



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 Wetlands Sub-component**

Ha Long City, Viet Nam, 5th – 8th October 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: White Egrets in Thale Noi non-hunting Area, Wetland Site, Thailand, by Mr. Narong Veeravaitaya.

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 Wetlands. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.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 DOCUMENTS 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	4
5.1 STATUS OF MID-YEAR PROGRESS REPORTS, EXPENDITURE REPORTS, AUDITS AND BUDGETS ...	4
5.2 EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE SPECIALISED EXECUTING AGENCIES	5
6. PROJECT EVALUATION	5
6.1 REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT	5
6.2 SPECIALLY MANAGED PROJECT REVIEW (SMPR) BY THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION UNIT OF THE GEF SECRETARIAT	7
7. DEVELOPMENT OF DEMONSTRATION SITE PROPOSALS FOR THE WETLANDS SUBCOMPONENT.....	7
7.1 UNEP/DGEF COMMENT ON DEMONSTRATION SITE PROPOSALS FOR APPROVED SITES	7
7.2 CONSIDERATION OF ACTIVITIES FOR SHARING EXPERIENCE AND INFORMATION BETWEEN DEMONSTRATION SITES	9
8. REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND CONSIDERATION OF THEIR INPUTS TO THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME FOR THE SOUTH CHINA SEA.....	10
8.1 REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS	10
8.2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF THE TARGETS AND GOALS CONTAINED IN THE FRAMEWORK STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (1999).....	13
9. CONSIDERATION AND REVISION OF THE WORK PLAN AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS FOR THE PERIOD 2004 TO 2007.....	15
10. DATE AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS	15
11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	15
12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING.....	15
13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING	15

List of Annexes

ANNEX 1	List of Participants
ANNEX 2	List of Documents
ANNEX 3	Agenda
ANNEX 4	Medium-Sized Project Proposal Request for Funding
ANNEX 5	Comparative Analysis of National Action Plans for Wetlands
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 The Project Director, Dr. John Pernetta, formally opened the Fifth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Wetlands (RWG-W) at 8:30am on 5th October 2004, and welcomed participants on behalf of Dr. Klaus Töpfer, the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Assistant Executive Director, and Director, Division of Global Environment Facility Co-ordination (UNEP/DGEF).

1.1.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that this was an important meeting as it was the first meeting in the second, operational phase of the project. He noted further that there was a very full agenda, which included the need to finalise the second amendment to the Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), the development of demonstration site proposals, a review of the draft National Action Plans, and their inputs to the Regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP).

1.1.3 Dr. Pernetta expressed the hope that it would be possible to work on the demonstration site proposals reminding participants that all the wetlands demonstration site proposals would be funded through the Medium-sized Project mechanism, which required reformatting and different procedures for approval, compared with the demonstration sites funded through the project grant of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project.

1.1.4 Dr. Pernetta noted that three project reviews and evaluations had been undertaken during 2004, which had imposed an additional burden on the already under-staffed Project Coordinating Unit (PCU). He informed the meeting that Mr. Yihang Jiang, had left the PCU to take up the post of Chief Technical Advisor in the UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project, and informed the meeting that the advertisement for his replacement had been posted on the project website and circulated to all members of the South China Sea network. He invited members to nominate qualified candidates to apply for the current vacancies in the PCU.

1.2 Introduction of Members

1.2.1 Dr. Pernetta noted with regret that the members from Cambodia (Mr. Sok Vong) and Malaysia (Dr. Ebil Bin Yusof) were unable to attend this meeting due to illness. In addition he noted that Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan, the Vietnamese Focal Point, was unable to attend the first day and was represented by Mr. An Thanh Duong, the Vietnamese expert member of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters (RTF-L). Dr. Pernetta welcomed Mr. Takashi Otsuka from UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination in Nairobi and Dr. Do Dinh Sam Vietnamese focal point for mangroves who were participating in the meeting to further develop the Medium Sized Project proposals.

