr. Tri thanked Khun Unchalee for the excellent social arrangements and Dr. Gong for assistance in preparing inputs to the meeting.

13.4 There being no further matters the Chairperson closed the meeting at 18:50 on 30th September 2004.

ANNEX 1**List of Participants****Focal Points****Cambodia**

Mr. Ke Vongwattana, Assistant to Minister
In charge of Mangrove and Wetland
Nature Conservation and Protection Department
Ministry of Environment
48 Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmon, Cambodia

Tel: (855 23) 213 908
Mobile: (855) 12 855 990
Fax: (855 23) 212 540, 215 925
E-mail: kewattana@yahoo.com

Indonesia

Mr. Nyoto Santoso
Lembaga Pengkajian dan Pengembangan
Mangrove Indonesia
(Indonesian of Institute Mangrove Research &
Development)
Multi Piranti Graha It 3 JL. Radin Inten II No. 2
Jakarta 13440, Indonesia

Tel: (62 251) 621 672; (62 21) 861 1710
Mobile: (62) 081 111 0764
Fax: (62 251) 621 672; (62 21) 861 1710
E-mail: imred@indo.net.id; imred@cbn.net.id

Philippines

Mr. Florendo Barangan, Executive Director
Coastal and Marine Management Office
Department of Environment and Natural
Resources (CMMO/DENR)
DENR Compound Visayas Avenue
Diliman, Quezon City 1100, Philippines

Tel: (632) 926 1004; 926 0550
Mobile: (63) 917 840 5616
Fax: (632) 926 1004
E-mail: cmmo26@yahoo.com

People's Republic of China

Dr. Hangqing Fan, Professor
Guangxi Mangrove Research Centre
92 East Changqing Road
Beihai City 536000
Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region
China

Tel: (86 779) 206 5609; 205 5294
Mobile: (86) 13 367798181
Fax: (86 779) 205 8417; 206 5609
E-mail: fanhq@ppp.nn.gx.cn;
13367798181@gx165.com

Malaysia

No National Focal Point designated

Thailand

Dr. Sonjai Havanond
Department of Marine and Coastal Resources
92 Pollution Control Building
Phaholyothin 7 (Soi Aree)
Phayathai, Bangkok 10400, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 298 2166; 298 2591
Mobile: (66) 01 811 4917; 01 173 1161
Fax: (66 2) 298 2591-2; 298 2166; 298 2058
E-mail: sonjai_h@hotmail.com;
sonjai_h@yahoo.com

Viet Nam

Dr. Do Dinh Sam, Professor
Forest Science Institute of Viet Nam
Dong Ngac, Tu Liem
Hanoi, Viet Nam

Tel: (844) 838 9815; 755 0801; 854 2044
Fax: (844) 838 9722
E-mail: ddsam@netnam.vn; fuongvt@hn.vnn.vn

Regional Experts

Professor Gong Wooi Khoon
Centre for Marine and Coastal Studies
Universiti Sains Malaysia
11800 Penang
Malaysia

Tel: (604) 653 2371
Fax: (604) 656 5125
E-mail: wkgong@usm.my; gongwk@yahoo.com

Ass. Prof. Dr. Nguyen Hoang Tri, Director
Center for Environmental Research and
Education (CERE)
Hanoi University of Education
136 Xuan thuy, Quan Hoa
Cau Giay, Hanoi, Viet Nam

Tel: (844) 768 3502
Mobile: (84) 09 1352 7629
Fax: (844) 733 5624; 768 3502
E-mail: CERE@hn.vnn.vn

Observer

Mr. Sok Vong
(Wetlands Focal Point)
Ministry of Environment
Department of Nature Conservation & Protection
48, Samdach Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmon
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Tel: (855 23) 213 908; 987 740
Mobile: (855) 12 852904
Fax: (855 23) 215 925; 212 540; 987 740
E-mail: sok_vong@camintel.com;
sokvong@yahoo.com

Project Co-ordinating Unit Member

Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
2nd Floor, Block B, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 1886
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094
E-mail: pernetta@un.org

**Global Environment Facility
Specially Managed Project Review Panel**

Team Leader

Mr. Jarle Harstad, Senior M & E Coordinator
GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
Global Environment Facility
1818 H St., NW
Washington, DC 20433, USA

Tel: (1 202) 458 4619
Fax: (1 202) 552 3240; 552 3245
E-mail: jharstad@TheGEF.org

