



**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

**Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group for
the Fisheries Component**

Manila, Philippines, 26th – 29th April 2004



First published in Thailand in 2004 by the United Nations Environment Programme.

Copyright © 2004, 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, 9th Floor Block A, Rajdamnern Avenue,
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel. +66 2 288 1886
Fax. +66 2 288 1094; 281 2428
<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: Anchovy light fishing boat, Gulf of Thailand by Mr. Kelvin Passfield.

For citation purposes this document may be cited as:

UNEP, 2004. Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Fisheries. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3.

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 DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE TO THE MEETING	2
2.3 ORGANISATION OF WORK	2
3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA.....	2
4. OPENING REMARKS FROM THE FOCAL POINTS FOR FISHERIES FROM EACH PARTICIPATING COUNTRY	2
5. REPORTS FROM THE PROJECT CO-ORDINATING UNIT (PCU) REGARDING OVERALL PROGRESS TO DATE	4
5.1 STATUS OF PROGRESS REPORTS, EXPENDITURE REPORTS, AND BUDGETS FOR 2003	4
5.2 STATUS OF PLANNED SUBSTANTIVE OUTPUTS FROM THE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL ACTIVITIES.....	4
6. REVIEW OF THE DEMONSTRATION SITES FROM THE HABITAT COMPONENT	5
6.1 DEMONSTRATION SITES APPROVED AT THE THIRD MEETING OF THE PSC	5
6.2 DEMONSTRATION SITE PROPOSALS IN THE GULF OF THAILAND: THEIR POTENTIAL FOR INCLUSION IN A SUB-REGIONAL SYSTEM OF <i>REFUGIA</i> FOR TRANSBOUNDARY FISH STOCKS	5
6.3 PUBLIC AWARENESS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS THREATS FROM FISHING ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED IN THE DEMONSTRATION SITES.....	7
7. STATUS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR THE TRIAL OF A BLAST FISHING DETECTION DEVICE	8
8. A SYSTEM OF <i>REFUGIA</i> FOR FISH STOCKS OF TRANSBOUNDARY SIGNIFICANCE IN THE GULF OF THAILAND	8
9. PROMOTION OF GUIDELINES FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES	9
10. REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES CONTRIBUTION TO THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME	10
11. POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS	13
12. REVISION OF THE WORK PLAN AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES.....	14
13. DATE AND PLACE OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES.....	15
14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.....	15
15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING	15
16. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING	15

List of Annexes

- ANNEX 1** **List of Participants**
- ANNEX 2** **List of Documents**
- ANNEX 3** **Agenda**
- ANNEX 4** **Fishery Threats and Issues Identified in the Proposals for Approved Demonstration Sites in the Habitat Component of the Project**
- ANNEX 5** **Work Plan and Timetable for the Regional Working Group on Fisheries**
- ANNEX 6** **Draft Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations Environment Programme and the Special Executing Agencies for the Fisheries Component of the UNEP/GEF Project Entitled: “*Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand*”**

Report of the Meeting

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome address

1.1.1 Mr. Kelvin Passfield, Fisheries Expert of the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU), welcomed the participants and opened the meeting on behalf of Dr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, the Director, Division of Global Environment Facility Co-ordination (UNEP/DGEF). He noted that, the Project Director, Dr. Pernetta was unable to be present for the opening of the meeting due to other commitments but that he would attend the meeting later in order to participate in the discussion of the next phase of the project.

1.1.2 Mr. Passfield noted that this was an important meeting, as the first phase of the project was nearly completed, and the activities for the next phase of the project had to be agreed during this meeting and a workplan and timetable had to be discussed and agreed. During the preparatory phase, the fisheries component under this project had focused on the collection of data and information relating to fisheries and the comparative importance of the coastal habitats in maintaining transboundary fish stocks of significance to the region. Activities during the second phase should focus on the integration of actions relating to fisheries with the work plan and activities agreed under the habitat component of the project.

1.2 Introduction of members

1.2.1 Mr. Passfield informed the meeting that there were two new members of the Regional Working Group: Mr. Parlin Tambunan, the new focal point from Indonesia, and Mr. Geronimo Silvestre, participating as a regional expert. Mr. Passfield noted that due to the re-scheduling of this meeting, Mr. Tambunan was unable to attend, as he had another commitment and that he was represented at this meeting by Mr. Sri Yono Wirjosuwarno. Dr. Johanes Widodo, who had participated in 2 previous meetings as the alternate member from Indonesia, was now joining the Regional Working Group as a regional expert member. Mr. Geronimo Silvestre was unavoidably delayed, and would join the meeting on the second day. Mr. Passfield also welcomed the invited observers, Dr. Yasuhisa Kato and Dr. Magnus Torell from SEAFDEC, and Dr. Paul Teng from World Fish Centre, and noted with regret that FAO was unable to be represented during the meeting.

1.2.2 Participants were invited to introduce themselves, and there followed a brief introduction of the participants who are listed in Annex 1 of this report.

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

2.1 Election of Officers

2.1.1 Mr. Passfield reminded participants that, the Rules of Procedure state: "*the Regional Working Group shall elect, from amongst the members, a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur to serve for one year*". The rules state further that, "*officers shall be eligible for re-election no more than once*". Mr. Passfield recalled that, at the third meeting of the regional working group, in Cambodia in April/May of 2003, Mr. Ing Try, Mr. Pirochana Saikliang and Mr. Noel Barut were elected as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur respectively, and that consequently they were eligible for re-election to these positions.

2.1.2 Participants were invited to nominate members as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur for 2004. Mr. Pirochana Saikliang nominated Mr. Noel Barut, Dr. Dao Manh Son, and Mr. Ing Try as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur respectively. Mr. Johanes Widodo seconded these nominations. Mr. Barut, Dr. Son and Mr. Try were duly elected by acclamation.

2.2 Documents available to the meeting

2.2.1 The Chairperson invited the PCU member to introduce the documentation available to the meeting. Mr. Passfield briefly introduced each document listed in the document UNEP/GEF/RWG-F.4/Inf.2, and the documents available on the CD-ROM. The list of documents is attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.2.2 Mr. Passfield further pointed out that an additional document, not listed in the provisional list of documents, was included in the meeting folder, namely an extract from the draft "Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the South China Sea", dated 24 February 1999, containing proposed fishery related targets, regional and national activities to be undertaken in the South China Sea.

2.3 Organisation of work

2.3.1 Mr. Passfield briefed participants on the administrative arrangements for the conduct of the meeting, and the proposed organisation of work. He noted that the meeting would be conducted in English and in plenary, although small working groups could be formed as required, and at the discretion of the meeting.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

3.1 Mr. Barut, the Chairperson, invited members to consider the provisional agenda prepared by the Project Co-ordinating Unit, and propose any amendments or additional items for consideration. No amendments were proposed, and no further items suggested for inclusion in the agenda, which was adopted as the meeting agenda, and is attached as Annex 3 to this report.

4. OPENING REMARKS FROM THE FOCAL POINTS FOR FISHERIES FROM EACH PARTICIPATING COUNTRY

4.1 The Chairperson invited the focal points from the SEAs to provide a short overview of their progress subsequent to the third meeting of the Regional Working Group.

4.2 Dr. Dao Manh Son informed the meeting that Vietnam had completed the national fisheries report, which had been revised on the basis of the comments of the independent reviewers. The final version of the report had been submitted to the PCU. In addition, Vietnam had issued contracts for the production of posters and other materials to raise awareness of fisheries problems in Vietnam. Posters and a CD-ROM had been produced in Vietnamese, and these could be translated into English if this was deemed useful.

4.3 Mr. Saikiang summarised the activities undertaken in Thailand since the third RWG-F meeting, noting that during the inter-sessional period, the Thailand national fisheries committee had convened two national committee meetings to review progress of activities. The national fisheries report had been revised and submitted to the PCU, incorporating comments from the reviewers and the PCU. The final version of the report had been sent to the PCU by the end of March 2004 as agreed. Some institutions had been contacted to produce awareness-raising materials, but progress has been slow. Activities to develop a national management plan were in hand and it was anticipated that the draft would be finalised by the end of June 2004. Finally, a meeting had been convened by the National Technical Working Group where members of the national fishery committee were able to assist other focal points of the habitat sub-components in formulating proposals for demonstration sites.

4.4 Mr. Barut informed the meeting that a national committee meeting was convened to consider the recommendations, work plan and timetable of the activities, made by the third RWG-F meeting. The national committee had also considered formats for awareness-raising materials such as posters, brochures and radio programmes. However these materials have not been produced, as his office had been unable to execute the contracts due to difficulties in accessing the funds. Under the MoU, these funds had been transferred by the PCU through the Environmental Management Bureau account rather than directly to the SEA. However, he considered that the Philippines would progress faster in its implementation of activities since future funds were to be transferred directly to the SEA

account. He assured the meeting that awareness-raising materials can be produced if the Philippines is granted time beyond June 2004. He further noted that the national report is being finalised to incorporate the comments made by the independent reviewers, and he expected the final report to be finished within this week.