1.2.2 Members were invited to introduce themselves to the meeting and there followed a *tour de table* during which participants gave a brief description of their background and involvement with the project. The List of Participants is attached as Annex 1 in this report.

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

2.1 Election of Officers

2.1.1 The meeting took note of the fact that the Rules of Procedure state that, 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 are eligible for re-election no more than once.

2.1.2 The members noted that Ms. Marlynn M. Mendoza, Mr. Sok Vong, and Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan had been elected as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur at the Third Meeting of the RWG-W held in Bali, Indonesia, 4-7 March 2003. The meeting noted further that since Mr. Vong and Dr. Mai were not present they could not be elected as officers of the meeting. Ms. Mendoza, the

former Chairperson, had served as Chairperson for 19 months, and it was left to the discretion of the Committee to decide whether or not she was eligible for re-election.

2.1.3 Dr. Pernetta invited members to nominate individuals to serve as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur. Mr. Dibyo Sartono proposed that Ms. Mendoza continue to serve as the Chairperson, and this was seconded by, Mr. Narong Veeravaitaya. Ms. Mendoza nominated Mr. Narong as Vice-Chairperson, and Dr. Pernetta seconded the nomination. Dr. Narong nominated Mr. Dibyo Sartono as Rapporteur, and this proposal was seconded by, Ms. Mendoza. There being no objections, Ms. Mendoza, Mr. Narong and Mr. Dibyo were duly elected as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur respectively.

2.2 Documents Available to the Meeting

2.2.1 The Chairperson invited Ms. Sulan Chen to introduce the documentation available to the meeting. Ms. Chen provided a brief overview of the information and discussion documents and the list is attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Organisation of Work

2.3.1 Ms. Chen briefed the participants on the administrative arrangements for the conduct of the meeting, and the proposed organisation of work, included as document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/Inf.3. She noted that formal sessions of the meeting would be conducted in English, and in plenary, although sessional working groups might be formed to review proposals for the approved demonstration sites and the national action plans. She noted that time might also need to be set aside for the finalisation of individual work plans, budgets and amendments to the MoUs.

2.3.2 Ms. Chen noted that Mr. Otsuka, the UNEP/DGEF representative who was responsible for the development of the seven MSP proposals would leave the meeting around 15:00 on 6th October 2004. She suggested therefore that Agenda item 7, the development of demonstration site proposals for the wetlands subcomponent, be moved to follow Agenda item 4, i.e. brief reports from the national focal points on the status of the preparatory phase outputs due 30 June 2004.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

3.1 The Chairperson, Ms. Mendoza introduced the provisional agenda prepared by the PCU as document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/1, and invited members to propose any amendments or additional items for consideration, prior to the adoption of the agenda.

3.2 Members agreed with the earlier suggestion to reschedule agenda item 7 to follow item 4, and the agenda was adopted with no substantive changes. The adopted agenda is attached as Annex 3 to this report.

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

4.1 The Chairperson invited the Focal Points for the wetlands sub-component from the participating countries to provide the meeting with a brief report regarding the status of the preparatory phase outputs, including national reports, meta-database, GIS database and national action plans. Ms. Chen referred to Table 1, page 5 in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.4/3, the meeting report of the fourth meeting of the RWG-W, which outlined the major decisions made by the RWG-W with respect to the production of national outputs expected in the first phase of the project.

4.2 Document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/4, "*Current status of outputs of the Specialised Executing Agencies for Wetlands Sub-component During the First Phase of the Project*", provided an overview of the current status of these outputs from the perspective of the PCU. It should be noted that no further funds would be remitted to focal points until such time as the anticipated outputs from the preparatory phase had been received by the PCU, and further that the due date for final receipt of these outputs was June 30th 2004.

4.3 Professor Chen Guizhu, Focal Point for wetlands in China, informed the meeting that all required reports from the first phase of the project had been produced, and informed the meeting that the national wetlands report had been published in Chinese, and the English version of the national report had been submitted to the PCU for English editing. National GIS data and meta-database had been linked to a designated website of Zhongshan University, China's wetland Specialised Executing Agency (SEA). A draft national action plan for China's wetlands bordering the South China Sea had been completed, and was available to the present meeting for review. The Shantou demonstration site proposal had leveraged RMB 6.63 million in-cash co-financing for the proposed activities in the demonstration site.

