



United Nations
Environment Programme



UNEP/GEF South China Sea
Project



Global Environment
Facility

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

REPORT

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

Koh Chang, Thailand, 13th – 16th September 2004



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

Copyright © 2005, United Nations Environment Programme

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

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

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

DISCLAIMER:

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

Cover Photo: Giant Clam, in coral reserve, Masinloc, Philippines, by Mr. Kelvin Passfield.

For citation purposes this document may be cited as:

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

Table of Contents

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	1
1.1 WELCOME ADDRESS.....	1
1.2 INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS	1
2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING	1
2.1 ELECTION OF OFFICERS.....	1
2.2 DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE TO THE MEETING	2
2.3 ORGANISATION OF WORK	2
3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA.....	2
4. BRIEF REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS ON THE STATUS OF THE PREPARATORY PHASE OUTPUTS DUE 30TH JUNE 2004	2
5. STATUS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS AND EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.....	3
5.1 STATUS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES (SEAs) FROM THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES, FOR THE CORAL REEF SUB-COMPONENT	3
5.2 EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES WITHOUT APPROVED DEMONSTRATION SITES (CAMBODIA AND VIET NAM)	4
5.3 EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES WITH APPROVED DEMONSTRATION SITES	4
6. PROJECT EVALUATION.....	6
6.1 REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT.....	6
6.2 SPECIALLY MANAGED PROJECT REVIEW (SMPR) BY THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION UNIT OF THE GEF SECRETARIAT	6
7. REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND DISCUSSION REGARDING INPUTS TO THE REGIONAL STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME.....	8
7.1 REVIEW OF THE CONTENTS OF THE DRAFT NATIONAL ACTION PLANS WITH A VIEW TO IDENTIFYING COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES.....	8
7.2 DISCUSSION ON THE INPUTS FROM THE CORAL REEF SUB-COMPONENT TO THE REGIONAL STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP), REVIEW OF THE SAP TARGETS AND GOALS AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROCESS OF INTEGRATING NAP AND SAP DEVELOPMENT.....	10
8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES	12
8.1 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DEMONSTRATION SITE ACTIVITIES.....	12
8.2 REGIONAL CO-ORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES IN THE APPROVED DEMONSTRATION SITES	12
9. WORK PLAN OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON CORAL REEFS FOR THE PERIOD 2004-2007	13
10. DATES AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP	13
11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.....	13
12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING	14
13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING	14

List of Annexes

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| ANNEX 1 | List of Participants |
| ANNEX 2 | List of Documents |
| ANNEX 3 | Agenda |
| ANNEX 4 | Tasks of Specialised Executing Agencies Included in the Second Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding |
| ANNEX 5 | Comparative Analysis of Actions in the National Action Plans on Coral Reefs |
| ANNEX 6 | Work Plan (2004-2007) and Schedule of Meetings for 2005 |

Report of the Meeting

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome Address

1.1.1 Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director opened the meeting, at 08:30am on 13 September 2004 and welcomed participants on behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP, Dr. Klaus Töpfer; and the Assistant Executive Director, and Director of the UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Co-ordination, Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaif.

1.1.2 Dr. Pernetta noted with regret that Professor Chou Loke Ming and Professor Ridzwan Abdul Rahman, the two regional experts for the Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs (RWG-CR), were unable to attend the meeting, and further noted that the dates of the fifth meeting had been discussed and considered during the fourth meeting. He drew the attention of members to the fact that since there was only one meeting each year during this phase of the project it was important that members blocked the dates for future meetings once the RWG-CR had decided on them.

1.1.3 The Project Director noted that the agenda for this meeting was extensive including the review of the draft national action plans and consideration of ways to finalise and adopt the national action plans. Key issues during this meeting were to consider ways of making the national action plans comparable across the participating countries; and integrating the national action plans of the four habitat sub-components. As the Project entered the second phase, the RWG-CR should also consider possible mechanisms for sharing experience gained and exchanging information.

1.1.4 The Project Director informed the meeting that, the independent mid-term evaluation was now completed and that the two evaluators had rated project implementation quite highly. Dr. Pernetta congratulated the members of the Working Group for their hard work, which had contributed both to project success to date and the high rating of the evaluation.

1.1.5 Finally the Project Director noted with regret, that Mr. Yihang Jiang, the senior expert member of the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) would leave the project to take the management responsibility for the Yellow Sea Project, funded by the Global Environment Facility. He expressed his appreciation for Mr. Jiang's contributions to the project, and expressed on behalf of the group, his best wishes for Mr. Jiang's future work in the Yellow Sea Project.

1.2 Introduction of Members

1.2.1 There being no new member of the Working Group, it was noted that there was no need to conduct a *tour de table* self-introduction. It was noted however that Mr. Ouk Vibol, from Cambodia would join the group the next day. The List of Participants is attached to this report as Annex 1.

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

2.1 Election of Officers

2.1.1 Members recalled that at the third meeting of the RWG-CR held in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia from 24th to 27th March 2003, Mr. Abdul Khalil bin Abdul Karim, Dr. Vo Si Tuan, and Dr. Thamasak Yeemin were elected as, Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur respectively.

2.1.2 The meeting recollected, that the Rules of Procedure state, the Regional Working Group should elect, from amongst the members, a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur to serve for one year. The rules state further that, officers were eligible for re-election no more than once and the Project Director noted that the extended interval from the time of election of the present officers to this meeting meant that the present officers had served for eighteen months. It was left to the discretion of the RWG-CR to decide whether they were eligible for re-election.

2.1.3 Members were invited to nominate candidates for the officers during the year 2004-2005. Mr. Abdul Khalil bin Abdul Karim nominated and Dr. Porfirio M. Aliño seconded Dr. Thamasak Yeemin as the Chairperson. Dr. Tuan nominated Dr. Aliño as the Vice-Chairperson, and this was seconded by Mr. Khalil. Dr. Suharsono nominated Mr. Kim Sour as Rapporteur to the meeting. There being no objection, Dr. Yeemin, Dr. Aliño and Mr. Kim were duly elected as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and rapporteur for the working group.

2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting

2.2.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to introduce the documentation available to the meeting. The list of documents is contained in Annex 2 of this report.

2.2.2 The Project Director provided an overview of the meeting documents prepared by the PCU. During the meeting, the working group should review the MoU for the second phase of the project, finalise the MoUs, and where possible sign the MoU amendments during the meeting. An important task in the second phase of the project is the development of the national action plans, and the Project Director noted, with compliments to the group, that all countries had submitted the NAPs for the consideration of the Working Group.