4.5 Mr. Sri Yono informed the meeting that the Indonesian national fishery report has been revised, finalised and submitted to the PCU. Consideration was given to the types of materials to be produced for awareness-raising, including posters, leaflets and CD-ROM. Draft subcontracts to produce these materials by June 2004 were recently submitted to the PCU. He further noted that due to several factors, Indonesia had experienced difficulty in collecting data and information for the regional meta-database and GIS.

4.6 Dr. Widodo inquired whether it would be possible to continue the meta-database and GIS data work after June 2004. Mr. Passfield noted that these outputs were a requirement under the original MoU and had not yet been completed. He added further that the PCU had concerns with the draft contracts for preparing awareness raising materials and implementing awareness raising activities in a very short time frame, by the end of June 2004. He said that it would be inappropriate to rush to spend the money by the end of first MoU, as this may have a negative impact on the quality of the outputs. He stated that the negotiation of a second MoU should carefully review what has been done and what needs to be done, so that activities could be planned and implemented in a timely manner.

4.7 Mr. Ing Try informed the meeting that the national fishery report has been revised, finalised and submitted to the PCU, incorporating the reviewers' comments. Translation into Khmer had commenced, and was expected to be finalised by mid June. Some posters and leaflets related to habitats and fishing grounds had been produced by Cambodia, and were presented to the meeting participants. He further informed the meeting that a Field Guidebook is being prepared, and will be completed by May. He added that the Fishery Department had the intention to use these materials in future consultations with stakeholders.

4.8 Mr. Ing Try pointed out that extensive stakeholder consultation had been undertaken to produce the public awareness materials in Cambodia. Only through direct consultation with stakeholders can materials be produced that directly address the needs of the stakeholders. In the case of Cambodia, materials were written in simple language to reach the community-level stakeholders.

4.9 Mr. Somsak noted that the major problems of fisheries were identified in the national reports as over fishing, and destructive fishing practices, such as blast fishing, push netting, trawling, etc. The materials produced by Cambodia mainly focused on habitat degradation, especially coral reefs, rather than on these main fishing problems in this region. He expressed concern that this could be a duplication of activities undertaken by the coral reef component. Dr. Kato concurred, saying that the materials should focus on the major mandate of the fisheries component. Mr. Passfield said he felt the habitat related materials should be concerned with the impact of fisheries on the 4 habitat types considered under the project, with less emphasis on the broader range of impacts on a single habitat, such as coral reefs.

4.10 A question was raised on whether there were restrictions on the format of materials produced for awareness raising. Mr. Passfield noted that each country should assess the needs of its own stakeholders and specific situations to decide on appropriate formats for the materials. Comic books and T-shirts were mentioned as examples, which may work with certain target audiences, rather than the standard booklets, posters, pamphlets and CD-ROMs. Mr. Passfield pointed out that a standardised acknowledgement of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project in printed documents was appropriate and that any use of the UNEP, GEF and Project logos should be accompanied by the inclusion of the standard disclaimer found on the inside cover of all meeting reports produced to date.

4.11 Dr. Paul Teng pointed out the importance of engaging the private sector in raising awareness of fisheries problems, and enquired about the strategy of this project for engaging the private sector. Mr. Passfield stated that private sector involvement was encouraged, particularly at the level of the demonstration sites.

4.12 Several participants suggested that it would be appropriate for awareness-raising materials to be also translated into English for regional distribution since the project aimed to address transboundary issues. The meeting also noted that, since national level materials were designed for national distribution, some modification and synthesis would be needed to make the materials appropriate at the regional level.

4.13 Dr. Torell suggested that materials should be designed for specific audiences, as different audiences require different information. When designing materials, the producers need to consider the objectives of the materials, and the concrete messages they would like to convey.

5. REPORTS FROM THE PROJECT CO-ORDINATING UNIT (PCU) REGARDING OVERALL PROGRESS TO DATE

5.1 Status of progress reports, expenditure reports, and budgets for 2003

5.1.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Passfield to introduce this agenda item and document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/4, "*Current status of budgets and reports from the Specialised Executing Agencies in the participating countries*", containing a summary of the current status of budgets and administrative reports, including audit reports, received by the Project Co-ordinating Unit (PCU) from the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) in the participating countries.

5.1.2 Mr. Passfield drew the attention of the meeting to Table 1 in the document. He noted that all countries except Indonesia had received funding for the period of June-December 2003, and January to June 2004. Members were reminded that audit reports for each calendar year were required under UN financial rules. Audit reports have been received from all participating countries for the year 2002. Although March 31 2004 was the deadline for submission of the audit reports for the year 2003, to date, only Vietnam had provided an audit report for year 2003. He took the opportunity to remind focal points that no future funds will be released until audit reports are received.

5.1.3 Mr. Passfield noted further the administrative difficulty of carrying forward large unspent cash balances, and encouraged the focal points to plan and implement activities in a timely manner and hence spend the allocated funding within the agreed budget period. He informed the meeting that unspent money would at this stage remain within the fisheries budget, but activities in the next phase of the project should be carefully designed and executed according to the agreed schedule.

5.2 Status of planned substantive outputs from the national and regional level activities

5.2.1 Mr. Passfield reminded participants that Annex 5 of the third meeting report (UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.3/3) indicated that National Reports, prepared in accordance with the agreed outline, were to have been prepared by the Focal Points by June, 2003, at the latest, after which they were to be sent out for peer review. He informed the meeting that in fact, the last of the draft national reports was received in September 2003, delaying the peer review and subsequent finalisation of the documents. Following the peer review, comments were sent to all focal points, and an agreement was made via electronic communication that finalised versions would be sent to the PCU by March 31, 2004. By early April, final reports were received from all countries with the exception of the Philippines.

5.2.2 The Chairperson invited the focal points from the SEAs to provide a short overview of their reports. In reverse alphabetical order, starting with Vietnam, focal points provided an overview of the present status of their national reports. All countries, except the Philippines, had finalised their reports, and these reports are now being translated. In the case of the Philippines, the final report is expected to be finished within this week. An executive summary only of the Philippines report will be prepared and translated into the national language. All the countries indicated that the national language reports would be published by June 2004.

5.2.3 For the publication of national reports in English, Mr. Passfield informed the meeting that the PCU will take responsibility to edit the English reports, and coordinate the publication of national reports in English for regional distribution. In this regard, Mr. Passfield brought to the attention of members to the fact that the PCU had been approached by the "Sea Around Us" Project concerning information sharing and collaborating with the Regional Working Group on Fisheries. Guidance and

opinions were sought from the meeting regarding such collaboration in producing a regional synthesis of the national reports.

5.2.4 Noting that insufficient information was available to assess the benefits of collaborating with the "Sea Around Us," the meeting agreed to defer discussion on this matter until Agenda item 11, where collaboration with other organisations was to be discussed.

5.2.5 Mr. Passfield then drew the attention of the meeting to the provisions of the MoUs regarding data and information sharing in the project. Annex 5 of the third meeting report also indicates that fisheries data, in the agreed Word document format for input into the regional GIS database, would be submitted by October 2003, and that metadata would be submitted by September 2003. To date, GIS data had only been received from Thailand and the Philippines, and metadata only from the Philippines. Participants were requested to provide an update on progress regarding collection and submission of the data and metadata.

5.2.6 Following discussion between focal points, where various reasons for delays in the submission of the required information were given, focal points agreed the deadlines to submit the GIS data and metadata as follows: Cambodia (mid-June 2004), Vietnam (the week of May 3rd-7th 2004), and Indonesia (Mid-June 2004). Philippines and Thailand also indicated their willingness to submit additional information if required by the SEASTART RC.

6. REVIEW OF THE DEMONSTRATION SITES FROM THE HABITAT COMPONENT

6.1 Demonstration sites approved at the third meeting of the PSC

6.1.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Passfield to introduce the background information for this agenda item. It was recalled that at the third meeting of the RWG-F in Cambodia, members were briefed on the process involved in selecting demonstration sites for the habitat component of the project, and were provided with two background documents. These were UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.2/8, which was a proposal for regional criteria and procedures to be used in ranking and selecting demonstration sites and UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.2/10/amend.1, which provided guidance to the PSC on the nature and types of potential demonstration sites, to be established during the next three years.

6.1.2 The regional working groups for the four habitat sub-components of coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass, and wetlands, have completed the process of clustering and ranking demonstration site proposals that have been developed over the past 9 months. At its 4th meeting in Pattaya, Thailand, in February 2004, the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) considered the results of the process for each of the habitat sites, which were presented to this meeting in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/9. This provided a summary of the procedures and outcome of the ranking of demonstration sites in the habitat sub-components.