4.4 Mr. Dibyo Sartono apologised for the delay in producing the outputs from the wetlands sub-component in Indonesia, and noted that the Indonesian SEA had tried to catch up with the agreed work plan. Indonesia had not submitted the final wetlands report in English to the PCU, but the report was completed and available in Bahasa Indonesia, and was in the process of being translated into English. He informed the meeting that the national action plan had been developed, and submitted to the PCU and noted further that Indonesia had recently completed a national action plan for wetlands in the whole country. He indicated the difficulties in developing national meta-data and GIS data for the wetlands bordering the South China Sea due to lack of available information. He indicated to the meeting that the completed meta-database and GIS data should be linked to the websites of the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Forestry, and he agreed that all outstanding tasks required by the original MoU would be completed by November 2004.

4.5 Mr. Dibyo Sartono noted the impact of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project activities in the region, stating that recently, Wetlands International had organised a conference in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia to finalise a regional wetlands strategy for 2005 to 2015 for Southeast Asia, and that the majority of the regional participants in this conference were members of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea project, and their experience gained in the project had proved valuable during that meeting.

4.6 Mr. Narong informed the meeting that he had recently updated the Thailand meta-database, and submitted it to the SEA START RC. Thailand's wetland national report was submitted to the PCU, and reports on legislation and economic valuation were revised based on the comments provided by the regional experts of the Task Forces on legal matters and economic valuation. Accordingly three reports would be published in Thai language, i.e. the national wetlands report, GIS report (including CD-ROM) and the national action plan. He indicated the national action plan was still in the process of development; hence initial publication would not exceed a hundred copies for review and distribution among major stakeholders and experts.

4.7 He informed the meeting that a website had been developed for the Thailand wetlands sub-component and briefly presented this to the meeting. The website would contain important information for the Thailand wetlands sub-component, including background information on the project, major national reports, GIS data, and meta-database etc.

4.8 Mr. An apologised on behalf of Dr. Mai who was unable to be present during the first day of the meeting and informed the meeting that the Vietnamese national action plan for 2004 to 2010 had already been submitted to the PCU, and was currently in the stage of preparation for publication in local language. The major wetlands national report had been completed, and submitted to the PCU. He indicated almost all the required data and information had been included in the national report. He noted the national meta-database had been completed, and would be transferred to link with the Environment Protection Agency website.

4.9 Ms. Mendoza noted that a draft national report for the Philippines had been submitted to the PCU in July 2004, and the report had been revised based on the comments provided by the PCU. She expected to submit the final version of the report during the course of this meeting. National meta-data were developed, and published in hard copy, and GIS data were posted on the website of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources of the Philippines, although she noted further information should be collected and linked to the website.

4.10 Ms. Mendoza further informed the meeting that a consultation workshop had been convened to consider the draft national action plan, which had been submitted to the PCU in September 2004.

Ms. Mendoza informed the meeting that various consultations had been undertaken for the revision of Malampaya wetlands demonstration site proposal since the last meeting of the RWG-W.

4.11 Noting that some focal points had already produced publications in the national languages under the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project with GEF, UNEP and the project logos, Dr. Pernetta requested members to ensure that they send to the PCU at least one hard copy of all of these publications for the record of the PCU. Ms. Chen further requested the Focal Points to provide their national project website addresses to the PCU so that linkages could be established between the project website and national project related websites.

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

5.1 Status of Mid-year Progress Reports, Expenditure Reports, Audits and Budgets

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

5.1.2 Members' attention was drawn to Table 1, which provided details regarding the reports received covering two periods: July 1st to December 31st 2003 and the period January 1st to June 30th 2004. By 7th September 2004, signed originals of 6 month reports had been received only from Philippines and Thailand, reports were thus outstanding from the five other countries.