2.2.3 The review of these action plans should form the basis for inputs to the updating of the Strategic Action Programme which was included in the documents presented to the meeting.

2.3 Organisation of Work

2.3.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to introduce the draft programme for the conduct of business contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.3. The Project Director briefed the meeting on the proposed administrative arrangements for the meeting. He proposed that the Working Group might wish to set aside some time for MoU amendments, and resolution of some outstanding issues for the finalisation of the demonstration site proposals.

2.3.2 Members inquired about the possibility of undertaking a field trip in Koh Chang and Dr. Yeemin informed the meeting that since it was the rainy season in Koh Chang, it was not a good time to dive or snorkel since the water was very turbid.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

3.1 The Chairperson introduced the Provisional Agenda prepared for the meeting as document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/1, and invited members to consider any amendments or additional items to be included in the proposed agenda.

3.2 There were no amendments or additional items proposed although the meeting noted that the order of the items might need to be changed during the course of discussion. Mr. Khalil proposed, and the meeting agreed, to adopt the agenda, as contained in Annex 3 of this report.

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

4.1 The Chairperson invited the Focal Points for the Coral Reef Sub-component from the participating countries to provide a brief report to the meeting regarding the status of the preparatory phase outputs, including national reports and national action plans. Members' attention was drawn to document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/4 "*Status of the Substantive Reports of the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) for the Coral Reef Sub-component from the Participating Countries*", which provided an overview of the current situation with regard to these outputs from the perspective of the Project Co-ordinating Unit.

4.2 Mr. Kim noted that Cambodia had submitted all the required outputs to the PCU, and that the latest version of the national report on coral reefs had been submitted to the PCU last week. The national action plan on coral reefs had been drafted in combination with seagrass and Mr. Kim noted, a workshop to develop the national action plan had been convened in May 2004 in Sihanoukville, Cambodia, and a draft sent to the PCU. He noted further that this draft would require substantial

revision before its finalisation. He reported that the meta-database and GIS data were submitted in September 2003 to both PCU and SEA START RC. During the fifth meeting of the Regional Working Group on Seagrass, he noted, that the map for seagrass in Cambodia did not include all the data and information provided by Cambodia. He expressed his willingness to resend the meta-database and GIS data, if necessary, to the SEA START RC and the PCU.

4.3 Dr. Suharsono informed the meeting that Indonesia had submitted all the required reports, copies of which were distributed during the meeting. He further informed the meeting that the review of data and information had been combined with the review of economic valuation. Additionally, a map of coral reefs along the Indonesian coast of the South China Sea had been produced. He stated that he would send the CD containing the electronic version of the report, meta-database, and GIS database to the PCU.

4.4 Mr. Khalil noted that following the election in February 2004 in Malaysia, the government had undertaken a restructuring of government agencies. As a result, the Marine Parks Unit had been moved from the Fisheries Department to the newly established Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and that this had caused some disruption to project activities. He noted further that he was remaining in the Department of Fisheries hence this was likely the last meeting that he would attend. Currently, the draft national report is still in the writing stage, but the draft national action plan had been distributed to the Working Group. However, he noted, it was difficult to identify the responsible agencies for various activities under the action plan following the government restructuring.

4.5 Dr. Aliño distributed some printed materials to the Working Group, which included a Philippine Marine Sanctuary Strategy, and various national reports on coral reefs. The RWG-CR complimented Dr. Aliño on the quality of these reports although it was noted that the Philippine Marine Sanctuary Strategy did not include the date of publication.

4.6 Dr. Yeemin informed the meeting that the GIS data, national action plan and the national report would be published at national level and would be available by the end of next month. Furthermore, updating of data and information would be finished by the end of this month.

4.7 Dr. Tuan informed the meeting that Viet Nam had submitted the required outputs to the PCU, and noted that the reason for delays in the publication of the national report in Viet Nam resulted from the plan to publish a book on coral reefs in Vietnamese, which would include data and information on coral reefs, and the summary of site characterisation. A draft national action plan was finished six months ago but the Inter-Ministry Committee and the National Technical Working Group had decided to agree on a uniform format for the national action plans across all sub-components prior to publication.

4.8 Dr. Pernetta requested the committee to provide the PCU with a list of publications and other outputs that had been produced to date. He further proposed to publicise the materials through linking the Specialised Executing Agencies' websites, with the project website thus forming a network of sites that would provide easier access to all materials at the national level.

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

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

5.1.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/5, "*Current status of budgets and reports from the Specialised Executing Agencies in the participating countries*" and draw to the attention of the meeting any outstanding issues or matters requiring the attention of the working group.

5.1.2 The Project Director drew members' attention to Table 1 of the document, which outlined the status of the six-monthly progress reports, expenditure statements, cash advance requests and audit reports from the SEAs, as of the 3rd of September. He noted audit reports for year 2003 had been received by the PCU from five out of the six countries and noted further an improvement in the

timeliness of submission of the six-monthly reports for the period July to December 2003. For the first half of 2004, there was a delay as Malaysia, Philippines, and Viet Nam had not submitted their draft six-monthly reports to the PCU.

5.1.3 The Project Director noted that Table 2 provides details of cash expenditures and balances held by the coral reef SEAs. The Project Director noted, Malaysia, Philippines and Viet Nam had not submitted their real expenditure as of June 2004, which would make the budget revision through June 2007 impossible as the volume of funds available for carry-forward into the next period could not be determined. He further noted the failure of many SEAs to report interest earned from the unspent money held in their bank accounts. In cases where the fund was managed through a government ministry account, he encouraged the SEAs to attempt to secure details of the interest and ensure that it was spent on project activities. In cases where no interest was reported, the SEAs should provide reasons why interest had not been earned.

5.1.4 Table 3 provides information on the calculated in-kind government co-financing for the coral reef sub-component from January 2002 – June 2004, derived from meeting participation at the national level using the agreed cost coefficient of US\$ 70 per person per day. He noted, the project was perhaps the only GEF project that had attempted to track the in-kind contribution from governments. He noted in this regard that during 2003, the GEF Council had adopted a policy that required accounting of co-financing with the same due diligence applied to GEF grant funds. Hence, it was important for the SEAs to deliver the six-monthly reports on time, so that the PCU could monitor and report government co-financing on a regular basis. The Project Director noted, that the coefficient of US\$70/day per person was applied to all people involved in the project regardless of their level, and to all countries since calculations involving assessment based on level for seven different countries would be difficult.