6.1.3 The RSTC considered the information and made recommendations to the third meeting of the PSC, held in Manila from 25th to 27th February 2004. The document UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/7, *Recommendations of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee regarding the selection of demonstration sites under the habitat sub-components of the project*, included in the documents for this meeting, contains a summary of the recommendations together with a map showing the location of the sites. The PSC approved the recommendations with minor changes. During the PSC meeting subsequent to the preparation of this map, the proposed Tun Mustapha Marine Park in Sabah was added to the approved list of sites subject to the finalisation of a full proposal.

6.2 Demonstration site proposals in the Gulf of Thailand: their potential for inclusion in a sub-regional system of *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks

6.2.1 Members were asked to refer to the map showing the proposed demonstration sites, contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/7. Mr. Passfield presented the map to the meeting and noted that the demonstration site proposals, as approved by the PSC, are included in a sub-directory on the CD-ROM of meeting documents. He noted further that these proposals had also been circulated by email several weeks in advance of the meeting. Members were invited to consider these sites, with respect to their proximity to known areas of significance to transboundary fish stocks, and

therefore their potential as the starting point for developing a regional system of *refugia* in the Gulf of Thailand.

6.2.2 Mr. Ing Try suggested that meetings should be organized between the habitat and fisheries components in each country, in order for them to work together in the consideration of which of the demonstration sites would be considered as potential *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks.

6.2.3 Although recognising that Busuanga was not located within the Gulf of Thailand, Mr. Barut noted that this mangrove site is rich in both mangrove and coral, and a variety of fisheries were conducted in this area, and suggested that Busuanga could be considered as a site for the *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks in the South China Sea.

6.2.4 Mr. Sri Yono commented that three Indonesia demonstration sites have close association with important fisheries, and could therefore serve as candidates for potential *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks, though they also were not located in the Gulf of Thailand.

6.2.5 Dr. Dao Manh Son informed the meeting that Phu Quoc Island was a very significant location for endangered species such as dugong and sea turtles, and that this area is endowed with a diversity of species associated with coral reef and seagrass. This site, therefore, can be considered as a potential refuge for transboundary fish stocks, and for endangered species, within the Gulf of Thailand.

6.2.6 Mr. Pirochana Saikliang suggested that the most important site among all the Thailand demonstration sites may be the Trat province mangrove site. The endangered species of sea turtles were found in this area, and they also migrated between Cambodia, Vietnam and Thailand, qualifying them as transboundary species.

6.2.7 Following the brief review of the demonstration sites as potential *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks, the Working Group discussed a wide range of issues concerning the purposes and process of selecting demonstration sites, the role of the RWG-F in assisting the habitat component in the demonstration activities, development of national action plans, fragmented management of marine environment protection, and the management regime of the project.

6.2.8 In replying to a question raised by Dr. Kato about the purpose of the demonstration sites, Mr. Passfield clarified that, the goal and purpose of each of the demonstration sites are contained in the demonstration site proposals. Ms Sulan Chen also pointed out that during the fourth round of the Regional Working Group meetings, the purpose of each demonstration sites had been discussed, and that information could be found in the relevant meeting reports.

6.2.9 Dr. Torell noted that socio-economic and ecological perspectives should be balanced in the consideration of demonstration sites. Dr. Kato further noted that fisheries considerations probably had not been emphasised due to the absence of quantifiable fisheries data. Mr. Passfield clarified that socio-economic considerations had been included in the process of selecting and ranking the demonstration sites. Due to the subjectivity of socio-economic indicators, less weight was given to the socio-economic indicators. He pointed out that nearly all demonstration site proposals considered fishing as a factor in habitat degradation, and detailed activities have been proposed to address the threat of destructive fishing practices in some of the proposals.

6.2.10 In response to a question posed by Mr. Somsak concerning the role of the fisheries component in assisting the habitat component to implement demonstration activities, Mr. Passfield suggested more coordination should be undertaken at the national level through National Technical Working Group meetings, and habitat committee meetings, to ensure the input of fisheries considerations in demonstration sites' activities.

6.2.11 It was pointed out by Mr. Somsak that in Thailand many focal points for the habitat sub-components were from universities and academia, some of whom may not have much experience in working with communities and NGOs in the field. The project needs to consider how to cooperate with the communities and NGOs in demonstration sites. Mr. Passfield clarified that, in many cases, local

governments, rather than the project focal points will serve as executing agencies, though the focal point institutions will play a monitoring and advisory role.

6.2.12 Mr. Ing Try pointed out the fragmented management system at the national level, and the inappropriateness of separating the fisheries from the habitat component. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the fragmentary system of environmental management at the national level. Some examples were also provided regarding the consequences of fragmentation of management of the marine environment in some of the countries.

6.2.13 Mr. Passfield presented the management structure of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea project, and pointed out that the design of the project had addressed the integration of different components in an attempt to ensure inputs from different components were brought together at both the national and regional levels. Thailand and Philippines outlined the coordination that had been undertaken at national level through meetings of National Technical Working Groups and Inter-ministerial Committees to ensure the communication and input between components and subcomponents.

6.2.14 A question was raised as to why different national action plans should be developed for each habitat subcomponent and fishery component. Mr. Passfield clarified the overall goal is to produce a single Regional Strategic Action Programme, with inputs from all the habitat, fishery and land-based pollution components.

6.2.15 In conclusion, the meeting considered that demonstration site proposals have not taken enough consideration of fisheries problems, and that the importance of fisheries should be emphasised by habitat demonstration site proposals. Where fisheries related issues were identified as threats to the demonstration site, the RWG-F urged the respective habitat sub-component to ensure the participation of the country's national fisheries committee and focal point in devising appropriate strategies to address the threats, and ensure that the social impacts to fishers of any mitigation measures were adequately considered.

6.3 Public awareness and other activities to address threats from fishing activities identified in the demonstration sites

6.3.1 Mr. Passfield pointed out that a number of the demonstration site proposals had identified fishing activities as significant threats to the sites. Members were therefore asked to consider the site proposals, and recommend specific activities that the fisheries committees in the respective countries might undertake to raise awareness among fishers concerning environmentally damaging practices in the area and to minimise the threats to the sites.

6.3.2 In order to assist the Working Group in this exercise, it was suggested that Mr. Passfield prepare a summary of threats to habitats, identified by the habitat demonstration site proposals. While Mr. Passfield was preparing the summary of threats to habitats, Dr. Dao Manh Son presented to the meeting Vietnam's CD-ROM concerning threats from fisheries in Vietnam (in Vietnamese language).

6.3.3 The meeting reviewed the summary of threats to habitats posed by fishing practices, and considered that the threats should be taken into account in designing public awareness materials and activities in the demonstration sites. It was noted that the impacts of destructive fishing practices should be emphasised, and that alternative livelihoods should be considered to balance sustainable use and development.

6.3.4 It was again emphasised that the fisheries component should have strong inputs to the activities in the demonstration sites. The meeting highlighted, a number of inaccuracies in the demonstration site proposals illustrating the lack of coordination between the fisheries and habitat components in putting together the demonstration site proposals. Based on the revisions suggested by the participants, fishery related threats to the demonstration sites were updated in the table. This table is attached to the report as annex 4.

7. STATUS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR THE TRIAL OF A BLAST FISHING DETECTION DEVICE

7.1 The chairperson invited Mr. Passfield to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/6, the *Proposal for the Trial of a Blast Fishing Detection Device*. It was recalled that at the informal meeting of the Fisheries Working Group held during the Regional Science Conference in February 2004, a revised proposal for testing a blast fishing detection device was presented by Dr. George Woodman, on behalf of the Teng Hoi Conservation Organisation. A copy of this proposal is included in the documents available to this meeting (UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/6). The proposal had been subsequently discussed at the 4th meeting of the RSTC in Pattaya. It was noted that the State of Sabah had expressed interest in being involved in testing the device in the proposed Tun Mustapha Marine Park, and that the trials would benefit from the participation of Malaysia in the fishery component of the project. The RSTC had expressed strong support for this proposal.

7.2 The Working Group expressed concern about testing a blast fishing detection device in Malaysia since Malaysia was still not participating in this component. Members were reminded, during the third meeting of the RWG-F, the group decided to collectively act in convincing Malaysia to participate in the component. Mr. Passfield asked each member to brief the meeting on any actions undertaken regarding the participation of Malaysia. Several members indicated that they had had informal discussions with Malaysian fisheries personnel when the opportunity arose, but had not been able to discover the cause for Malaysia's non-participation, nor offer any suggestions on what approach should be taken to facilitate Malaysia's participation.

7.3 Mr. Passfield informed the meeting that at the 3rd PSC Meeting, held in Manila in February, it was suggested that the trials could also take place under the Coral Reef sub-component, as an activity within the Tun Mustapha Marine Park demonstration site. Dr. Kato noted that existing facilities in Sabah, such as the maritime surveillance capacity, which was a requirement under the blast fishing trials proposal to test the detection device, belong to fisheries department, rather than the Ministry of Environment. This may pose challenges to the implementation of the activity.