5.1.3 Ms. Chen drew to the attention of participants Table 2 which details the under-expenditures of the SEAs in the first phase of the project, and noted that currently the seven SEAs were collectively holding a total amount of US\$100,458. Ms. Chen noted the failure of SEAs to report interest earned from this money held in their accounts, and noted that under the terms of the MoU interest should be reported to the PCU and should be spent on project related activities.

5.1.4 Ms. Chen informed the meeting that the GEF Council had recently adopted a policy paper to strengthen the monitoring of co-financing, and noted that co-financing should be accounted for with the same due diligence as were GEF grant funds. Table 3 in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/5 outlines national co-financing from January 2002 to June 2004, calculated on the basis of the information included in the six-monthly reports and the cost coefficient (US\$70/day) agreed by the Project Steering Committee (PSC). She further noted that the in-kind co-financing of the wetlands sub-component ranked lowest among all components and subcomponents, and had only reached 78% of the original estimates, while the mangrove subcomponent had received about 260% of the originally estimated in-kind co-financing. Ms. Chen further urged members to report all national activities in their six-monthly reports, and to submit these reports to the PCU in a timely manner.

5.1.5 Members with outstanding routine reports were invited to explain the reasons why there were delays in submission, and indicate the timeline for their submission. Indonesia and Viet Nam informed the meeting that their six-monthly reports had been submitted during the meeting, and China would submit the audit report, six-monthly report, expenditure report and cash advance request within a month following the closure of the meeting.

5.1.6 Dr. Pernetta noted, that despite the experiences gained in the first phase of the project, the SEAs continued to delay submission of the routine financial and administrative reports required by UNEP. He further pointed out, that this project was unusual in that all other UNEP projects had to report on a quarterly basis. It was the focal points' obligation to complete and submit the routine reports within 30 days of the closure of the reporting periods.

5.1.7 Dr. Pernetta further reminded the focal points that they were not authorised to spend money on activities not included in the MoU and work plan. Money spent on unauthorised activities should be returned to UNEP.

5.2 Extension of the Memoranda of Understanding for the Specialised Executing Agencies

5.2.1 The Project Director drew members' attention to document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/6. He noted that the original MoU and its first amendment expired on 30th June 2004, hence either a new MoU or a second amendment should be signed to cover the period till 30th June 2007. It was noted that a new MoU would require the closure of the original MoU, which would necessitate repayment of the unspent grant to UNEP by the SEAs. Therefore, it was recommended that a second amendment to the MoU should be signed, where possible.

5.2.2 In the case of the MoUs for demonstration sites, there were also two options for their signature. Where the SEA would be responsible for sub-contracting the local executing agencies the demonstration site activities could be included in the second amendment of the original MoUs. In some cases, for example, in Viet Nam, a tri-partite MoU would be signed, where UNEP would transfer monies directly to the Provincial Government as the local executing agency, but the focal ministry would remain responsible for ensuring financial and administrative reports were received by UNEP.

5.2.3 Dr. Pernetta drew the attention of members to the decision of the PSC that the costs of national coordination would be gradually assumed by the national governments as the project entered the second phase. Members' attention was drawn to paragraphs 8.2.7 and 8.2.8, of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3, 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.*

5.2.4 Accordingly, the GEF grant should account for a decreasing percentage of the overall funding for the national committee meetings. These conditions applied to all future MoU extensions regardless of whether or not the focal point and Specialised Executing Agency were responsible for a demonstration site. It was requested that members should report the government co-financing to the PCU for the purpose of monitoring co-financing.

6. PROJECT EVALUATION

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

6.1.1 Dr. Pernetta noted that the 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 had been lodged on the Project Website and was included in the information documents for this meeting.

6.1.2 Dr. Pernetta noted further that the overall rating of the project is 1, which was the highest possible rating. The project had been considered as highly successful by the independent evaluators.