5.1.5 The focal points of Malaysia, Philippines and Viet Nam were invited to clarify the status of the six-monthly reports in each country, and to indicate when these would be submitted. Dr. Aliño indicated he had brought with him the six-monthly reports of the Philippines. Dr. Tuan would send the progress reports of Viet Nam for coral reefs sub-component this month and Mr. Khalil agreed to send the six-monthly reports as soon as possible to the PCU.

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

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

5.3.1 Discussion of these two agenda sub-items was taken together.

5.3.2 The Project Director briefed the meeting on the process of extension of the MOUs between UNEP and the SEAs. For countries without demonstration sites, such as Cambodia and Viet Nam, the MoU amendments might be relatively easier to finalise for signature. Regarding the MoU amendments for countries with demonstration sites funded through the project grant, each country should consider carefully the process and contracting parties to the MoUs. From the perspective of the PCU, it would prefer to contract directly the SEA, which in turn would subcontract local executing agencies at the demonstration sites. This reflected the volume of work associated with processing the regular administrative reports for each MoU, and noted that since the SEAs had gained experience in producing administrative and financial reports it would be better if they remained responsible for their production for the demonstration sites.

5.3.3 In some countries, such as Viet Nam, a tripartite MoU involving three contracting parties, i.e. UNEP, the SEA and the local implementing agency of the demonstration site, would be signed. The demonstration sites funded under the Medium-sized Projects would be handled through completely separate MoUs. In any case, the SEA would retain primary responsibility for national coordination and oversight of the demonstration sites and for the timeliness of administrative reporting.

5.3.4 Dr. Suharsono raised a query regarding the development of Medium-sized Projects (MSPs). The Project Director noted, the development of the MSPs was different from that for demonstration sites funded under the project grant. Ms. Sulan Chen from the PCU was liaising with Mr. Takashi

Otsuka, Task Manager for UNEP/DGEF in reviewing and putting the proposals into the new MSP format. The responsible person for the finalisation of MSPs had promised to give the comments of UNEP/DGEF by next week.

5.3.5 Dr. Aliño informed the meeting, that the demonstration site proposal for the Philippines was proposed to be implemented by local government, and operated fully independently from the SEA. He proposed the cost of the oversight, and financial and administrative reporting provided by the SEA should be funded, and budgets should be allocated for such administrative costs in the proposal of the demonstration site.

5.3.6 The attention of members was drawn to the decisions of the Project Steering Committee with respect to the budgets for national co-ordination under the extension of the MoUs as follows:

8.2.7 Mr. Manuel D. Gerochi stated that he was of the view that the costs for national co-ordination should be switched from the GEF grant funds to government recurrent budgets, as this is an appropriate step towards achieving sustainability of project benefits following expenditure of the GEF grant funds. He proposed, and the meeting agreed with this principle.

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

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

5.3.7 These conditions would apply to all future MoU extensions regardless of whether or not the focal point and Specialised Executing Agency were responsible for a demonstration site.

5.3.8 Members were then invited to review the draft MoU amendment, and discuss the tasks to be completed during the second phase of the project. An extensive discussion ensued and some amendments to the wording of the tasks were proposed and accepted by the group. The revised list of tasks is attached as Annex 4 to this report.

5.3.9 The major points of discussion were as follows.

- **Regarding the new membership of national committee.** Considering the implementation of demonstration sites, Dr. Suharsono noted the necessity to extend membership of the national committees to selected key persons in the implementation of demonstration site. Furthermore, a national subcommittee might also be established for the implementation of the demonstration sites given the geographic separation between the members of the national committee and the demonstration sites.
- **Regional synthesis of data and information.** Dr. Pernetta noted that extensive data and information had been generated at the national level during the first phase of the project, and RWG-CR should consider ways to synthesise the data and information for the benefit of the next generation of marine scientists in the region. One possible way might be to produce an atlas of the South China Sea, based on outputs from all project components.
- **Economic valuation of coral reefs.** Dr. Suharsono noted the importance of economic valuation, and suggested the need for funding to conduct economic valuation on coral reefs. Dr. Pernetta supported this proposal, and informed the meeting that certain actions had already been taken by the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation (RTF-E) including the preparation of guidelines for the conduct of such evaluations. In addition at the demonstration site business plans should be developed to ensure the sustainability of the demonstration sites, including sources of revenues, evaluation of resources and cost of

actions. One of the major tasks for the RTF-E was to develop regionally applicable values, as opposed to nationally derived values in order to determine at a regional level the costs and values of regional co-ordination. The Project Steering Committee would need to review and approve the values once developed for further use in the justification of the Regional Strategic Action Programme.

- **Cost of management or other related actions.** In connection with the discussion on economic valuation of habitats, Dr. Aliño noted the analysis of cost of management or other related actions should be also carefully analysed and based on actual experience.
- The meeting agreed to give full consideration to the **National Biodiversity Action Plan, developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**, to which all the participating countries were Contracting Parties. It was noted that the National Biodiversity Action Plans mainly focused on terrestrial biological diversity, rather than marine biological diversity or marine habitats. The meeting noted the complicated nature of the national networking, and the ineffectiveness of many of the national committees under the CBD.
- **Differing status of the national action plans in the participating countries**, with some nearing the stage of adoption one adopted and others at earlier stages of preparation. In the case of Viet Nam, the action plans were developed for six components and sub-components. Six national action plans would be consolidated into one national action plan for marine habitats in the South China Sea. Dr. Tuan informed the meeting that Viet Nam might approve its national action plan by the end of this year, and made a query regarding future activities after the approval of national action plan. It was proposed and agreed by the meeting to conduct activities to increase public awareness and acceptance of the approved national action plan.

5.3.10 It was proposed that the draft amendments to the existing MoUs contained in UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/6 be finalised and signed during the meeting. Members were invited to note that these amendments serve as bridging documents allowing continuity of fund transfer until such time as the demonstration site documents are finalised, approved by Nairobi, and signed.

5.3.11 To date only the Thailand demonstration site proposal has been extensively reviewed, revised and is in near final form, a copy is provided as document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.4 for information of the focal points responsible for the remaining three demonstration sites.

6. PROJECT EVALUATION

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

6.1.1 The Project Director informed the meeting that the independent mid-term evaluation of the project was conducted from February to July 2004 by two independent evaluators Dr. Mike Bewers and Professor Su Jilan. Their report had been finalised and accepted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Executive Director of UNEP and was in the process of being formally published. A copy of the final Mid-Term Evaluation Report had been lodged on the Project Website and was included in the documents for the meeting. Members' attention was drawn to extracts relating directly to the Coral Reef sub-component and the work of the Regional Working Group. Dr. Pernetta noted the excellent rating that the independent evaluators had given to the project. The meeting accepted the contents of the paragraphs related to coral reefs.