GEF Secretariat member

Ms. Sara Graslund, International Waters Specialist
Global Environment Facility
1818 H St., NW
Washington, DC 20433, USA

Tel: (1 202) 458 7335
Fax: (1 202) 552 3240/3245
E-mail: sgraslund@TheGEF.org

Implementing Agency Representative

Dr. Juha Uitto, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator
Global Environment Facility
United Nations Development Programme
New York, USA

Tel: (1 212) 906 5723
Fax: (1 212) 906 6998
E-mail: juha.uitto@undp.org

UNEP Observer

Mr. Takashi Otsuka, Task Manager, Asia and Pacific
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi 00100, Kenya

Tel: (254 20) 624380
Fax: (254 20) 624041 / 624042
E-mail: Takashi.Otsuka@unep.org

Project Co-ordinating Unit

Mr. Kelvin Passfield
Expert - Fisheries
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
2nd Floor, Block B, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 1116
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094
E-mail: passfield@un.org

Ms. Unchalee Rodsomchit
Programme Assistant
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
2nd Floor, Block B, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 1670
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094
E-mail: kattachan.unescap@un.org

ANNEX 2

List of Documents

Discussion documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/1	Agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/2	Annotated Agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/3	Report of the Meeting
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/4	Status of the Substantive Reports of the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) from the Participating Countries for the Mangrove Sub-component.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/5	Current Status of Budgets and Reports from the Specialised Executing Agencies in the Participating Countries.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/6	Draft Amendments to the Memoranda of Understanding to Cover the Period July 2004 to June 30 th 2007.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/7	Review of the National Action Plans for Mangroves
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8.Cam	National Action Plan of Cambodia
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8.Chi	National Action Plan of China
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8.Ind	National Action Plan of Indonesia
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8.Phi	National Action Plan of Philippines
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8.Tha	National Action Plan of Thailand
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/8.Vie	National Action Plan of Viet Nam

Information documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.1	List of Participants
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.2	List of Documents
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.3	Draft Programme
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.4	Fangchenggang revised operational project document
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.5	Trat Province revised operational project document
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.5/Inf.6	Specialty Managed Project Reviews (SMPR) 2004
J. Michael Bowers and Su Jilan	Mid-Term Evaluation of GEF Project No. GF/2730-02-4340 Entitled " <i>Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand</i> " July 2004.
UNEP SCS/SAP Ver. 3	Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea (Draft Version 3, 24 February 1999).

The following documents are supplied in published form.

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Mangroves Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project " <i>Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand</i> ". Report of the Meeting. Beihai, China, 14 th – 17 th October 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.4/3.
------------------------	---

- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Coral Reefs Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 27th - 30th November 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Seagrass Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 29th November – 2nd December 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Wetlands Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 15th – 18th December 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Pattaya, Thailand, 15th - 17th February 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3 Third Meeting of the Project Steering Committee for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Manila, Philippines, 25th - 27th February 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Land-based Pollution Component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 30th March – 2nd April 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Fisheries Component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Manila, Philippines, 26th – 29th April 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.2/3 Second Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Phu Quoc Island, Viet Nam, 3rd - 6th May 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.2/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.2/3 Second Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Siem Reap, Cambodia, 31st May – 2nd June 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.2/3.

List of Documents received during the RWG-M-5 in Trat Province, Thailand 27- 30 September 2004

- Cambodia**
- Report on National Management Regimes and Legislations, 25pp.** electronic copy
 - Cambodia National Report: Report on National Data and Information, 175pp.** electronic copy
 - Mangrove Strategy and Action Plan, 30pp.** electronic copy
 - Cambodia Wetland Component: National Legislation and Management Regime, 38pp.** electronic copy
 - Cambodia Wetland Component: Final National Report: Data and Information of Cambodia Wetland, March 2004, 180pp.** electronic copy
 - Cambodia Wetland Component: Final National Report: Cambodia Coastal Wetlands Strategy and Action Plan, 57pp.** electronic copy
 - Mangrove_Wetland GIS** electronic copy
 - Maps** electronic copy
 - Cam-M&W Budget revision Jun 04–Dec 07 excel file** electronic copy and hard copy
 - MoU Cam Man-Wet Meas** electronic copy and hard copy
 - MoU Cam Man-Wet SV-Wattana** electronic copy and hard copy
- China**
- Technical Criteria of Mangrove Afforestation at Demo Site, China Mangrove Executing Agency, Gaungxi Mangrove Research Center 2004, 14pp.** hard copy in Chinese Language
- Indonesia**
- Progress Report Activities, June 2004, 26pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Cash Advance Request, 13pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Central Java Province), 38pp.** hard copy 1 copy
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Central Kalimantan Province), 30pp.** hard copy 3 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Jambi Province), 19pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (South Sumatra Province), 30pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Lampung Province), 24pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Bangka Belitung Province), 30pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (West Kalimantan Province), 45pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (South Kalimantan Province), 32pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (East Java Province), 56pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (West Java Province), 68pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Banten Province), 32pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (DKI Jakarta), 49pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Review Data and Information Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea (Riau Province), 70pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Flora and Fauna of Indonesian Mangrove Ecosystem in the South China Sea, 222pp.** hard copy 2 copies
 - Economic Valuation of the Mangrove Ecosystem in Indonesia, 21pp.** hard copy 2 copies