7.4 Realising the importance of Malaysia's participation in the fisheries component to ensure the success of the testing of the blast fishing detection device, the Working Group urged the PCU to continue contacting the Malaysian Government. It was noted that there is a new Director General of the Malaysia Fisheries Department, Datu Junaidi Bin Che Ayub. A letter from the PCU to the National Focal Point for Malaysia, copied to Mr. Junaidi, might therefore elicit a more promising response than in the past. It was again suggested that the testing of the blast fishing detection device in Sabah could possibly serve as an entry point for Malaysia's participation in the fisheries component.

7.5 In discussing methods to stop blast fishing, Mr. Geronimo Silvestre suggested that other methods should be considered to prevent blast fishing in the region. He further recommended that an important strategy is "market denial" of fisheries products derived from blast fishing. If governments can pass certain regulations or laws to deny fish caught by blast fishing access to the markets, blast fishing may be more effectively controlled.

8. A SYSTEM OF REFUGIA FOR FISH STOCKS OF TRANSBOUNDARY SIGNIFICANCE IN THE GULF OF THAILAND

8.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Passfield to introduce background information for this Agenda item, referring to document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/7, a compilation of information extracted from the draft Fisheries National Reports relating to areas of importance to transboundary stocks. Mr. Passfield reminded the meeting, that the original project work plan, agreed by the PSC for the fisheries component for the period 2002 to 2007, included the development of national and regional management plans for a regional system of *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks in the Gulf of Thailand.

8.2 Mr. Passfield drew attention to the relevant targets and activities concerning fisheries in the draft SAP, and outlined the major objectives and activities stated in this document. He specifically pointed out, that one objective was to establish a system of *refugia* for fish stocks of transboundary

significance in the Gulf of Thailand. Mr. Passfield then presented maps from national reports, illustrating the identified spawning and nursery grounds.

8.3 Participants were invited to consider these areas, along with those approved as demonstration sites under the habitat component (see agenda item 6.2), and discuss whether these might be incorporated into a sub-regional system of *refugia*, and how this might be facilitated. Each country gave a brief introduction on the spawning and nursery grounds identified in the national reports.

8.4 Mr. Somsak noted that good management measures can ensure sustainable catch of fisheries and it was noted that open access to fisheries resources is a critical factor in fishery depletion. Limited numbers of boats and restricted closed seasons should be enforced to ensure sustainable management of fish stocks. He further note that illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing was a real problem in the region.

8.5 The Working Group discussed possible mechanisms to establish a sub-regional system of *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks in the Gulf of Thailand. Considering management measures already existing in some fishing grounds, Dr. Torell proposed that it would be useful to collect information on the mechanisms that had been used to establish some of these measures in each country, and explore the national processes used in developing them. The Working Group considered Dr. Torell's proposal, and concluded that some of this information was included in national reports.

8.6 The Working Group noted, the importance of the concept of establishing the system of *refugia*. However, they felt more research should be conducted in order to determine the priority areas for spawning and nursery grounds. The Working Group considered it is more critical for the Fisheries Component to collect more data and information, to provide a valid basis for establishing management measures. It was noted that this issue might be further discussed under the agenda item 11 on collaboration with other organisations.

9. PROMOTION OF GUIDELINES FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES

9.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Passfield to introduce background information relating to this agenda item. Mr. Passfield reminded the meeting that, a significant activity in the original work plan was the promotion of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries among the participating countries. The original Code had been prepared by FAO. However, concern among ASEAN member countries that the Code did not fully consider the special situation in developing countries had prompted SEAFDEC to produce the Regional Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries in South East Asia.

9.2 Members were invited to brief the meeting on the status of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries in their respective countries. It was noted that the Code of Conduct has been translated into national languages in Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. In the case of Cambodia, Mr. Ing Try suggested that translation of itself would not promote the Code of Conduct, because local people's understanding of the Code of Conduct is limited. Therefore, there was a need to conduct consultations and workshops to assist grassroots organisations and local communities in Cambodia to promote a simple version of the Code of Conduct.

9.3 SEAFDEC observers were invited to introduce the objectives and activities of SEAFDEC, and discuss possible opportunities for collaboration between SEAFDEC and the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project Fisheries Component regarding the promotion of the code. Dr. Kato briefed the meeting on SEAFDEC's overall activities, and its close collaboration with ASEAN. Dr. Torell informed the meeting that a series of activities are being planned to promote the Guidelines.

9.4 The Working Group welcomed the opportunity to cooperate with SEAFDEC, and took note of two specific areas for future collaboration between the Fisheries component and SEAFDEC, namely in the regional, technical consultation scheduled for June 2004 to develop a plan to promote the code in SEAFDEC member countries, and in the production of awareness-raising materials.

9.5 Mr. Somsak expressed concern about different countries' needs and priorities in promoting different aspects of the Code of Conduct. Questions were also raised about the specific administrative and financial arrangements for the collaborative activities. Therefore, the Working Group urged the PCU to explore more specifically areas of collaboration, and make specific arrangements for future collaborative activities. Mr. Passfield agreed to liaise with SEAFDEC, and would keep the Working Group informed of progress. It was noted that the PCU would endeavour to facilitate the participation of SCS focal points for fisheries in the Technical Consultation, if it were found that they were not on the intended list of participants.

10. REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES CONTRIBUTION TO THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME

10.1 The chairperson invited Mr. Passfield to introduce this Agenda item. Mr. Passfield drew members' attention to the extract from the document, entitled "*Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the South China Sea*" (Draft version 3, 24 February 1999), containing the proposed targets, and national and regional activities designed to meet those targets. He noted that participating Governments had endorsed the draft SAP at the 15th COBSEA meeting in September 2000. He drew the attention of the meeting to the extracted recommendations from the national fisheries reports, contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/8, and invited the meeting to review the appropriate section of the SAP in relation to these recommendations.

10.2 Participants were invited to discuss whether the recommendations were consistent with all or any of the targets and activities mentioned in the Draft Strategic Action Programme. They were also invited to consider what additional inputs the RWG-F could make to the further elaboration of the Strategic Action Programme during the operational phase of the project.

10.3 The Chairperson then invited the focal points to present the management recommendations extracted from their national reports:

Cambodia. The recommendations from Cambodia include:

- Initiate, develop or strengthen research and monitoring programmes;
- Develop environmental education and increase public awareness;
- Management measures, such as marine fisheries sanctuaries (MFS) should be developed and implemented to address over fishing and destructive fishing practices.

Indonesia. Recommended activities at national level should include:

- Carry out collection of detailed fisheries statistical data regarding total catch, catch per unit effort, species diversity and their distribution;
- Conduct special surveys on spawning, feeding and nursery grounds of important transboundary species.

Recommended regional activities include:

- Undertake a general survey concerning transboundary species and endangered species;
- Set up a regional institutional arrangement to implement the management measures on transboundary fish stocks that have been agreed by countries bordering the South China Sea.

Additionally, the National Report provided recommendations to address the problems of habitat degradation and conflicts of interests among fishermen. The involvement of local communities through education and socialisation of the programme was recommended as an important strategy in protecting marine habitats and managing fish stocks.

Vietnam. It was recommended that the following actions should be undertaken:

- Strengthen fisheries research to develop fisheries management;
- Promote responsible fishing technologies and practices;

- Protect and enhance fisheries resources;
- Manage fishing capacity;
- Establish a national fisheries statistical system.

Thailand. Recommended national level actions in Thailand included:

- Fisheries management, collection of data and information, research and training;
- Fisheries classification, improved management policies;
- Alternative livelihood for fishermen;
- Development of appropriate legal frameworks; and
- Development of post-harvesting technologies and good marketing systems.

Recommended regional actions included:

- Establish a regional body for designing regional policies;
- Develop a mechanism to strengthen national management measures;
- Identify regional changes in fisheries;
- Provide scientific support for fisheries development;
- Develop a system of communications, exchange of data and interaction on management;
- Promote compatibility and consensus among countries in sharing the stock assessment studies; and
- Generate adequate funds for implementing the management programme.

Philippines. Recommendations for government follow-up actions include:

- Activities under the Monitoring, Control and Surveillance System should be strongly implemented and executed;
- Implementation of specific projects in fulfilment of commitments and in compliance with various international conventions;
- Collaborative interagency efforts/activities must address and incorporate relevant concerns.

Recommendations for regional collaborative efforts were:

- International waters' concern should address highly migratory and transboundary aquatic species, monitoring and evaluation programmes, and bilateral fisheries cooperation;
- Conduct stock assessment and studies of shared fisheries resources;
- Establish joint fisheries management frameworks;
- Undertake joint management and research for shared stocks of threatened and/or endangered marine species.