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

6.2.1 The Project Director informed the meeting that the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit in consultation with the GEF Secretariat had selected the UNEP/GEF South China Sea project as one of two International Waters projects from the GEF portfolio, to be included in the Specially Managed Project Review for 2004. He drew the attention of members to document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG.CR.5/Inf.5 entitled "*Specially Managed Project Reviews (SMPR) 2004*" which contained information of the process and purpose of these reviews. The outputs from this process would be reported directly to the GEF Council, hence this process was of significance from the perspective of the profile of the South China Sea project within the GEF, but perhaps more importantly it will provide

country focal points with an opportunity to provide more directly, their views regarding the GEF, in general and this project in particular.

6.2.2 It was noted, that the SMPR has a dual objective: (1) to assess whether projects are implemented in conformity with project objectives and GEF policies, standards and procedures; and (2) to provide lessons on project design and implementation. The scope of the SMPR is to review GEF project conformity with: GEF policies, operational strategy, and programs established by the GEF, especially those issues related to project progress towards achieving results and impacts related to global environmental objectives. GEF project review criteria, relate to: country ownership, sustainability, replicability, stakeholder involvement, monitoring and evaluation, cost-effectiveness, financial plans ("GEF SMPR Review Criteria"); required project response and follow-up to comments by the GEF entities at the design stage; policies of coordination among GEF partner agencies.

6.2.3 The SMPR process involved both desk reviews of documentation and field visits for consultations with participating stakeholders and governments. The evaluators would complete a specifically designed questionnaire, which had been lodged on the project web site together with the implementation plan for the SMPR process in 2004.

6.2.4 The Project Director drew members' attention to the SMPR questionnaire, and requested members to consider the answers to the questionnaire since the team might conduct telephone interviews with the focal points during the period 21st to 25th September 2004. It was noted by the members that many of the questions included in the questionnaire were too difficult to answer, and in some cases, impossible to comprehend.

6.2.5 In the light of the forthcoming SMPR team visit, members were invited to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the project in its implementation of the first phase. The strengths of the project noted by the meeting included:

- **MoUs between UNEP and 45 executing agencies.** UNEP contracts directly the SEAs hence reducing the transaction cost incurred for third parties. This maximises the amount of money that directly to the countries.
- **The South China Sea Project management framework.** This provides a model of regional management arrangements for multi-country international waters projects, that passes has proved to work well.
- **Membership and operation of the Project Steering Committee (PSC).** The Committee members are two representatives only from each country, and no external agencies were members of the committee resulting in a strong sense of country ownership.
- **Transparency of financial management of the project.** All budget allocations and financial reports were made available and easily accessed by the public through the project website.
- **Continuity of representation** on various committees and working groups. It was noted that the continuity of the Regional Working Groups' membership resulted in greater coherence and facilitated co-operation, and ease of joint working compared with other groups where representation was changed for each meeting.
- **Capacity building.** All members of the RWG-CR recognised that they had benefited both technically and in terms of administrative and financial management from involvement in the project.
- **Wide representation in the IMC and NTWG and national committees of the components and sub-components** from various government agencies and institutions, which provided a forum to address cross-cutting issues and resulted in wider recognition of the South China Sea Project, nationally.
- **Division of the project into two phases:** The first phase collected the fundamental data and information, based on which actions were proposed and would be implemented in the second phase, resulting in a more balanced and sound series of decisions regarding future actions.
- **Regional professional networking** established through the various Working Groups under the project.
- **The strong involvement of local authorities** in implementing demonstration sites.

6.2.6 Weaknesses of the project or areas needing improvement, noted by the meeting, were:

- **Malaysia's weak involvement and implementation of the project.**
- **Problems at the national level involving inter-agency confusion and conflict.**
- **Confusion regarding the definition and coverage of the wetlands sub-component, resulting from the broad and ambiguous definition of wetlands in the RAMSAR Convention.**
- **Limited interaction between different Regional Working Groups.**
- **Overlapping of sub-components of the habitat component, which required stronger integration across the sub-components from the RSTC.**
- **Communications between members of the Regional Working Group during the inter-sessional periods of the meeting.**

6.2.7 Regarding the integration of the different habitat sub-components, Dr. Pernetta noted the possibility of convening a second Regional Scientific Conference during Year 2005, using savings from the budget for the first conference and proposed to include Working Group meetings as joint parallel sessions, and plenary sessions focusing on common issues such as legal instruments in the region.

6.2.8 With respect to exchange of information and experience between demonstration sites, the Project Director referred to a later agenda item and he assured the meeting that local government officials should have the opportunity to participate in this exchange programme.

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

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

7.1.1 The Chairperson noted that draft National Action Plans (NAPs) had been received from all participating countries and that a preliminary review of these had been completed by the PCU. The Chairperson invited the Project Director to present document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/7, "*Review of the National Action Plans for coral reefs*". The draft NAPs were provided in documents UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Cam; 8.Ind; 8.Mal; *et sequitor*.

7.1.2 In introducing this agenda item, the Project Director requested members to consider the reasons why past action plans had not resulted in action and noted that, a major failing of many existing action plans was that they lacked specificity regarding the areas where interventions would be undertaken, they failed to identify the specific actions, and the costs and often failed to set realistic or achievable management goals. Therefore, national action plans often represented little more than sets of principles or policies and were rarely operational. He drew examples from other regions where action plans were based on impractical or unrealistic goals and targets.

7.1.3 A concrete and operational national action plan should state clearly "what is to be done, where it will be done, why it is to be done, and when it is to be done, who will do it and how much the costs will be." It should produce enough detail for operational managers regarding what to do, while allowing certain flexibility to the decision-makers for future changes. He further noted the importance of economic justification for the actions in order to convince the governments of the necessity for action. He invited members to present their national action plans and identify common elements and differences between NAPs, and consider their implications for the regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP).

7.1.4 Mr. Kim presented the Cambodian national action plan on coral reefs and seagrass noting there were five main categories of actions, i.e. research and monitoring; national policy, legal and administration framework; public awareness, communication and education; capacity building and sustainability; resource and habitat management. Responsible agencies were identified for each of the actions. He noted the national action plan remain largely without detail.

7.1.5 It was suggested that more specific actions should be identified for the Cambodian national action plan, and activities should be divided into long-term and short-term activities. Furthermore, Cambodia should prioritise actions included in the NAP, and capacity building was proposed as a priority action to be undertaken.