- Philippines** **Cash Advance Request 30 June – 31 Dec 2004** 1pp. hard copy
Six Monthly Project Expenditure Jan-Jun 04 3pp. hard copy
Philippines Sub-contractor Summary 1pp. hard copy
Management Letter on the Audit of the State of Expenditure (SOE) of the Project
20pp. hard copy
IMC Cash Advance Request 1pp.hard copy
IMC Six Monthly Expenditure Jan-June 04 1pp.electronic copy
Monthly Progress Report (mangrove) Jan-Jun 04 16pp. hard copy
Philippines Budget Proposed for 2005-2007 Excel file electronic copy
Philippines MoU Second Amendment 4pp. electronic copy
- Thailand** **Contents No.1 (3/8/04) 21KB ELECTRONIC COPY**
Contents No.2 (3/8/04) 22kb electronic copy
Final No.1 (26/07/04) 1,675kb electronic copy
Final No.2 (3/8/04) 1,916kb electronic copy
Forward for Mangrove Database (28/7/04) 20kb electronic copy
Mangrove Database (28/7/04) 1,521kb electronic copy
Six Monthly Progress Report, 8pp. electronic copy and hard copy
Action Plan for Mangrove Management in the Gulf of Thailand under the
UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project, 9pp. electronic copy and hard copy
Five Year Action Plan for Managing Mangrove Resources in the Gulf of
Thailand (2004-2008), 4pp. electronic copy and hard copy
- Viet Nam** **Six Monthly Expenditure Mangrove Jan – June 04** 1pp. hard copy
Six Monthly Progress Report Jan-June 04 7pp. hard copy
Cash Advance Request 1pp. hard copy

ANNEX 3

Agenda

- 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**
 - 1.1 Welcome Address
 - 1.2 Introduction of Members
- 2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING**
 - 2.1 Election of Officers
 - 2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting
 - 2.3 Organisation of Work
- 3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA**
- 4. BRIEF REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS ON THE STATUS OF THE PREPARATORY PHASE OUTPUTS DUE 30TH JUNE 2004**
- 5. STATUS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS AND EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING**
 - 5.1 Status of the Administrative Reports of the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) from the Participating Countries, for the Mangrove Sub-component
 - 5.2 Extension of the Memoranda of Understanding for the Specialised Executing Agencies without Approved Demonstration Sites (Cambodia and Viet Nam)
 - 5.3 Extension of the Memoranda of Understanding for the Specialised Executing Agencies with Approved Demonstration Sites
- 6. PROJECT EVALUATION**
 - 6.1 Report of the Independent Mid-term Evaluation of the Project
 - 6.2 Specially Managed Project Review (SMPR) by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the GEF Secretariat
- 7. REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND DISCUSSION REGARDING INPUTS TO THE REGIONAL STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME**
 - 7.1 Review of the Contents of the Draft National Action Plans with a View to Identifying Commonalities and Differences
 - 7.2 Discussion on the Inputs from the Mangrove Sub-component to the Regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP), Review of the SAP Targets and Goals and Discussion of the Process of Integrating NAP and SAP Development
- 8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES**
 - 8.1 Progress Report on the Demonstration Site Activities
 - 8.2 Regional Co-ordination of Activities in the Approved Demonstration Sites
- 9. WORK PLAN OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON MANGROVES FOR THE PERIOD 2004-2007**
- 10. DATES AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP**
- 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING**
- 13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