10.4 A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the content and wording of the draft SAP. The Working Group noted some general issues regarding the revision and updating of the SAP, as follows:

- The proposed targets were ambitious, and in some cases, impractical, unrealistic and unachievable;
- Proposed activities at national and regional levels were not well-thought out in relation to the achievement of the proposed targets;
- The proposed targets and activities should be more specific, and individual actions should be planned to achieve practical targets;
- Other regional efforts and activities should be taken into consideration in developing and revising the SAP, such as the ASEAN "Resolution and Plan of Action on Sustainable Fisheries for Food Security in the New Millennium";
- Joint management is a useful framework for the participating countries to protect and sustainably manage the transboundary fish stocks;
- Based on recommendations provided by the national reports, consistencies and commonalities related to the SAP were discussed and in general it was agreed, that given some changes, the SAP was still relevant in principle.

10.5 Mr. Silvestre and Dr. Torell proposed some revised targets and possible national/regional activities that might be included in the revised SAP, and the meeting collectively reviewed, revised and agreed on these proposed targets, regional and national activities.

10.6 The proposed targets were:

- By 2010 to have established a regional system of *refugia* for the management of commercial fisheries stocks and conservation of endangered species.
- By 2010 to have prepared and implemented appropriate sustainable management systems at chosen areas.

10.7 The proposed regional level activities were:

- Review the compatibility of existing national policy frameworks against existing international/regional instruments (with emphasis on the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries). This should lead to identification of gaps and directions for improvement of the national policy frameworks to harmonize it with international/regional instruments.
- Designate fish *refugia* in addition to or in conjunction with selected habitat demonstration sites. These *refugia* should be developed by fisheries related agencies to promote their impacts on rehabilitating resources and in achieving the objectives of fisheries management. Build Information and Education Campaign (IEC) and alternative livelihood programs as necessary for affected fishing communities. Draw lessons from these activities/experiences to define protocols for establishment of a wider system of *refugia* for fisheries management purposes.
- Identify fish stocks or areas requiring bilateral, multilateral, and regional management collaboration.
- Identify areas requiring special protection and appropriate fishing technology to reduce impacts on endangered/threatened species in the region.
- Identify, develop and establish joint fisheries management frameworks between and among neighbouring countries sharing and utilising common resources through dialogues and consultations.
- Develop criteria for selection of marine habitats and areas (*refugia*) critical to the maintenance of regionally important fish stocks, particularly those of transboundary importance.
- Identify and prioritise specific areas for future management and protection and develop regional and national action plans to develop a regional system of *refugia* for maintenance of regionally important fish stock.
- In collaboration with other relevant institutions promote the standardisation of fisheries related statistics and information exchange.

10.8 The proposed national level activities were:

- Review destructive fishing gear and practices with the aim of removing and replacing them with more environmentally acceptable fishing gear and practices.
- Review fisheries management systems.
- Review compliance with international and regional fisheries legal instruments.
- Establish *refugia* in areas identified as critical habitats for management of commercial fish stocks and protection of endangered species.
- Implement programmes to provide information on sustainable fishery practices among small and artisanal fishing communities.
- Conduct resources assessment of fishery resources to evaluate the status related to catch efforts and availability of resources in given areas.
- Develop educational and public awareness materials on sustainable fishery practices for dissemination in countries.
- Establish in selected pilot areas sound management systems, which can be tested to determine if they are leading to sustainable exploitation of resources and reduction of conflicts between groups of fishermen.
- Promote the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries through workshops, awareness building, translation into national languages and education of people about the Code. The activities should be consistent with related activities proposed at regional level.

11. POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS

11.1 Mr. Passfield briefed the working group about a meeting between the PCU, FAO and SEAFDEC in Bangkok in March 2004, to explore possible opportunities for collaboration in the implementation of project activities in the future. He noted that, the FAO representative was unfortunately unable to attend this meeting, but noted that FAO had expressed willingness and support for future cooperation with the Fisheries Component in the project.

11.2 The Chairperson invited Dr. Paul Teng to make a presentation on behalf of the World Fish Centre on its current programmes and activities. Dr. Teng introduced the research, training and information dissemination activities of the World Fish Centre in 2004. Currently, the World Fish Centre is implementing four programmes, namely: the biodiversity and genetic resources programme; the coastal and marine resources research programme; the policy research and impact assessment programme; and the freshwater resources research programme. An information and communication programme is also undertaken to support these substantive programmes. Dr. Teng briefed the meeting on the three databases of the World Fish Center, trawlbase, fishbase and reefbase, all of which are potentially valuable to the project.

11.3 Dr. Teng, highlighted four possible areas for future collaboration:

- Preparation of a regional management plan for the maintenance of habitats of importance to transboundary fish stocks in the Gulf of Thailand.
- Establishment of a regional system of marine protected areas for fishery stock conservation and protection of endangered species.
- Assistance in implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (relevant to SE Asia and small-scale fisheries context).
- Stronger links with information system databases.

11.4 Members recalled that the World Fish Centre had participated in the second meeting of the Regional Working Group on Fisheries, held in Phuket, Thailand. It was noted that the Trawlbase project had direct relevance to the work of the RWG for Fisheries in the Gulf of Thailand. The meeting considered that further collaboration with the World Fish Centre would be mutually beneficial.

11.5 The Chairperson invited Dr. Kato to introduce SEAFDEC activities, of relevance to the fisheries component. Dr. Kato stated, that SEAFDEC had a strong interest in promoting the FAO code of conduct for responsible fisheries, and had produced a number of guidelines specific to the situation in this region, which accommodate both national and regional requirements. Dr. Kato noted that collaborating with the UNEP/GEF project provided a good opportunity for SEAFDEC to become involved in the environmental aspects of fisheries problems and expressed his interest in continuing dialogue with the PCU regarding specific future cooperative activities. He informed the meeting of a planned regional technical consultation on human resources development for promoting the Code of Conduct that would be held in June 2004 and noted the possibilities for the participation of the Fishery Component members in this consultation.

11.6 Dr. Pernetta expressed his appreciation to the representatives of the World Fish Centre and SEAFDEC for agreeing to participate in the meeting and their support to the future development of cooperative activities. He further explained that the reason why no regional organisations had been formally involved in previous meetings, was that the participating governments had originally agreed that no international or regional organisations other than UNEP could be involved in the implementation of the project. He informed the meeting that after two years' of implementation of the project, this position had changed and the Project Steering Committee had directed the PCU to explore opportunities for collaboration with regional organisations in implementing some project activities.

11.7 Members expressed support for future cooperation with organisations such as FAO, the World Fish Centre and the SEAFDEC, and encouraged further dialogue with regional organisations regarding the implementation of future activities.

12. REVISION OF THE WORK PLAN AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES

12.1 In the light of the discussion and agreements reached under prior agenda items, the meeting was invited to review and discuss the contents of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/9 "*Proposals for a revised work plan and timetable for the RWG-F with details of outputs and milestones between March 2004 and June 2007.*"

12.2 Dr. Pernetta reminded the meeting that the original MoUs with the Specialised Executing Agencies had been extended to 30th June 2004 to accommodate delays in the completion of preparatory phase activities. He noted that all planned outputs for this phase should be produced by 30th June. He noted that the MoUs for the Operational Phase of the project were before the RWG for their consideration later in the meeting.

12.3 In discussing the translation of national awareness raising materials into English, Ms. Chen noted that, awareness-raising materials produced at the national level for national or local distribution might not be suitable for regional use and she proposed that some regional synthesis based on these awareness materials be prepared collectively by the RWG-F. Mr. Somsak and Dr. Widodo agreed to take the lead in consolidating the materials, with the assistance of the PCU, with the aim of developing awareness-raising materials for regional use and distribution.

12.4 Mr. Passfield reminded the meeting of their previous deferral of consideration of the proposal to collaborate with the "Sea around Us" project in consolidating a regional synthesis of national reports. Members requested that he pursue this possibility and work out details of the planned activities, including various matters such as the purpose, nature, and ownership of the synthesis.

12.5 Members were requested to provide some thoughts and inputs regarding the steps to implement the activities included in the Work Plan overnight, and following their consolidation by the PCU these would be presented to the morning session on 29th April for their consideration and approval.

12.6 In the discussion relating to the workplan and specifically related to the *refugia*, Mr. Sri Yono indicated that Indonesia would be recommending the agreed habitat demonstration sites as *refugia* in Indonesia. Specifically he said that:

- Batu Ampar would be an appropriate refuge site for neritic tunas, small pelagics, and demersal species;
- Belitung was suitable for offshore small pelagics, and
- Trikora was suitable for small pelagics, demersal species, turtles, and marine mammals.

12.7 Mr. Ing Try suggested adding one day to the Regional Technical Consultation on the Code of Conduct, being organised by SEAFDEC for early June, and referred to earlier in the meeting under agenda items 9 and 11. This would allow time to discuss fisheries issues in demonstration site proposals, after the members had considered these over the next few weeks. Dr. Torell indicated that this might be a useful adjunct to the technical consultation, as a training exercise for the benefit of all the participants.

12.8 For the establishment of a subregional system of *refugia*, it was suggested, that the PCU develop a framework together with the RWG-F members to guide the information gathering process on the mechanisms to establish *refugia*. Mr. Passfield agreed to facilitate this process on his return to Bangkok.