7.1.6 Dr. Suharsono noted that the Indonesian NAP included nine strategies and 34 programmes. The strategies included empowerment of coastal communities; reduction of the rate of coral reef degradation; management of coral reefs based on ecosystem characteristics, utilisation models, their legal status and existing community wisdom; formulation and coordination of programmes of different stakeholders; strengthening capabilities, commitments and capacity to implement the management of coral reefs; community-based management; legal and institutional development; building partnerships among various stakeholders, and commitment to international agreements. He noted the Indonesian NAP stated general principles and actions, and then translated the general principles into specific actions at community and village level. He pointed out the importance of public awareness at the community level.

7.1.7 Dr. Aliño noted that local government codes in the Philippines had empowered the local governments in managing marine resources, including coral reefs. The central government agencies' role mainly focused on the provision of technical support functions. The Philippines NAP outlined vision, mission, goals, principles and approaches to achieve sustainable management of coral reefs. Operationally, the Philippines NAP had three major programmes, i.e. policy, strategic planning and implementation programmes; adaptive management programmes; and sustainable financing.

7.1.8 Dr. Yeemin noted, that Thailand's national action plan included detailed activities to achieve the objectives, and identified responsible agencies for the specific activities, against which budgets had been proposed. There were six major policies and each policy contained measures, strategies, projects and activities, and main responsible agencies. Under the UNEP/GEF project, a National Technical Working Group meeting was convened to review the national action plans produced by Thailand. During the meeting, senior government officials indicated the intention to submit the plan to the Cabinet for adoption by the government at the end of 2004. However, Dr. Yeemin anticipated some delays and considered it would be mostly likely that the government would adopt the NAP by the end of 2005.

7.1.9 That was noted by the meeting that there were no priority sites included in the Thai NAP, which meant each site had equal opportunity to apply for the government funding proposed in the NAP. Noting that government financial sectors would lack information on the priority sites, this would reduce the effectiveness of the NAP, Dr. Pernetta urged Thailand to include prioritisation of sites. An approach to prioritise the sites could follow the regional approach of prioritisation of sites. As the funding resources changed yearly, it was suggested that the Thai NAP should include a section on the process of revising and updating the NAP in the longer term.

7.1.10 A query was raised regarding the ways by which the costs of activities were calculated. In response, Dr. Yeemin noted that the budget was an educated estimate based on prior experience in conducting similar activities to those proposed in the NAP. It was noted there was a need to include a section on the process of revising and updating the NAPs over the longer timeframe after the completion of the first five year period. Under the Thai system the main executing agencies apply for money from the government on the basis of the plan and can sub-contract the supporting agencies. Other funding sources from the private sector, environmental or user fees and other sources of revenue for financial sustainability had not been considered in the plan to date.

7.1.11 Dr. Tuan briefed the meeting regarding the process of drafting the NAP in Viet Nam, and summarised the main content of the coral reef action plan. He informed the meeting that an Inter-ministerial Committee meeting had been convened to agree on the format of six national action plans produced under the framework of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project. During that meeting, it was agreed that all the NAPs would follow a similar format, and would be integrated into a single NAP for coastal marine habitats in Viet Nam that would be approved by the national government at the end of 2004.

7.1.12 There were six objectives in the Viet Nam NAP, including the establishment of a scientific basis for sustainable use and management of priority coral reef areas; establishment of a coral reef

monitoring system and improving management effectiveness; increasing awareness of coral reefs; developing and improving legislation and institutional arrangements for coral reef management; building capacity; establishing management models for sustainable use of coral reefs. Dr. Tuan emphasized the importance of engaging the private sector in implementing the NAP, and indicated that a private tourist agency was in consultation with the Viet Nam coral reefs SEA to discuss the development of eco-tourism in Phu Quoc Island.

7.1.13 Mr. Khalil informed the meeting that management plans existed for marine parks in Malaysia. The draft national action plan outlined the current status of coral reefs, threats to coral reefs, causes of degradation, issues in the conservation of coral reefs, and recommendations for short-term and long-term actions. As for the financial management for the national action plan, Mr. Khalil noted a trust fund for marine parks could be used to manage or finance any activities under the action plan. He took note of the fact that the NAP was still generic in nature, and that it could be adapted to the local and community level.

7.1.14 It was noted by the meeting that the Malaysian NAP mainly focused on coral reefs within the marine parks or potential marine parks, and that there was no reference to existing management plans or action plans for areas outside the parks system.

7.1.15 Following the presentation of each national action plan, the Working Group proceeded to compare the actions proposed in each NAP in order to identify common elements and differences between them, for the purpose of integration at regional level in an up-dated regional SAP. The comparison of the contents of the NAPs is attached as Table 1 of Annex 5 to this report.

7.1.16 Noting the weaknesses of the draft national action plans, the meeting discussed and agreed that each NAP should include the basic elements, proposed in UNEP/GEF/RWG-CR.5/7: goals, objectives; justification for the objectives; targets and necessary actions to meet the targets; timeframes for the actions to be taken; prioritisation of the actions; milestones to measure the success or otherwise of the action plan; Costs of the actions; institutional and other responsibilities for the actions. The revision of the next draft NAPs should be based on the basic elements outlined above. It was further agreed that the revised NAPs should be submitted to the PCU by the end of June 2005, prior to the convening of the sixth meeting of the Working Group. It was further noted that where an action plan had already been submitted for approval then the additional elements could be produced as supporting documentation and did not have to be incorporated into the NAP.

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

7.2.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to introduce the agenda item on the updating of the Regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP). Dr. Pernetta drew members' attention to the regional draft *Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea* prepared in 1998 and published in 1999, a copy of which was provided in the meeting documents. He noted that the targets and goals established in this document were now outdated and it would be necessary to revise the goals, targets, and the contents of the draft SAP in the light of more recent information including *inter alia* that contained in the National Reports and in documents such as the GCRMN *Status of the Coral Reefs of the World*.

7.2.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that a large portion of the SAP was devoted to a discussion of the costs of actions and the benefits from action as opposed to non-action. In terms of justifying the actions he drew members' attention to Table 4.1, valuation of ecosystems derived from the work of Costanza, and noted that the values of mangroves, coral reefs, seagrass, and wetlands were based on studies from outside the region. It was important to conduct economic valuation of ecosystems in the region, and obtain regional values of these ecosystems. The most important activity of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation was to develop regional values that were more applicable to the region.