ANNEX 4**DRAFT SECOND AMENDMENT****TO THE****MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING****BETWEEN****THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME****AND****THE [INSERT NAME OF THE SEA], IN IT'S CAPACITY AS THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCY FOR [Insert Country name] [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] OF THE UNEP/GEF PROJECT ENTITLED:****“REVERSING ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION TRENDS IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA AND GULF OF THAILAND”***(Ref.: UNEP GEF/SCS/Ind/MoU 2c)*

This amendment is drafted under the terms of Article 9 of Annex 1 of the original Memorandum of Understanding, dated 21st January 2002, between the United Nations Environment Programme, and the [INSERT NAME OF THE SEA], [Insert Country name]. The following amended articles (5, 6, 8 and 10) shall be deemed to replace, and/or, add to, (as specified in each article) the corresponding articles contained in the original memorandum and the amendments contained in the first Amendment. All the remaining articles of the original memorandum, together with the contents of Annex 1 shall be deemed to remain in effect.

5. TASKS BY DESIGNATED INSTITUTION. The Mangrove Focal Point on behalf of the Specialised Executing Agency, in close collaboration with the members of the National Mangrove Committee and in accordance with the amended workplan, (Figure 1) agrees to the following:

- i. The Mangrove Focal Point shall continue to chair and convene meetings of the National Mangrove Committee (NMC), composed of individuals from various organisations and institutions that represent a wide spectrum of expertise and interests in Mangrove issues including *inter alia* academics, managers, government officials, and marine park managers. The terms of reference for this committee are contained in the project document and annexed to the report of the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee¹;
- ii. The Mangrove Focal Point will serve as a member of [Insert Country name]'s National Technical Working Group (NTWG) established under the Project, to ensure linkage with the other national components of the project. The terms of reference for the NTWG are contained in the project document and annexed to the report of the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee;
- iii. The Mangrove Focal Point will also represent the National Mangrove Committee on the Regional Working Group on Mangroves (RWG-M)², to ensure input and exchange at the regional level, between the participating countries. The terms of reference for the (RWG-M) are contained in the project document and annexed to the report of the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee;
- iv. Ensure that the NMC serves as an effective source of scientific and technical advice to the National Technical Working Group established under the project, and thence to the country members of the Project Steering Committee;

¹ UNEP, 2002. *First Meeting of the Project Steering Committee For the UNEP/GEF Project “Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the meeting, UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.1/3, 110 pp. UNEP, Bangkok, Thailand.

² *If the focal point from the SEA happens to be elected as chairperson of the RWG-M, he/she will become a member of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) which is the highest technical and scientific committee of the project.*

- v. Ensure that the NMC serves as an effective source of scientific and technical advice regarding **[Insert Country name]**'s Mangrove systems to the Regional Working Group for Mangroves established under the Project, and thence to the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee;
- vi. Provide in a format to be agreed by the Regional Working Group on Mangrove and the RSTC, such data and information as may be required from time to time by the Regional Working Group on Mangroves and/or the RSTC;
- vii. Maintain the national meta-database developed during the preparatory phase of the project containing information on **[Insert Country name]**'s Mangrove;
- viii. Update as required the criteria currently in use at the national level for decision making with respect to future use of marine habitats;
- ix. Update as required the data contained in the Regional GIS database relating to Mangroves;
- x. Continue to work with the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters regarding national legislation and the preparation of a regional directory of legislation and best practices;
- xi. Continue to work with the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation regarding national level economic valuation of Mangrove resources and the preparation of regionally applicable valuations that can be used in the cost benefit analysis of actions and non-actions proposed in the Strategic Action Programme;
- xii. Assist, through the Regional Working Group on Mangrove in the preparation of a comprehensive regional synthesis of data and information regarding the distribution, extent and state of Mangrove ecosystems bordering the South China Sea; together with an ongoing review of threats to sustainable management of such systems for publication in early 2007;
- xiii. Further develop the preliminary national Mangrove action plan to meet the targets provisionally agreed in the regional SAP;
- xiv. Critically review from the national perspective, the targets and goals set by the draft SAP adopted by the XIIIth meeting of COBSEA³ (November 1998) and prepare concrete proposals concerning actions at the national level, required to meet these targets;
- xiv. Based on the criteria and ranking processes for the selection of sites of national and regional significance, prepare and submit proposal(s) for the **[INSERT COMPONENT NAME]** specific site(s) to be adopted by the government for sequential intervention;
- xv. Provide guidance to the national Inter-Ministry Committee on how the goals and targets of the regional Strategic Action Programme may be met in **[Insert Country name]** through a cost benefit or cost effectiveness consideration of alternative courses of action;
- xvi. Present the national Mangrove action plan and regional Strategic Action programme to workshops and public meetings as appropriate, for consideration and input from as wide as possible, a cross section of the involved stakeholders;
- xvii. Facilitate the process of formal government approval of the national action plans;
- xviii. Complete any outstanding tasks, listed in articles 5.i to 5.xvi of the original memorandum, which have been delayed as a consequence of initial delays in fund transfer;

THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS WILL BE VARIED ACCORDING TO THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SEA WITH RESPECT TO THE EXECUTION OF DEMONSTRATE SITE ACTIVITIES

- xix. Undertake to execute the activities at the insert name of demonstration site as approved in the operational plan⁴ for the site, being developed by insert name of focal point in conjunction with the PCU; and to,
- xxi. Co-ordinate national involvement in the regional programme for co-ordination, dissemination of experiences, and personnel exchange between demonstration sites.

³ UNEP, 1998. Report of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Co-ordinating Body for the Seas of East Asia (COBSEA) on the East Asian Seas Action Plan. UNEP(WATER)/EAS IG.9/3.

⁴ Once developed and agreed by both parties the full document will be attached to this amendment as Annex 1 and become an integral part of the amendment.

6. TASKS BY UNITED NATIONS. UNEP agrees to perform the following tasks:

- i. Provide the financial resources according, to the agreed revised schedule, detailed in the budget attached as Table 1 to this amendment; and,
- ii. Provide financial support to enable the National Mangrove Focal Point to travel to such regional meetings as may be agreed from time to time.

8. REFUND OF UNSPENT BALANCE. The Designated Institution will refund to UNEP in US dollars any unspent balance of the funds provided by UNEP within 30 days after completion of the final task. Such refund should be wired to:

Name of account holder: ESCAP
 Account number: 485-002051
 Name of bank: Chase Manhattan Bank
Address of bank: New York
 ABA number: 021000021

10. EFFECTIVE DATE. This amendment to the existing Memorandum of Understanding shall enter into effect when signed in duplicate by the authorised persons below, and shall expire on 30th June 2007. Three months prior to the expiry of this amendment (i.e. by March 31st 2007) a new agreement may be negotiated taking into account any decisions of the Project Steering Committee regarding activities to be executed during the remainder of the project period.

Insert Focal Point name and address

Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director
 UNEP/DGEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
 United Nations Environment Programme
 Bangkok, Thailand

Date: _____

Date: _____

ANNEX 5

Analysis of the Contents of the National Action Plans for Mangroves

ACTIONS (Mangroves)	Cambodia	China	Indonesia	Philippines	Thailand	Viet Nam
1. Research and Monitoring						
1.1 Resource assessment	Vh	Vh	Vh	Vh	Vh	Vh
1.2 Mapping	H	M	Vh	X	Vh	Vh
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	M	H	H	X	H	H
1.4 Database management	H	Vh	H	Vh	Vh	H
1.5 Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)	H	Vh	H	H	Vh	H
1.6 Decision support system	X	X	M	X	Vh	H
Environment impact assessment						
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination						
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making	Vh	Vh	Vh	H	Vh	H
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	VI	M	M	X	Vh	H
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	H	H	Vh	H	L	Vh
2.4 Integration of government agencies	H	Vh	H	H	H	Vh
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	M	M	M	H	H	H
2.6 Community empowerment	H	L	Vh	Vh	H	H
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and management systems	M	M	M	M	Vh	X
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	X	X	M	H	X	X
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	X	H	H	H	X	Vh
2.10 International and regional cooperation	X	H	H	H	X	Vh
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education						
3.1 Improve government services	Vh	X	Vh	X	X	Vh
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	H	H	Vh	Vh	Vh	Vh
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability						
4.1 Human resource development	Vh	X	Vh	H	Vh	Vh
4.2 Immediate training activities	Vh	H	Vh	H	Vh	Vh
4.3 Law enforcement	H	H	H	X	X	Vh
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance	H	Vh	H	X	Vh	X
4.5 Financial sustainability	X	H	M	X	X	M
4.6 Infrastructure development	X	X	M	M	H	H
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	H	X	Vh	H	H	Vh
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	M	X	H	X	Vh	Vh
5. Resource and Habitat Management						
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	Vh	Vh	Vh	H	Vh	H
5.2 Strengthen management components	Vh	M	H	H	Vh	Vh
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	H	Vh	H	Vh	Vh	Vh
5.4 Community-based management	H	M	H	Vh	Vh	H
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	L	Vh	H	H	Vh	Vh
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	X	H	H	X	M	H
5.7 Types of management regimes, development of models	X	X	Vh	H	M	H

ANNEX 6

Analysis of National Action Plans with Respect to Targets, Timeframes, Costs and Implementing Agency Information

Table 1 Analysis of national action plan contents for Cambodia.