Members' attention was drawn to the following extracts related directly to the wetlands sub-component and the work of the Regional Working Group:

5.2.1.4. Wetlands

The Wetlands Working Group has also held four meetings. The report of the Third Meeting, similar to the reports of the third meetings of the other habitat sub-component working groups, provides a list of substantive documents relating to the wetlands sub-component that have been submitted up to February 2003. A feature of this list is again the absence of submissions from Malaysia. The report of the Fourth Meeting contains the results of cluster analysis and the basis and results of the independent socio-economic and environmental ranking of candidate wetland sites that forms the basis for proposals to the RSTC regarding the selection of demonstration sites. The report concludes with combined ranking assignments to candidate sites within each cluster based on a comparative weighting of 70:30 between environmental and socio-economic rankings respectively. The report of the Fourth Meeting contains decisions, expressed in tabular form, reached by the working group regarding the structure of the final publications describing national-level preparatory phase outputs. Unfortunately, the meaning and import of this table is difficult to comprehend in the absence of clarifying footnotes¹. Notwithstanding this minor deficiency, the working group has essentially completed all necessary preparatory work in this habitat sub-component of the project in a time and manner consistent with ProDoc expectations.

Section 5.2.5

The intimate inter-dependence of mangrove, coral reef, seagrass and wetland habitats deserves emphasis. Rational management requires a holistic approach encompassing all these ecosystem types and it would therefore be advantageous to initiate an appropriate dialogue towards this end at an early stage in the operational phase of the project. It is clear from the proceedings at the Fourth RSTC Meeting that such dialogue has already commenced. Experience gained in this project may well be useful for new project proposals on related interventions. In this context, the introduction of the GIS through initiatives of the PCU has been a very valuable tool for illustrating the interacting nature of the habitat components and subcomponents.

Section 5.3

In relation to potential wetland demonstration sites, the RSTC noted outstanding issues regarding the quality of data in some areas. Accordingly, the results of the cluster analysis and ranking of wetlands could not be accorded the same degree of confidence as those for the other habitat subcomponents. The RSTC agreed that the data should be checked and verified that any sites for which data were unsubstantiated should be deleted or the data concerned removed before final clustering and ranking were undertaken. In this context, the meeting agreed that of the five demonstration site proposals, Koh Kapik (Cambodia), Balat Estuary (Viet Nam) and Shantou (China) should be accorded first priority. Thale Noi Non-hunting Area (Thailand) and Malampaya Sound (Philippines) were accorded second priority for possible financial support from co-financing sources.

6.1.3 Dr. Pernetta pointed out that the Mid-term evaluators had highlighted the fourth Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) meeting decision that no further wetland proposals should be funded until such time as the RWG-W had cleaned the data and information and conducted another round of cluster analysis and ranking based on accurate data and information with supporting documentation. He noted that the cluster analysis and ranking process of the wetlands sites had not followed the comments and advice provided by the third RSTC meeting. Two problems raised by that meeting had been the exceedingly large size of some wetland areas and the large number of wetland types. The RSTC had noted that the group should only focus on the five types of wetlands, agreed as being within the agreed scope of work.

6.1.4 Dr. Pernetta proposed, and the meeting agreed that he would extract the comments from the meeting documents of the RSTC, and present these for consideration under agenda item 11.

¹ The difficulty of interpreting this table was pointed out to the PCU during the review. The table was expediently and appropriately revised prior to the preparation of the final report of this Mid-term Evaluation.

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

6.2.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to introduce this agenda item. Dr. Pernetta informed the meeting that the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (M&E) in consultation with the GEF Secretariat had originally 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. 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. The SMPR results would be particularly important because this year the GEF M&E Unit only managed to review and visit six projects, and the UNEP/GEF South China Sea project was the only international waters project to be included in this year's SMPR.