7.2.3 The original target for coral reefs in the SAP, was to maintain the area of coral reef with more than 50% live cover at the 1998 level. Members were invited to discuss and consider the applicability of the goals, targets and activities at national and regional levels related to coral reefs, taking into account the activities undertaken and experiences gained in the first phase of the project.

7.2.4 It was agreed unanimously that the target was neither realistic, nor was it appropriate. Dr. Suharsono pointed out the maintenance and the recovery of coral reefs largely depended on the locations of the areas. He noted the recovery rate of coral reefs in Indonesia Senayang-Lingga was only 11%, while in Pulau Gunuang Api, Banda Islands in Indonesia, recovery had reached 100% in 7 years, after a complete destruction of the live coral cover.

7.2.5 Dr. Tuan noted that different coral reefs had different percentages of live coral cover and that percentage cover alone was not a good indicator of coral reef health. Similarly the rates of recovery of degraded reefs were highly variable due to such variables as water quality, current patterns, algal growth rates and the nature of the remaining substratum. Therefore it was proposed to examine the rates of change of reef state so that, the SAP targets could be set more realistically.

7.2.6 Dr. Aliño noted that the target of the Philippines was to put 30% of the good reef, which represented 3% of the total area of coral reefs, under certain forms of sustainable management by the year 2015. It was suggested that each country determine the total area of coral reefs, area of coral reefs under current management, and the target of increased area under management, based on the data and information collected in the first phase. Table 1 provides these data for all countries.

Table 1 Total area of coral reefs, area under management, and area for future management along the coastline of the participating countries (km²) bordering the South China Sea.

	Cambodia	Indonesia	Malaysia	Philippines	Thailand	Viet Nam	Total	%
Total Area Km²	28	371.7	3,805.7	4,640	900	1,100	10,845.44	
Area under current Management	0	18.59	2,230	397	540	22	3,207.6	29.58
Target area to be added for management by 2015	8.4	55.8	1,332	76	180	33	1,685.16	15.54%

7.2.7 The meeting debated extensively what would be appropriate targets and noted that over the last ten years the percentage of reefs in Southeast Asian countries that had declined in state from one quartile category to a lower one in the GCRMN system was around 16%. It was noted that setting a target for the total area under management did not represent a target for the state of the reef although it could be assumed that those under management would, depending on the management regime, be more likely to sustain their biological diversity than those that were not under management.

7.2.8 Following a lengthy discussion on realistic targets, based on existing data and information, the Working Group proposed two targets in place of the single original target, as follows:

Target 1: By 2015, at least 50% of the existing area of coral reefs would be put under an appropriate form of sustainable management.

Target 2: By 2015, reduce the regional rate of degradation in live coral cover from the present rate of 16% to 5%.

7.2.9 From Table 1, it was noted that around 45% of the total coral reef area would be under some form of management by 2015 if all national targets were met. The RWG-CR decided to set a higher target (50%) for the consideration of Regional Scientific and Technical Committee and Project Steering Committee.

7.2.10 Following discussion the paragraph relating to the goal of the SAP was amended as follows:

The goal of the Strategic Action Programme is to foster regional cooperation and collaboration in order to halt or slow the current rate of environmental degradation and assist participating states in taking actions within their respective policies, priorities and resources, thereby contributing to human well-being; promotion of the sustainable use of marine living resources; and contributing to the maintenance of globally significant biological diversity, for the benefit of present and future generations.

7.2.11 The Working Group took note of the necessity to revisit the proposed targets and goal during the inter-sessional periods, as more data and information were reviewed and as consideration of national actions to meet the targets were defined and refined. In this context it was noted that the process of developing the SAP and revising the National Action Plans would be an iterative process with both processes feeding into the other. The first step in this process had already been started in reviewing the comparability of the NAPs.

8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES

8.1 Progress Report on the Demonstration Site Activities

8.1.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to provide relevant information on the progress of operationalising the demonstration site activities. Dr. Pernetta reminded the working group that the Project Steering Committee had approved the following demonstration sites for the coral reef sub-component: (i) Mu Koh Chang, Thailand (ii) Belitung, Indonesia, (iii) Masinloc, Philippines, (iv) Tun Mustapha Park, Sabah, (Malaysia).

8.1.2 He noted that the PCU had worked with some of the focal points on the improvement of these proposals and put them into a format and condition to satisfy the requirements of UNEP/GEF before the funding could be provided. Members' attention was drawn to the document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.4, *Mu Koh Chang revised operational project document*. It was noted, that the revised proposal had a very detailed breakdown of budgets, and activities were specified for the purpose of financial management and budgeting and in order to meet the UNEP and GEF requirements.

8.1.3 Dr. Pernetta then presented an example of the process of revising a proposal using the mangrove demonstration site in Trat, Thailand. He illustrated to the meeting the process of analysing the proposal by aligning in a single spreadsheet, goals, components, and activities taken from the proposal. He urged the SEAs to make efforts to work on the proposals' activities to ensure they were synchronous with the goals and budgets.

8.1.4 Ms. Sulan Chen also presented an initial analysis of the Philippines proposal in Masinloc, and it was noted in the meeting that the activities were not well specified or organised, and some were not eligible for GEF funding. It was agreed that the PCU members would work with the focal points individually to review these proposals.

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

8.2.1 Regarding the co-ordination of regional activities associated with the execution of the demonstration sites the Regional Working Group was reminded that the Project Steering Committee had decided that:

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

8.2.2 This decision is based on the recommendation contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/11 and as amended in Annex 8 of UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3 *"Report of the third meeting of the Project Steering Committee"*. The Chairperson invited Dr. Tuan, the Chairperson of the Project Steering Committee, to introduce the document and brief the meeting regarding the decisions made by the PSC on regional coordination, exchange of experiences and personnel between sites.

8.2.3 Dr. Tuan noted that the document outlined three possible modes of exchanging information and experience: 1) exchange of personnel between sites; 2) training courses and/or workshops based on the demonstration sites, and; 3) publication and dissemination of technical reports and/or public awareness materials. Additionally, he noted the document also provided some guidance to those countries with approved demonstration sites on the selection and terms of reference of a site manager and the establishment and functions of a management board.

8.2.4 The meeting expressed concern regarding the requirement of English as local government officials might not speak any English. It was noted by the meeting, that if a qualified candidate commanded a certain level of the language of the country to which he or she would be sent, then the requirement of English might not be necessary. It was further noted that where necessary, a second person should be sent to act as interpreter.