ACTIONS	Target	Timeframe	Financing	Responsibility
1. Research and Monitoring				
1.1 Resource assessment	Yes	No	No	No
1.2 Mapping	Yes	No	No	No
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	No	No	No	No
1.4 Database management	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.5 Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.6 Decision support system	No	No	No	No
1.7 Environment impact assessment	No	No	No	No
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination				
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making	No	No	No	No
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	No	No	No	No
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	Yes	No	No	Yes
2.4 Integration of government agencies	Yes	No	No	Yes
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	Yes	No	No	No
2.6 Community empowerment	No	No	No	No
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and management systems	No	No	No	No
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	No	No	No	No
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	No	No	No	No
2.10 International and regional cooperation	No	No	No	No
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education				
3.1 Improve government services	No	No	No	No
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Yes	No	No	No
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability				
4.1 Human resource development	Yes	No	No	No
4.2 Immediate training activities	Yes	No	No	No
4.3 Law enforcement	Yes	No	No	No
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance	Yes	No	No	No
4.5 Financial sustainability	No	No	No	No
4.6 Infrastructure development	No	No	No	No
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	No	No	No	No
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	Yes	No	No	No
5. Resource and Habitat Management				
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	No	No	No	No
5.2 Strengthen management components	No	No	No	No
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	Yes	No	No	Yes
5.4 Community-based management	No	No	No	Yes
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	No	No	No	No
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	No	No	No	No
5.7 Types of management regimes, development of models	No	No	No	No

Table 2 Analysis of National Action Plan contents for China.

ACTIONS	Target	Timeframe	Financing (RMB)	Responsibility
1. Research and Monitoring				
1.1 Resource assessment	Yes	2005~2007	10,000,000	SEP/SOA/SFB
1.2 Mapping	Yes	2007~2008	3,000,000	SOA
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	Yes	2006~2007	2,500,000	SEP
1.4 Database management				
1.5 Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)	Yes	2007~2009	5,000,000	SOA
1.6 Decision support system	Yes	2006~2008	2,000,000	SEP
1.7 Environment impact assessment				
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination				
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making	Yes	2005~2006	4,000,000	SEP
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	Yes	2004~2010	6,000,000	SEP
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	Yes	2005~2006	3,000,000	SEP
2.4 Integration of government agencies	No	2005~2008	5,000,000	State Department
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	Yes	2006~2007	1,500,000	SEP
2.6 Community empowerment	No			
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and management systems	Yes	2006~2008	5,000,000	SEP
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	No			
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	Yes	2005~2010	3,000,000	SEP
2.10 International and regional cooperation	Yes	2004~2010	5,000,000	SEP/SOA/SFB
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education				
3.1 Improve government services	Yes	2004~2010	3,000,000	State Department
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Yes	2004~2010	7,000,000	SEP
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability				
4.1 Human resource development	Yes	2005~2010	2,000,000	State Personnel Bureau
4.2 Immediate training activities	Yes	2005~2010	6,000,000	SEP/SOA/SFB
4.3 Law enforcement	Yes	2005~2010	5,000,000	SEP/SOA/SFB
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance	Yes	2005~2010	15,000,000	SEP
4.5 Financial sustainability	Yes	2005~2010	3,000,000	State Monetary Dept
4.6 Infrastructure development	Yes	2005~2010	15,000,000	State Monetary Dept
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	Yes	2005~2010	20,000,000	SEP/SOA/SFB
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	Yes	2005~2010	10,000,000	SEP
5. Resource and Habitat Management				
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	Yes	2005~2008	5,000,000	SEP
5.2 Strengthen management components	No			
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	Yes	2005~2010	10,000,000	SFB
5.4 Community-based management	No			
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	Yes	2006~2010	15,000,000	SEP/SOA
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	Yes	2006~2010	5,000,000	SEP
5.7 Types of management regimes, development of models	Yes	2005~2008	4,000,000	SEP

State Environment Protection Bureau (SEP)
State Oceanic Administration (SOA)
State Forestry Bureau (SFB)
State Monetary Dept (SMD)
State Personnel Bureau (SPB)

Table 3 Analysis of National Action Plan contents for Indonesia.