12.9 The meeting agreed on the workplan, which is attached as Annex 5 to this report.

12.10 The Chairperson then invited Dr. Pernetta to present Document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/10, entitled "*New Memoranda of Understanding between UNEP and the Specialised Executing Agencies Responsible for Fisheries in the Participating Countries*". Dr. Pernetta outlined the present status of the Memoranda of Understanding and the agreements of the Project Steering Committee regarding activities and budget allocations for the period July 1st 2004 to June 30th 2007. The meeting considered,

discussed and agreed, item by item, the activities to be undertaken by the SEA contained in part 5 of the MoU. This draft MoU is attached as Annex 6 to this report.

12.11 The meeting discussed whether individually each SEA wished to amend their existing MoU or to negotiate a new one. Mr. Ing Try expressed his preference in negotiating a new MoU, Mr. Barut preferred to amend the existing MoU. Indonesia needed to discuss with the PCU regarding the specific situation of Indonesia. Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam indicated that they would need to report to a higher authority on whether to amend the existing MoU or negotiate a new one. The members agreed to discuss the matter with their agencies, and inform the PCU regarding the decisions as soon as possible.

13. DATE AND PLACE OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES

13.1 Members were invited to consider and agree upon the proposed time and place for the fifth meeting of the RWG-F. Members were reminded that the PSC decided at its second meeting that future RWG meetings could only be convened at habitat demonstration sites approved by the PSC.

13.2 Mr. Ing Try suggested that the meeting be held in Phu Quoc in Vietnam. Dr. Dao Manh Son agreed that of the approved demonstration sites in Vietnam, Phu Quoc was the better choice, as there were several demonstration sites there, and hotels were available. The meeting unanimously agreed that Phu Quoc would be the location for the next meeting, and the proposed date of October 11th to 14th, 2004 was acceptable.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 Members were invited to consider and discuss any further items of business. No other business was raised.

15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

15.1 Mr. Ing Try presented the draft report of the meeting for consideration and adoption by the members. The report was duly reviewed, amended, and adopted.

16. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

16.1 The Chairperson invited any final comments from participants. Mr. Passfield expressed his appreciation to all participants for their extremely hard work during what had been a very full agenda. He also thanked the observers from SEAFDEC and World Fish Centre for their participation, and looked forward to future collaboration as discussed during the meeting. He further extended the appreciation of the PCU to Mr. Noel Barut and his staff for the preparations and logistical support provided by the Philippines for the meeting.

16.2 The Chairperson closed the meeting at 3pm on 29th April 2004.

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

Mr. Ing Try, Deputy Director
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
186 Norodom Blvd.
P.O. Box 582
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Tel: (855 23) 219256; (855) 11 957 884
Fax: (855 23) 219256; 427048; 215470
E-mail: tmmp.cam@bigpond.com.kh

Philippines

Mr. Noel Barut, Chief
National Fisheries Research and Development
Institute, Department of Agriculture
940 Kayumanggi, Press Building
Quezon Avenue
Quezon City, Philippines

Tel: (63 2) 373 6336; (63) 917 8385701
Fax: (63 2) 372 5063
E-mail: noel_barut@hotmail.com

Viet Nam

Dr. Dao Manh Son, Vice Director
Research Institute for Marine Fisheries
170 Le Lai Street
Haiphong City, Viet Nam

Tel: (84 31) 837 898, 836 135
Fax: (84 31) 836 812
E-mail: daoson@hn.vnn.vn

Indonesia

Mr. Sri Yono Wirjosuwarno
Head of Monitoring and Evaluation Division
Directorate General of Capture Fisheries
Jln. Harsono RM No.3, Gd. B, Lt VI, Ragunan -
Pasar Minggu, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia

Tel: (62 21) 781 1672
Fax: (62 21) 781 1672
E-mail: dfrmdgf@indosat.net.id;
dgcfsat@indosat.net.id

Thailand

Mr. Pirochana Saikliang, Senior Fishery Biologist
Upper Gulf Marine Fisheries Research and
Development Center
49 Soi Phrarachveriyaporn 16
Phrarachveriyaporn Road
Bangphueng Sub-district, Phrapradeang District
Samut Prakan 10130, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 816 7635-8 ext. 15; 01 843 9887
Fax: (66 2) 816 7634
E-mail: pirochas@fisheries.go.th

Regional Experts

Mr. Somsak Chullasorn
45, Soi Watthana Niwet 4
Sutisan Rd, Huay Kwang
Bangkok 10320, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 277 5015; 06 8923528
Fax: (66 2) 562 0571 (C/- Fisheries)
Email: papasomsak@hotmail.com

Mr. Geronimo T. Silvestre, Senior Policy Specialist
The Fisheries Improved for Sustainable Harvest
Project, 18F OMM-CITRA Building
San Miguel Avenue, Ortigas Center,
Pasig City, Philippines

Tel: (632) 636 0052 to 53
Fax: (632) 634 0327
Email: gtsilvestre@yahoo.com

Dr. Johannes Widodo
Research Institute for Marine Fisheries
Jl. Muara Baru Ujung
Jakarta Utara 14440, Indonesia

Tel: (62 21) 660 2044; (62) 813 1000 6891
Fax: (62 21) 871 4855
E-mail: jwidodo_uw88@cbn.net.id

Project Co-ordinating Unit Member

Mr. Kelvin Passfield, Expert - Fisheries
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
9th Floor, Block A, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

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

Observers

Dr. Yasuhisa Kato, Special Advisor
The SEAFDEC Secretariat
Suraswadi Building
Kasetsart University Campus
P.O. Box 1046, Kasetsart Post Office
Bangkok 10903, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 940 6335; 01 825 5637
Fax: (66 2) 940 6336
E-mail: kato@seafdec.org

Dr. Paul S. Teng
Deputy Director General - Research
WorldFish Center
P.O. Box 500
GPO, 10670 Penang, Malaysia

Tel: (604) 626 1606
Fax: (604) 626 5690
E-mail: p.teng@cgiar.org

Dr. Magnus Torell
The SEAFDEC Secretariat
Suraswadi Building, Kasetsart University Campus
P.O. Box 1046, Kasetsart Post Office
Bangkok 10903, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 940 6326-9; (66 9) 0238294;
(855 12) 663-905
Fax: (66 2) 940 6336
E-mail: magnus@seafdec.org

Mr. Francisco Torres Jr.
National Fisheries Research and Development
Institute, Department of Agriculture
940 Kayumanggi, Press Building
Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines

Tel: (63 2) 373 7451
Fax: (63 2) 372 5063
E-mail: jtorres@nfrdi.da.gov.ph

Project Co-ordinating Unit

Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
9th Floor, Block A, United Nations Building,
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 1886
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094; 281 2428
E-mail: pernetta@un.org

Ms. Sriskun Watanasab, Secretary
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
9th Floor, Block A, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 2608
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094
E-mail: watanasab@un.org

Ms. Sulan Chen, Associate Expert
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
9th Floor, Block A, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (662) 288 2279
Fax: (662) 288 1094
E-mail: chens@un.org

Mr. Vinarin Sour, Intern
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
9th Floor, Block A, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (662) 288 2606; (855 11) 636-596
Fax: (662) 288 1094
E-mail: sour@un.org; vinarin@hotmail.com

ANNEX 2

List of Documents

Discussion documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/1	Provisional agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/2	Provisional annotated agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3	Report of the meeting
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/4	Current status of budgets and reports from the Fisheries Component Specialised Executing Agencies in the participating countries.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/5	Reviews from two regional experts of the drafts of the substantive reports produced by the Specialised Executing Agencies in the participating countries. <i>[Individual reports for each country have been produced with the same document number together with the first letters of the country name appended.]</i>
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/6	Testing of a prototype blast detection system. A proposal to the project steering committee of the UNEP/GEF project: <i>'Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand'</i> .
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/7	Extracts from the national fisheries reports from participating countries relating to areas of significance to transboundary fish stocks.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/8	Extracts from the national fisheries reports from participating countries concerning national and regional management recommendations.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/9	Proposals for a revised, work plan and timetable for the RWG-F with details of outputs and milestones between March 2004 and June 2007.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/10	New Memoranda of Understanding between UNEP and the Specialised Executing Agencies Responsible for Fisheries in the Participating Countries.

Information documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/Inf.1	Provisional list of participants
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/Inf.2	Provisional list of documents
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/Inf.3	Draft programme

The following documents are supplied on CD-ROM and in published form.

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee for the UNEP/GEF Project <i>"Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand"</i> . Report of the meeting. Pattaya, Thailand, 15 th – 17 th 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 <i>"Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand"</i> . Report of the meeting. Manila, Philippines, 25 th – 27 th February 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3.

- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.3/3 Third 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. Siem Reap, Cambodia, 29th April – 2nd May 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.3/3 Third Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Mangroves Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project “*Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand*”. Report of the meeting. Bali, Indonesia, 3rd – 6th March 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.3/3 Third 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. Bali, Indonesia, 4th – 7th March 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.3/3 Third 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. Phuket, Thailand, 7th - 10th July 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.3/3 Third 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. Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia, 24th – 27th March 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.3/3 Third 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. Kinabalu, Malaysia, 25th – 28th March 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/ RWG-SG.3/3 Kota.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.3/3 Third 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. Phuket, Thailand, 16th – 18th June 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Mangroves Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project “*Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand*”. Report of the meeting. Beihai, China, 14th – 17th 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-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/RWG-SG.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Seagrass 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. Guangzhou, China, 29 th November – 2 nd December, 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.4/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.1/3	First Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation for the UNEP/GEF Project “ <i>Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand</i> ”. Report of the meeting. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.1/3 Phuket, Thailand, 11 th – 13 th September 2003.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.1/3	First Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters for the UNEP/GEF Project “ <i>Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand</i> ”. Report of the meeting. Phuket, Thailand, 15 th – 17 th September 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.1/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/9	Summary of the procedures and outcome of the ranking of demonstration sites in the habitat sub-components.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/7	Recommendations of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee regarding the selection of demonstration sites under the habitat sub-components of the project.

The following documents are supplied on CD-ROM.

Demonstration site proposals from the participating countries. *[These documents are not individually numbered, rather they are presented as received with minimal formatting. They have been distributed by e-mail and are contained on the CD-ROM together with all other meeting documents.]*

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 Documents available to the meeting**
 - 2.3 Organisation of work**
- 3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA**
- 4. OPENING REMARKS FROM THE FOCAL POINTS FOR FISHERIES FROM EACH PARTICIPATING COUNTRY**
- 5. REPORTS FROM THE PROJECT CO-ORDINATING UNIT (PCU) REGARDING OVERALL PROGRESS TO DATE**
 - 5.1 Status of progress reports, expenditure reports, and budgets for 2003**
 - 5.2 Status of planned substantive outputs from the national and regional level activities**
- 6. REVIEW OF THE DEMONSTRATION SITES FROM THE HABITAT COMPONENT**
 - 6.1 Demonstration sites approved at the third meeting of the PSC**
 - 6.2 Demonstration site proposals in the Gulf of Thailand: their potential for inclusion in a sub-regional system of *refugia* for transboundary fish stocks**
 - 6.3 Public awareness and other activities to address threats from fishing activities identified in the demonstration sites**
- 7. STATUS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR THE TRIAL OF A BLAST FISHING DETECTION DEVICE**
- 8. A SYSTEM OF *REFUGIA* FOR FISH STOCKS OF TRANSBOUNDARY SIGNIFICANCE IN THE GULF OF THAILAND**
- 9. PROMOTION OF GUIDELINES FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES**
- 10. REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES CONTRIBUTION TO THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME**
- 11. POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS**
- 12. REVISION OF THE WORK PLAN AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES**
- 13. DATE AND PLACE OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES**
- 14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING**
- 16. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

ANNEX 4

Fishery Threats and Issues Identified in the Proposals for Approved Demonstration Sites in the Habitat Component of the Project

Table 1 Fishery threats identified in approved demonstration site proposals for the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand.

	Coral reef	Fisheries threats	Mangrove	Fisheries threats	Seagrass	Fisheries threats	Wetlands	Fisheries threats
Inside Gulf of Thailand								
Cambodia							Koh Kapik	Intensive fishing with modernised gear
Thailand	Koh Chang	Illegal fishing by locals and others, chemicals, illegal nets					Thale Noi	Overfishing, increase in fish predators, eg birds, threatens sustainable fisheries
			Trat Province	Illegal clearing for shrimp and fish ponds, overfishing by commercial fishing boats using push nets, fine mesh nets				
Vietnam	Phu Quoc	Overfishing, Cyanide, blast fishing, light attraction fishing, mangrove conversion for shrimp farming	Balat/Xuan Thuy	Over-exploitation of aquatic products. Destruction of mangrove forests for shrimp farming	Phu Quoc	Destructive fishing methods (explosives, trawling gill net, cyanide etc., trampling, digging)		

Table 1 continued Fishery threats identified in approved demonstration site proposals for the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand.

	Coral reef	Fisheries threats	Mangrove	Fisheries threats	Seagrass	Fisheries threats	Wetlands	Fisheries threats
Outside Gulf of Thailand								
China			Fangcheng-gang	Shrimp farming, Macrobenthos digging	Hepu	Fish fences, trawling, digging for seafood	Shantou	Conversion to shrimp ponds
Indonesia	Belitung	Blast fishing, trawling, trawling	Batu Ampar	Conversion (ponds)	Trikora Beach	No fisheries threats listed		
Malaysia	Tun Mustapha	Blast fishing, trawling, over-exploitation of fisheries						
Philippines			Busuanga	Fishing activities not listed as a threat	Bolinao	Large population leading to overfishing, weak institutional control of fisheries, lack of awareness on fishery related issues	Malampaya	Conversion to fish ponds, blast fishing, fine mesh nets, poison fishing
	Masinloc	Cyanide, blast fishing, non selective fishing, commercial fishing in municipal zones						
Vietnam	Nin Hai	Overfishing, destructive fishing						

ANNEX 6

Draft Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations Environment Programme and the Special Executing Agencies for the Fisheries Component of the UNEP/GEF Project Entitled: “Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN

THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

AND

[INSERT NAME OF THE SEA], IN ITS CAPACITY AS THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCY FOR [Insert Country name] FISHERIES COMPONENT OF THE UNEP/GEF PROJECT ENTITLED:

“REVERSING ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION TRENDS IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA AND GULF OF THAILAND”

*(Ref.: UNEP GEF/SCS/***/MoU 3a)*

1. PARTIES. This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into between the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and [INSERT NAME OF THE SEA], in its capacity as the Specialised Executing Agency (SEA) for [Insert Country name]'s Fisheries component of the UNEP/GEF Project entitled “Reversing environmental degradation trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”.

2. BACKGROUND. The UNEP/GEF Project Brief entitled “Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand” (hereafter called the South China Sea Project) was approved by the GEF Council in November 2000, following its approval by the 15th meeting and special session of COBSEA¹, held in Pattaya, Thailand, 11-12th September 2000. The project brief was endorsed by the GEF Operational Focal Point for [INSERT NAME AND DESIGNATION OF THE FOCAL POINT MINISTRY] on behalf of the Government, on [INSERT DATE].

The operational project document was cleared by the Chief Executive Officer of the Global Environment Facility on December 12th 2001 and signed by UNEP on 21st January 2002. At this time the original Memoranda of Understanding between UNEP and the SEAs, were duly signed by the authorised official of the United Nations Environment Programme and became operational.

The overall goals of the South China Sea Project are: to create an environment at the regional level, in which collaboration and partnership in addressing environmental problems of the South China Sea, between all stakeholders, and at all levels is fostered and encouraged; and to enhance the capacity of the participating governments to integrate environmental considerations into national development planning.

The role of the Specialised Executing Agency (SEA) during the preparatory phase of the project (January 2002 to June 2004) was primarily to provide national level scientific and technical information and data regarding Fisheries. These activities were undertaken within the overall management framework (Figure 1) of the South China Sea Project, and were designed to provide the basic data and information on which the Strategic Action Programme is to be developed.

3. PURPOSE. Under this Memorandum of Understanding the SEA agrees to make available the services of [INSERT NAME OF NATIONAL FOCAL POINT] to act as the Fisheries Focal Point in [Insert Country name]. It is critical to the project that all Fisheries Focal Points from the participating countries function effectively if the overall goals of the project are to be met, hence the SEA agrees to release [INSERT NAME OF NATIONAL FOCAL POINT] for an estimated 30% of his/her (as appropriate) time over the period July 2004 to June 2007 in order to fulfil the tasks and responsibilities detailed in this agreement.

¹ UNEP, 2000. Report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Co-ordinating Body for the Seas of East Asia (COBSEA) on the East Asian Seas Action Plan (Special Session for the UNEP GEF Project in the South China Sea) and Report of the Meeting of National Experts for the UNEP GEF Project in the South China Sea. UNEP(DEC)/EAS IG.11/3.

4. GENERAL CONDITIONS. The United Nations Standard Conditions for Memoranda of Understanding are attached as Annex 1 and form a part of this Memorandum.

5. TASKS BY THE DESIGNATED INSTITUTION. The Fisheries Focal Point on behalf of the SEA, and in close collaboration with the members of the National Fisheries Committee or sub-committee **[insert NC acronym]** and according to the work plan, (Figure 2) agrees to carry out the tasks which will include the following:

- i. The Fisheries Focal Point shall continue to chair and convene meetings of the national committee or sub-committee **[insert NC acronym]** composed of individuals from various organisations and institutions that represent a wide spectrum of expertise and interests in Fisheries 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 Committee²;
- ii. The Fisheries 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 (Figure 3). 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 Fisheries Focal Point will also represent the National Fisheries Committee on the Regional Working Group on Fisheries (**Insert RWG Acronym**)³, to ensure input and exchange at the regional level, between the participating countries. The terms of reference for the (**Insert RWG Acronym**) are contained in the project document and annexed to the report of the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee;
- iv. Ensure that the **[insert NC acronym]** 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;
- v. Ensure that the **[insert NC acronym]** serves as an effective source of scientific and technical advice regarding **[Insert Country name]**'s fisheries systems to the Regional Working Group for **Fisheries** 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 Fisheries and the RSTC, such data and information as may be required from time to time by the Regional Working Group on Fisheries 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 fisheries;
- 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 fisheries;
- 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 fisheries resources and the preparation of regionally applicable valuations

² 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, 110pp. UNEP, Bangkok, Thailand.