6.2.2 The SMPR is a specific GEF M&E modality, which is complementary to the existing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in the GEF. The SMPR had 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 was 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 projects review criteria, specifically: 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 evaluation team for the South China Sea Project consisted of the Chief of the GEF M&E Unit; an International Waters Program Manager from the GEF Secretariat; the Senior Evaluator from the UNDP/GEF, M & E Unit; together with the UNEP GEF Task Manager as an observer. The team had visited three participating countries, i.e. China, Indonesia, and Thailand. In all three countries, meetings of the National Technical Working Group (NTWG) and the Inter-ministerial Committee (IMC) were convened so that the panel had the opportunity to meet with the focal points of all components and sub-components. They also accompanied the Regional Working Group on Mangroves to Trat Province to observe the work of a Regional Working Group and talk to the Provincial authorities responsible for implementation of the Trat demonstration site.

6.2.4 From amongst the members of the RWG-W, Professor Chen, Mr. Narong, and representatives of the Indonesian wetlands sub-component had met with the SMPR team. Ms. Chen accompanied the team on their visit to China. Consulted individuals were asked to brief the meeting regarding interviews conducted by the SMPR. It was noted that the interviews mainly focused on country drivenness, policy impact of the project, countries' benefits gained from project activities, regional cooperation etc. From the discussion and comment, the team was fairly impressed with the execution of the project from country visits and telephone interviews.

6.2.5 Dr. Pernetta noted that, in addition to the SMPR and mid-term evaluation the project had been visited by Professor Laurence Mee one of the evaluators conducting the International Waters Portfolio review. This review was one contribution towards the overall evaluation of the GEF that was required as background to the process of replenishing the GEF. He noted that Professor Mee had highlighted a number of aspects of this project including the management framework and the impacts of co-financing in the case of the China Seagrass component. He indicated that once the review was finalised he would lodge a copy on the project website and ensure that copies were circulated to network members.

7. DEVELOPMENT OF DEMONSTRATION SITE PROPOSALS FOR THE WETLANDS SUBCOMPONENT

7.1 UNEP/DGEF Comment on Demonstration Site Proposals for Approved Sites

7.1.1 The Chairperson invited Ms. Chen to introduce this Agenda item. Ms. Chen noted that, during the third meeting of the PSC, three wetlands sites and one wetland/mangrove site were selected as demonstration sites to be funded under the GEF Medium-sized Project (MSP) mechanism. These

wetland sites were China Shantou, Philippines Malampaya Sound, Thailand Thale Noi, and Viet Nam Xuan Thuy mangrove site combined with the Balat Estuary.

7.1.2 As all the wetlands proposals were originally developed following the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project format, which was different from the new MSP format required by the GEF Secretariat finalising these proposals required extra efforts in comparison with those funded through the project grant. Procedures for the development of these MSPs were clarified by an email sent by the Associate Expert, dated 4th August 2004, with the attachment of the GEF *“Operational Guidance for Preparation and Approval of the Medium-sized Projects”*, duplicated as an information document for this meeting. Currently all the four proposals had been transformed by the UNEP/DGEF and the PCU into the MSP format, with comments inserted. She further noted that the Thailand Thale Noi proposal had nearly completed a specific activity table, required by UNEP.

7.1.3 The Chairperson invited Mr. Takashi Otsuka to brief the meeting regarding the process, requirements, and timelines for finalising the MSPs. Mr. Otsuka briefly introduced the format of the MSP proposal, including summary, country ownership, programme and policy conformity, financing, institutional coordination and support. A simplified format for the MSP proposal is included as Annex 4 to this report.

7.1.4 Mr. Otsuka highlighted some common problems or issues existing in the original proposals and noted that they were generally weak in terms of sustainability and replicability of the project. He further noted all the proposals were developed under the framework of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project, but there was no explicit statement regarding the linkage between the management of the demonstration sites and the management scheme of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project, including the PCU, RWG-W and RSTC and PSC.

7.1.5 Mr. Otsuka stated that sustainability issues could include consideration of three aspects, i.e. financial, institutional, and environmental. Each proposal had to be designed in a way that financial support would be sustained, or institutional arrangements would continue beyond the life of the project, or environmental benefits of the project would be sustained beyond GEF funding. Replication of the project could be ensured through the communication and exchange channels within the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project to ensure regional and local replicability of the demonstration sites' experiences and lessons learnt.