ACTIONS	Target	Timeframe	Financing	Responsibility
1. Research and Monitoring				
1.1 Resource assessment	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF
1.2 Mapping	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	Yes	2005-2007	Yes, 200,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv
1.4 Database management	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv
1.5 Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)				
1.6 Decision support system	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv
1.7 Environment impact assessment	-			
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination				
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, Dept.HomeA, MoEnv
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	Yes	2005-2010	Yes, 100,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, Dept.HomeA, MoEnv, LIPI
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv
2.4 Integration of government agencies	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, Dept.HomeA
2.6 Community empowerment	Yes	2005-2010	Yes, 200,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, Dept.HomeA
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and management systems	Yes	2005-2007	Yes, 200,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, Dept.HomeA
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, Dept.HomeA, MoEnv
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv
2.10 International and regional cooperation	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education				
3.1 Improve government services	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, Dept.HomeA, MoEnv
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability				
4.1 Human resource development	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.2 Immediate training activities	Yes	2005-2007	Yes, 200,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.3 Law enforcement	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.5 Financial sustainability		2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.6 Infrastructure development	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	Yes	2005-2010	Yes, 200,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
5. Resource and Habitat Management				
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	Yes	2005-2008	Yes, 500,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv
5.2 Strengthen management components	Yes	2005-2007	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	Yes	2005-2008	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
5.4 Community-based management	Yes	2005-2007	Yes, 1,000,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	Yes	2005-2010	Yes	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	Yes	2005-2008	Yes, 200,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA
5.7 Types of management regimes, development of models	Yes	2005-2007	Yes, 1,000,000,000	Dept.Forestry; Dept.MarineF, LIPI, MoEnv, Dept.HomeA

Table 4 Analysis of National Action Plan Contents for Philippines.

ACTIONS	Target ⁵	Timeframe	Financing (US\$ '000)	Responsibility
1. Research and Monitoring				
1.1 Resource assessment	SCS Coast	2005	20,000	CMMO-NAMRIA
1.2 Mapping	SCS Coast	2005	10,000	CMMO-NAMRIA
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	SCS Coast	2005	5,000	CMMO/CMMD
1.4 Database management	SCS Coast	2005	5,000	CMMO/CMMD
1.5 Information system (database management GIS system and web development)				
1.6 Decision support system				
1.7 Environment impact assessment				
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination				
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy making	National	Continuing	1,000	CMMO/PPSO/ERDB
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	Nationwide	Continuing	1,000	Focal Point
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	National	Continuing	3,000	CMMO
2.4 Integration of government agencies	SCS Coast	Continuing	1,000	CMMO
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	SCS Coast	2005	1,000	CMMO
2.6 Community empowerment	SCS Coast	2005-2007	5,000	CMMO/Local Governments (LGUs)
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and mgmt systems				
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	SCS Coast	2005-2007	2,000	DENR/LGUs
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	Nationwide	Continuing	2,000	DENR/DFA
2.10 International and regional cooperation	Nationwide	Continuing	2,000	DENR/DFA
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education				
3.1 Improve government services	Nationwide	Continuing	5,000	Executive Branch
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Nationwide	Continuing	5,000	DENR/DPI/Academe, etc.
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability				
4.1 Human resource development	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	2,000	CMMO/NGO/Academe
4.2 Immediate training activities (Mangrove Mgmt)	SCS Coastal	2005	2,000	CMMO/NGO/Academe
4.3 Law enforcement	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	20,000	DENR/DA/PCG/LGU, etc
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance				
4.5 Financial sustainability	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	50,000	LGU
4.6 Infrastructure development				
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	20,000	DENR, DA, LGUs, Academe
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	Nationwide	Continuing	10,000	DENR
5. Resource and Habitat Management				
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	SCS Coastal	2005	1,000	DENR, NGA, NGO & Academe
5.2 Strengthen management components	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	1,000	DENR, NGA, NGO & Academe
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	50,000	DENR, NGA, NGO & Academe
5.4 Community-based management	SCS Coastal	2005-2007	50,000	DENR, LGUs, NGO & Academe
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	Nationwide	Continuing	50,000	LGUs
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	SCS Coastal	2005	20,000	LGUs
5.7 Types of mgmt regimes, dev't of models	Nationwide	Continuing	5,000	DENR
Total			349,000	

CMMO = Coastal and Marine Management Office; NAMRIA = National Mapping and Resource Inventory Authority; CMMD = Coastal and Marine Management Division; PPSO = Policy & Planning Service Office; ERDB = Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau; LGU = Local Government Units; DPI = Department of Public Information; DA = Department of Agriculture; NGA = National Government Agencies; DFA = Department of Foreign Affairs.