³ If the focal point from the SEA happens to be elected as chairperson of the **Insert RWG Acronym**, 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.

that can be used in the cost benefit analysis of actions and non-actions proposed in the Strategic Action Programme;

- xii. Advise, as appropriate the Specialised Executing Agency(ies) in **[Insert Country name]**; regarding educational and awareness materials produced for the benefit of fishing communities in the habitat demonstration sites;
- xiii. Further develop the preliminary national fisheries 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 COBSEA⁴ (November 1998) and prepare concrete proposals concerning actions at the national level, required to meet these targets;
- xv. Based on agreed criteria and the recommendations of the National Reports produced during the Preparatory Phase of the project, prepare and submit proposal(s) to the competent national authorities for the establishment of *refugia* for fish stocks of transboundary and regional significance to be adopted by the governments;
- xvi. 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;
- xvii. The national fisheries action plan and regional Strategic Action programme will be presented to workshops and public meetings as appropriate, for consideration and input from as wide as possible, a cross section of the involved stakeholders; and
- xviii. Facilitate the process of formal government approval of the national action plans;
- xix. Participate, through the Regional Working Group in oversight of the blast fishing trials and where appropriate advise national and local authorities on the practicality of its wider adoption in the participating countries.

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

- i. Provide the financial resources according, to the agreed schedule, detailed in the budget attached as Annex 3 to this memorandum in UNEP operational format, which forms part of this agreement; and
- ii. Provide financial support to enable the National **Fisheries** Focal Point to travel to such regional meetings as may be agreed from time to time.

7. ADMINISTRATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND FUNDS BY SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCY. The **[INSERT NAME OF THE SEA]**, shall co-ordinate project activities and administer UNEP funds in an efficient manner to fulfil the project objectives.

8. BANK ACCOUNT. **[INSERT NAME OF THE SEA]**, shall operate a separate bank account in order to receive and disburse UNEP funds. Any interest earned on the separate bank account shall be recorded and used exclusively for the project.

9. TRANSFER OF PAYMENTS AND RELEASE OF FUNDS. Transfer of payments and release of funds will be undertaken as follows:

⁴ 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.

- i. Monetary contributions by UNEP will be made in US dollars by wire transfer to the following account:

Name of Account Holder:

Account Number:

Name of Bank:

Address of Bank:

Swift Code:

- ii. The initial cash advance will be made upon final signature of this agreement by UNEP.
- iii. Subsequent payments will be made at six monthly intervals upon receipt by the Project Co-ordination Unit of an expenditure statement signed by a duly authorised official (in the format attached as Annex 4 to this MoU), and report (in the format attached as Annex 5 to this MoU) together with a cash advance request in the format attached as Annex 6 to this MoU.
- iv. The Specialised Executing Agency shall report the end year expenditure accounts at 31 December, certified by a duly authorised official, but, in addition, UNEP requires that the end of year expenditure account should be reported in an opinion by a recognized firm of public accountants (for a government, by Government auditors), which shall be dispatched to UNEP by 31 March of the following year. In particular, the auditors should be asked to report whether, in their opinion:
- Proper books of account and records have been maintained;
 - All project expenditures are supported by vouchers and adequate documentation; and
 - Expenditures have been incurred in accordance with the objectives outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding.

10. 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:	001-1-014313
Name of bank:	Chase Manhattan Bank
Address of bank:	New York
ABA number:	021000021

11. CORRESPONDENCE. All correspondence regarding this agreement should be addressed to:

In **[Insert Country name]:**

To:

[Name Address, Fax phone and e-mail of the Focal Point]

Copied to:

[Name Address, Fax phone and e-mail of the National Focal Point for the Project]

And to:

[Name Address, Fax phone and e-mail as required]

In UNEP:

Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director,
South China Sea Project Co-ordination Unit,
United Nations Environmental Programme,
United Nations Building, 9th Floor,
Rajdamnern Avenue,
Bangkok 10200, Thailand.
Tel: (662) 288 1905, 288 1889
Fax: (662) 281 2428

Copied to:

Chief,
Budget and Financial Management Services,
United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)
P.O. Box 30552,
Nairobi, Kenya.
Tel: (254 2) 623 637, 623 632
Fax: (254 2) 623 755, 623 614
E-mail: Edmundo.Ortega@unon.org

12. EFFECTIVE DATE. This 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 agreement a new agreement may be negotiated taking into account the decisions of the Project Steering Committee regarding activities to be executed beyond the duration of the Project Document.

**[Name Address, Fax phone
and e-mail of the Focal Point]**

Chief,
Budget and Financial Management Services,
United Nations Office at Nairobi

Date: _____

Date: _____

Table 1 Extract of the budget for the operational phase of the project as approved by the Project Steering Committee.

		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	PROPOSAL TO PSC-3	PSC Approved 2001	PSC Approved December 2002
		Total Expenditure	Total Expenditure	Commitment	Commitment	Commitment	Commitment			
2000	SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT									
	2200 Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for non-profit SOs)									
	2204 MoU Fisheries Cambodia	13,966.80	18,778.20	18,585.00	5,850.00	5,675.00	1,225.00	64,080.00	51,330.00	51,330.00
	2216 MoU Fisheries Indonesia	14,000.00	4,600.00	35,630.00	5,850.00	5,675.00	1,225.00	66,980.00	51,330.00	51,330.00
	2230 MoU Fisheries Philippines	14,000.00	3,403.74	35,495.78	5,850.00	5,675.00	1,225.00	62,749.52	51,330.00	51,330.00
	2237 MoU Fisheries Thailand	14,000.00	1,027.23	24,241.38	5,850.00	5,675.00	1,225.00	49,118.61	51,330.00	51,330.00
	2244 MoU Fisheries Vietnam	14,000.00	17,000.00	20,330.00	5,850.00	5,675.00	1,225.00	64,080.00	51,330.00	51,330.00
	2251 Develop national & regional management plans for a regional system of refugia (fishery)	3,210.00	0.00	21,790.00	20,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	60,000.00	80,000.00	60,000.00
	2252 Preparation, translation into local languages and dissemination of public awareness materials (fishery)	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	90,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
	2254 Testing of prototype blast fishing detection system (fishery)	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	100,000.00	60,000.00	0.00	210,000.00	210,000.00	210,000.00
	2999 Component Total									
3000	TRAINING COMPONENT									
	3200 Group training (study tours, field trips, workshops, seminars, etc)									
	3210 Training workshop on blast fishing detection system (fishery)	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
	3211 Regional workshops to promote the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
	3300 Meetings/conferences (give title)									
	3307 Regional Working Group Fisheries (RWG-F)	14,951.81	7,194.58	24,000.00	18,000.00	18,000.00	0.00	82,146.39	108,000.00	97,165.00
	3309 Develop regional management plans for a regional system of refugia for transboundary fish stocks	0.00	0.00	24,000.00	24,000.00	0.00	0.00	48,000.00	75,000.00	72,000.00

Table 2 Budget by activity for GEF Fisheries Specialised Executing Agency January 2002 to June 2007(in thousand US dollars for the first two years.)

Fishery component	GEF											Government Co-financing													
	2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007	GEF	2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007	Gov't	
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	GRAND	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	GRAND	
												TOTAL													TOTAL
Establish national fishery committee & convene regular meetings	4.00		4.00		?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	4.53	4.53	4.53	4.53	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Preparation of national overview of the state of fisheries	5.00	5.00	5.00		?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	4.20	4.20	0.70	0.70	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Develop criteria for determining the national, regional and transboundary significance of individual stocks, spawning and nursery areas				5.00	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			3.15	3.15	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Develop and implement awareness programmes among small and artisanal fishing communities in the priority areas			3.00	2.00	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			3.15	3.15	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Develop educational and public awareness materials on sustainable fishery practices & FAO Code of Conduct on Fisheries				8.33	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			3.15	3.15	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Translation into local languages and dissemination of public awareness materials			5.00	5.00	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			1.05	1.05	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Component total	9.00	5.00	17.00	20.33		2.90	3.90	1.95	4.20	1.48	1.23	66.98	8.73	8.73	15.73	15.73	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
GEF Total CASH	Preparatory Phase				51.33	Operational Phase					15.65	66.98													
Government Total In-Kind												Preparatory Phase				48.928	Operational Phase				?	?			