7.1.6 Regarding the relationship between the management of demonstration sites and management scheme of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project, Dr. Pernetta noted a generic framework for the management of the demonstration sites had been developed by the PCU and had been circulated to all the SEAs. The framework had clarified the relationships between demonstration sites, including those funded by the project grant and those funded through the MSP mechanism, and the management of UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project, although the generic framework should be tailored to individual needs and conditions of each country.

7.1.7 Mr. Narong noted that the Thale Noi proposal was designed in such a way as to ensure institutional sustainability through strong community involvement and support.

7.1.8 Dr. Sansanee noted that the demonstration sites provided a good opportunity to apply the approaches designed in the first phase of the project, hence it was important for the design of the projects to integrate relevant results from the preparatory phase, including application of the economic valuation framework and actions to address legislation and legal issues. She further noted, it would be difficult to ensure financial sustainability of a demonstration site, which also depended on individual countries' conditions, hence demonstration site proposals should focus on environmental and Institutional arrangements for sustainability.

7.1.9 Dr. Pernetta noted it was important to recognise that financial sustainability could not be guaranteed but individual projects could be designed to increase community revenues, part of which could subsequently be used to cover the costs of management. This would also further strengthen the feeling of the ownership of the management process, hence increasing the commitment of communities to continue supporting wetlands management.

7.1.10 Ms. Chen noted that a mechanism used by the Chinese government to ensure the financial sustainability of wetlands management in the demonstration sites was to elevate all demonstration sites to the status of national nature reserves. National nature reserves would receive regular funding from central, provincial, and local governments.

7.1.11 Mr. Chen Liwei noted, from his experience in executing GEF projects, that four approaches could be applied to ensure sustainability. First was the policy-making approach to change government policies to ensure the sustainability beyond GEF funding. Second was the communications strategy, which should aim to involve different stakeholders, including potential donors and investors for funding. The third was to initiate some pilot sites or activities to have tangible influences and impacts. The fourth was to undertake training/communication to ensure sustainability of human resources and capacity.

7.1.12 Following the discussion, Ms. Chen presented the procedures used to develop the activity table for the Thale Noi proposal. Ms. Chen drew members' attention to Table 1 and Table 2 of Annex 7 of the UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/7.Th, the project budget by component and activity and by object of expenditure. She noted that the basis for developing these budget tables was the table of detailed activities. During the course of this meeting, members should work with UNEP staff to develop such detailed activity tables for each demonstration site.

7.1.13 Mr. Narong briefed the meeting regarding his experience in developing the activity table for the Thale Noi wetland demonstration site proposal. He pointed out that the causal chain analysis formed the fundamental starting point for the development of activity tables that would address the root causes of wetland degradation or threats.

7.1.14 It was then proposed that the RWG-W be divided into four subgroups to review the four demonstration site proposals, specifically to develop the activity tables. Members were invited to present their subgroups' work on the activity table. The meeting considered and discussed the activity tables developed by each subgroup, and noted these activity tables should be further elaborated after the meeting.

7.1.15 In response to a query regarding the submission of the final demonstration site proposals, Dr. Pernetta informed the meeting that Thailand, Thale Noi wetland site and Indonesia, Trikora Beach seagrass site would be submitted in 2004 and the other five projects would be submitted in 2005. In order to meet the deadlines, final proposals for Thailand, Thale Noi and Indonesia, Trikora Beach should be submitted to UNEP Nairobi no later than the end of October 2004.

7.2 Consideration of Activities for Sharing Experience and Information between Demonstration Sites

7.2.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Pernetta to introduce this agenda item. Dr. Pernetta noted that during the third meeting the PSC had considered and agreed on a framework for regional co-ordination, dissemination of experiences, and personnel exchange between sites. This agreed framework was annexed to the report of that meeting (UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.3/3) as Annex 8. This report was included in the information documents available to this meeting.