⁵ The targets are not quantified due to inavailability of information on the number of coastal municipalities and cities in the SCS and these be supplied upon my return to office. To be emailed soonest.

Table 5 Analysis of National Action Plan Contents Thailand.

ACTIONS	Target	Timeframe	Financing	Responsibility
1. Research and Monitoring				
1.1 Resource assessment	Yes	2005-2008	1,200,000	DMCR
1.2 Mapping	Yes	2005-2008	250,000	DMCR
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	Yes	No	No	No
1.4 Database management	Yes	2005-2008	500,000	DMCR
1.5 Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)	Yes	2005-2008	500,000	DMCR
1.6 Decision support system	No	No	No	No
1.7 Environment impact assessment	Yes	2005-2008	511,500	DMCR
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination				
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making	Yes	No	No	No
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	Yes	2005-2008	-	DMCR
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	Yes	No	No	No
2.4 Integration of government agencies	Yes	No	No	No
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	Yes	No	No	No
2.6 Community empowerment	Yes	2005-2008	440,750	DMCR
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and management systems	Yes	2005-2008	200,000	DMCR
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	No	No	No	No
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	No	No	No	No
2.10 International and regional cooperation	Yes	2005-2008	150,000	DMCR
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education				
3.1 Improve government services	Yes	2005-2008	125,000	DMCR
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Yes	2005-2008	750,000	DMCR
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability				
4.1 Human resource development	Yes	2005-2008	1,500,000	DMCR
4.2 Immediate training activities	Yes	No	No	No
4.3 Law enforcement	Yes	2005-2008	440,750	DMCR
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance	Yes	No	No	No
4.5 Financial sustainability	Yes	2005-2008	60,000	DMCR
4.6 Infrastructure development	Yes	2005-2008	2,000,000	DMCR
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	Yes	2005-2008	600,000	DMCR
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	Yes	2005-2008	900,000	DMCR
5. Resource and Habitat Management				
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	Yes	2005-2008	500,000	DMCR
5.2 Strengthen management components	Yes	2005-2008	3,925,000	DMCR
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	Yes	2005-2008	39,534,000	DMCR
5.4 Community-based management	Yes	2005-2008	750,000	DMCR
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	Yes	No	No	No
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	Yes	No	No	No
5.7 Types of management regimes, development of models	No	No	No	No

Table 6 Analysis of National Action Plan Contents Viet Nam.

ACTIONS	Target	Duration	Finance	Responsibility
1. Research and Monitoring				
1.1 Resource assessment	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.2 Mapping	Implicit	Yes	No	Yes
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.4 Database management	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.5 Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.6 Decision support system	No	No	No	No
1.7 Environment impact assessment	Limited	Yes	No	Yes
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination				
2.1 Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making	Implicit	No	No	No
2.2 Monitoring the NAPs	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
2.3 Review and improve existing laws and policies	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
2.4 Integration of government agencies	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
2.5 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	Limited	No	No	Limited
2.6 Community empowerment	Implicit	No	No	No
2.7 Strengthening traditional value and management systems	No	No	No	No
2.8 Establish an incentive system for good governance	Implicit	No	No	No
2.9 Linkage to regional and international obligations	Implicit	No	No	No
2.10 International and regional cooperation	Yes	No	No	Yes
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education				
3.1 Improve government services	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
3.2 Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4. Capacity Building and Sustainability				
4.1 Human resource development	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4.2 Immediate training activities	Limited	No	No	Limited
4.3 Law enforcement	Yes	Yes	No	Limited
4.4 Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4.5 Financial sustainability	Limited	No	No	Yes
4.6 Infrastructure development	Implicit (N. Park)	No	No	Yes
4.7 Institutional building and strengthening	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4.8 Network establishment and strengthening	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
5. Resource and Habitat Management				
5.1 Develop guidelines for sustainable use	No	No	No	No
5.2 Strengthen management components	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
5.3 Establish/enhance mangrove system	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
5.4 Community-based management	Implicit	No	No	Yes
5.5 Sustainable use of coastal systems	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
5.6 Environmentally friendly technologies	No	No	No	No
5.7 Types of management regimes, development of models	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