8.2.5 Mr. Khalil suggested the length of the time proposed for on-site training was probably too long, and he suggested perhaps only 2-3 weeks would be adequate. Dr. Pernetta noted that the length of time required would depend on the nature of the programme and the degree to which the exchange personnel were expected to view an entire process. From the experience of the project Intern Programme, six months seemed a reasonable period enabling the individual to acquire a range of skills and experience a wider range of activities than would be possible in a shorter period.

8.2.6 Dr. Aliño noted the importance of considering the purpose of demonstration sites, and the need of personnel training and capacity building. Dr. Pernetta noted that in the personnel exchange programme and the study tours, the SEAs and site managers would first need to work out a programme of activities and suitable timetable which could then be presented to the Regional Working Group. At the same time each site would need to evaluate their training and capacity building needs and see whether such training could be provided at another site. This Working Group will need to decide which programmes and which individuals should be supported in which order.

8.2.7 The meeting agreed the principles and frameworks for regional coordination, exchange of information and personnel outlined in document, and agreed further to consider at the national level the ways to implement the proposed programmes in the National Technical Working Group meetings.

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

9.1 Members' attention was drawn to the proposed work plan for the Regional Working Group for the period 2004 – 2007, contained as Figure 1 of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/5. Based on the discussion and agreements reached under the previous agenda items, and the review of the draft second amendment to the MoUs, the Regional Working Group considered and proposed additional activities for the work plan. The work plan includes the timetable to finalise and print the national reports, preparation, and adoption of the national action plans, and provision of inputs to the Strategic Action Programme. The adopted work plan, along with the schedule of meetings for 2005, is included as Annex 6 of this report.

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

10.1 Members of the Regional Working Group were reminded that according to the decision of the PSC, regional working group meetings are to be organised at the demonstration sites. It was noted further that each regional working group would have only one meeting each year from 2004 to 2007.

10.2 The Chairperson invited members to consider the dates and place of the sixth meeting of the Regional Working Group. Dr. Aliño offered to host the meeting in Masinloc in the Philippines, and Dr. Suharsono also indicated his willingness to host the meeting in Indonesia. However Dr. Suharsono noted that August was not a good month for convening a meeting at Belitung since the strong winds resulted in rough seas making a field visit difficult.

10.3 Following discussion the meeting agreed to accept the invitation from Dr. Aliño. Logistics and transportation of the meeting were briefly discussed and Dr. Aliño indicated his intention to facilitate the successful convening of the meeting. Following discussion it was agreed to convene the meeting from 22nd to 25th August 2005 in Masinloc, Philippines.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Members were invited to raise any other matters that needed to be considered by the Regional Working Group under this agenda item.

11.2 Mr. Khalil informed the meeting that as a consequence of the movement of the Marine Parks Unit to a new Ministry he would no longer serve as the coral reef focal point for Malaysia and a replacement would be formally nominated in due course.

11.3 No further matters were raised.

12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

12.1 The Rapporteur, presented the draft report of the meeting, prepared by the secretariat. The report was considered, amended and adopted as it appears in this document.

13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

13.1 Mr. Khalil proposed on behalf of the members a vote of thanks to the Secretariat for their support to the smooth functioning of the meeting and to Dr. Yeemin for hosting the meeting in Mu Koh Chang.

13.2 The Chairperson invited Dr. Pernetta to say a few words. Dr. Pernetta thanked all members for their hard and constructive work that had enabled the meeting to complete its agenda, and reminded those focal points who had not completed their expenditure reports to submit them as rapidly as possible.

13.3 The Chairperson expressed his appreciation to members for their support and formally closed the meeting at 16:30 on 16th September 2004.

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

Mr. Kim Sour
 Department of Fisheries
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
 186 Norodom Boulevard
 PO Box 582, Phnom Penh
 Cambodia

Tel: (855) 12 942 640
 Fax: (855 23) 210 565
 E-mail: sourkim@hotmail.com

Malaysia

Mr. Abdul Khalil bin Abdul Karim
 Marine Parks Branch
 Department of Fisheries, Malaysia
 Jalan Sultan Salahuddin
 50628 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Tel: (60 3) 2698 2500; DL: 2698 2700
 Fax: (60 3) 2691 3199
 E-mail: abkhalil@hotmail.com;
 abkhalil@yahoo.com

Thailand

Dr. Thamasak Yeemin
 Marine Biodiversity Research Group
 Department of Biology, Faculty of Science
 Ramkhamhaeng University
 Huamark, Bangkok 10240, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 319 5219 ext. 240, 310 8415
 Fax: (66 2) 310 8415
 E-mail: thamsakyeemin@yahoo.com

Indonesia

Dr. Suharsono
 Research Center for Oceanography – LIPI
 Puslit OSEANOGRafi - LIPI
 Pasir Putih 1 Ancol Timur
 Jakarta UTARA
 Indonesia

Tel: (62 21) 64713850 ext. 202; 3143080: 102
 Fax: (62 21) 64711948; 327 958
 E-mail: shar@indo.net.id;
 harsono@coremap.or.id

Philippines

Dr. Porfirio M. Aliño
 Marine Science Institute
 University of the Philippines
 Diliman, Quezon City 1101
 Philippines

Tel: (63 2) 922 3949; 922 3921
 Fax: (63 2) 924 7678
 E-mail: pmalino@upmsi.ph

Viet Nam

Dr. Vo Si Tuan
 Institute of Oceanography
 01 Cau Da Street
 Nha Trang City
 Viet Nam

Tel: (84 58) 590 205; 871134; 0914017058
 Fax: (84 58) 590 034
 E-mail: thuysinh@dng.vnn.vn

Observer

Mr. Ouk Vibol
 Department of Fisheries
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
 186 Norodom Boulevard
 PO Box 582, Phnom Penh
 Cambodia

Tel: (855) 12 836 376
 Fax: (855 23) 210 565
 E-mail: aims1@online.com.kh

Project Co-ordinating Unit Member

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

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

Project Co-ordinating Unit

Ms. Sulan Chen, Associate Expert
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
2nd Floor, Block B, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 2279
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094
E-mail: chens@un.org

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

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

ANNEX 2

List of Documents

Discussion documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/1	Agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/2	Annotated Agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/3	Report of the Meeting
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/4	Status of the Substantive Reports of the Specialised Executing Agencies (SEAs) from the Participating Countries for the Coral Reef Sub-component.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/5	Current Status of Budgets and Reports from the Specialised Executing Agencies in the Participating Countries.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/6	Draft Amendments to the Memoranda of Understanding to Cover the Period July 2004 to June 30 th 2007.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/7	Review of the National Action Plans for Coral Reefs
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Cam	National Action Plan of Cambodia
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Ind	National Action Plan of Indonesia
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Mal	National Action Plan of Malaysia
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Phi	National Action Plan of Philippines
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Tha	National Action Plan of Thailand
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/8.Vie	National Action Plan of Viet Nam
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/9	Extracts from Draft SAP, Feb 1999, Relevant to Habitats

Information documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.1	List of Participants
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.2	List of Documents
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.3	Draft Programme
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.4	Mu Koh Chang revised operational project document
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.5/Inf.5	Specially Managed Project Reviews (SMPR) 2004
J. Michael Bewers and Su Jilan	Mid-Term Evaluation of GEF Project No. GF/2730-02-4340 Entitled <i>"Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends In The South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand"</i> July 2004.

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

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Mangroves Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project <i>"Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand"</i> . Report of the Meeting. Beihai, China, 14 th – 17 th October 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.4/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Coral Reefs Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project <i>"Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand"</i> . Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 27 th - 30 th November 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.4/3.

- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Seagrass Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 29th November – 2nd December 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Wetlands Sub-component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 15th – 18th December 2003 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Pattaya, Thailand, 15th - 17th February 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3 Third Meeting of the Project Steering Committee for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Manila, Philippines, 25th - 27th February 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Land-based Pollution Component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 30th March – 2nd April 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3 Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Fisheries Component for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Manila, Philippines, 26th – 29th April 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.2/3 Second Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Phu Quoc Island, Viet Nam, 3rd - 6th May 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.2/3.
- UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.2/3 Second Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation for the UNEP/GEF Project *“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”*. Report of the Meeting. Siem Reap, Cambodia, 31st May – 2nd June 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.2/3.
- UNEP SCS/SAP Ver. 3 Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea (Draft Version 3, 24 February 1999).

ANNEX 3

Agenda

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

ANNEX 4

Tasks of Specialised Executing Agencies Included in the Second Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding

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

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

- i. The [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] 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 [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] issues including *inter alia* academics, managers, government officials, and marine park managers. The terms of reference for this committee are contained in the project document and annexed to the report of the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee¹;
- ii. The [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] 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 [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] Focal Point will also represent the National [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] Committee on the Regional Working Group on [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] (Insert RWG Acronym)², 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 [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] systems to the Regional Working Group for [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] 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 [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] and the RSTC, such data and information as may be required from time to time by the Regional Working Group on [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] 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 [INSERT COMPONENT NAME];
- viii. Update as required the criteria currently in use at the national level for decision making with respect to future use of [INSERT COMPONENT NAME];
- ix. Update as required the data contained in the Regional GIS database relating to site characterisation;
- 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;

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

² *If the focal point from the SEA happens to be elected as chairperson of the [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.*

- xi. Continue to work with the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation regarding national level economic valuation of [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] resources and the preparation of regionally applicable valuations that can be used in the cost benefit analysis of actions and non-actions proposed in the Strategic Action Programme;
- xii. Assist, through the Regional Working Group on [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] in the preparation of a comprehensive regional synthesis of data and information regarding the distribution, extent and state of [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] ecosystems bordering the South China Sea; together with an ongoing review of threats to sustainable management of such systems for publication in early 2007;
- xiii. Further develop the preliminary national [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] action plan to meet the targets provisionally agreed in the regional SAP; (according to the timetable and workplan attached to this memorandum);
- xiv. Critically review from the national perspective, the targets and goals set by the draft SAP adopted by the XIIIth meeting of COBSEA³ (November 1998) and prepare concrete proposals concerning actions at the national level, required to meet these targets;
- xv. Based on the criteria and ranking processes for the selection of sites of national and regional significance, prepare and submit proposal(s) for the [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] specific site(s) to the government for sequential intervention;
- 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 [INSERT COMPONENT NAME] 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 and the process of increasing public awareness and acceptance of the plans;
- xix. Co-ordinate national involvement in the regional programme for co-ordination, dissemination of experiences, and personnel exchange between sites; and

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

- xx. Undertake to execute the activities at the [INSERT NAME OF SPECIFIC SITE] as approved in the business plan for the [INSERT NAME OF SPECIFIC SITE] as contained in Annex 2 of this document.

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

ANNEX 5

Comparative Analysis of Actions in the National Action Plans on Coral Reefs⁴

	Cambodia	Indonesia	Malaysia	Philippines	Thailand	Viet Nam
1. Research and Monitoring	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.1 Resource assessment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.2 Mapping	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.3 Socio-economic and cultural	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.4 Database management	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Information system (database management, GIS system and web development)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.5 Decision support system	Yes			Yes	Implicit	Yes
Environment impact assessment		Yes	Yes		Yes	
2. National Policy, Legal and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Integration of research programmes with management and policy-making				Yes	Yes	Yes
Monitoring the NAPs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Review and improve existing laws and policies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Integration of government agencies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.2 Stakeholder analysis and involvement	Yes	Implicit		Yes	Yes	Yes
2.3 Community empowerment	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
2.4 Strengthening traditional value and management systems		Yes		Implicit	Implicit	
2.5 Establish an incentive system for good governance				Yes		
Linkage to regional and international obligations				Yes		Yes
International and regional cooperation		Yes		Yes		Yes
3. Public Awareness, Communication and Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Improve government services		Yes		Yes	Yes	
Development, improvement, and dissemination of awareness materials	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

⁴ . "Yes" indicates national action plans contain the actions identified in the first column of the table. "Implicit" means that the actions are not stated directly, but implied in the action plans.

ANNEX 6

Work Plan (2004-2007) and Schedule of Meetings for 2005

Table 1 Work Plan and Time Table for Coral Reef Sub-component to June 30th 2007⁵.

Quarter	2004				2005				2006				2007																			
	3		4		1		2		3		4		1		2		3		4													
	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D		
NATIONAL ACTIVITIES																																
National Committee meetings	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X									
National Technical Working Group			X				X				X				X				X				X									
RWG-CR meetings	X										X								X													
Provide information to RWG-CR and RSTC																																
Maintain national metadata base																																
Publication of National Reports in local language				D			P																									
Regional synthesis of data and information regarding the distribution and status of coral reefs															X																	
Complete second draft of NAP				X																												
Final draft of NAP								X																								
Submission for adoption of Nap (contributing to SAP targets)								Vie																								
				Ind			Mal																									
National public meetings and workshops for NAP				Tha			Cam																									
Update data to regional GIS Database			X																													
Provide guidance to IMC on the Coral Reef component input to SAP																																
Prepare concrete proposals to IMC concerning actions at national level, to meet SAP targets																																