7.2.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that Annex 8 laid out a framework for regional coordination of demonstration site activities and a framework for regional dissemination of experiences derived from the demonstration site activities. At the national level, the SEAs and NTWG played a role in coordinating and supervising demonstration site activities. At the regional level, the RWG-W was given responsibility for coordination of activities at all demonstration sites, and the RWG-W should continue to report to the RSTC. At the site level, he noted the document also provided some guidance to those countries with approved demonstration sites on the selection of a site manager and the establishment of a management board.

7.2.3 Three possible modes of exchanging information and experience are outlined in the document: 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. The objectives and procedures were specified in the document.

7.2.4 Dr. Pernetta pointed out that each demonstration site should develop a programme of activities, based on the purposes of demonstration sites. The PCU would circulate the programme of activities to the group through email and post it online. In line with the programme of activities, each country should consider their national needs, and nominate individuals whose participation would provide most benefit to wetland management in their country. All participating countries, no matter whether or not they had demonstration sites, should have equal opportunities to participate in the exchange programme.

7.2.5 The RWG-W was requested to consider and discuss how it might facilitate the sharing of experiences and knowledge gained from the demonstration site activities among all participating countries, and also between components in their own countries, to ensure maximum benefits were derived from the activities throughout the region.

7.2.6 There followed a lengthy discussion on the purposes of the demonstration sites and the content of the programme of activities at each demonstration site. The meeting agreed that each site would develop a programme of activities including what was to be demonstrated, description of the proposed activities, timeframe, type of programme, number of participants and potential candidates for regional exchange of experience and information. It was agreed that, this programme of activities should be developed by, each site prior to the next RSTC meeting in December this year.

7.2.7 Additionally, Dr. Pernetta noted, the project would cooperate with the GEF IW-LEARN project, which was designed to exchange and disseminate experience and lessons learnt between GEF international waters projects. The SEA START RC would serve as a node for the learning network in this region. In cooperation with the SEA START RC and IW-LEARN, the project would aim to develop some training courses for the participating countries, and a Masters Programme on international waters would be established through the Asian University Network.

8. REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND CONSIDERATION OF THEIR INPUTS TO THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME FOR THE SOUTH CHINA SEA

8.1 Review of National Action Plans

8.1.1 The Chairperson invited the Associate Expert to introduce document, UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/8, *“Review of national action plans for wetlands”*, which provided an overview and initial comparison of the national action plans. Ms. Chen noted, that the purpose of the national action plans was to provide a concrete, operational plan for execution at the national level, it should therefore contain clear statements regarding what should be done, where it should be done, why it should be done, when it would be done, who would do it and how much the costs would be. A major failing of many action plans was that they lack specificity regarding the areas where interventions should be undertaken, or failed to identify the specific actions, and the costs and often failed to set realistic or achievable management goals.

8.1.2 For the sake of consistency and comparability of the national action plans (NAPs), it was proposed that the meeting should consider adopting some basic elements to be included in the next draft of the national action plans. These elements included goals, objectives, justification for the objectives; targets and necessary actions; timeframes for the actions; prioritisation of the actions; milestones to measure the success of the action plan; costs of the actions; institutional and other responsibilities for the actions.

8.1.3 Ms. Chen further pointed out five problems with the existing draft NAPs. First, all NAPs contained similar general statements of principle or actions to be done, but there were no specific or operational actions proposed to achieve the goals and objectives. Second, they lacked information on present state/distribution of wetlands in the South China Sea; priority sites in the region; priority threats to these sites; site-specific actions to address the threats; implementing agencies; and cost-benefit analysis to persuade governments and relevant entities to adopt the NAPs. Third, there was a general lack of justification for the defined objectives and actions proposed. Fourth, NAPs did not include quantified measurable targets. These measurable targets should provide the means to evaluate the effectiveness of NAPs. Finally, some NAPs contained general statements on international and regional cooperation as an objective or activity. It was recommended that more specific actions should be included for the promotion of regional cooperation.

8.1.4 Each focal point was invited to present their draft action plans, and brief the meeting on the current status, and future plans for further developing and implementing the action plans. Copies of all the plans received were included in the meeting documents as UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Cam; 9.Chi; 9.Ind *et sequitor*.

8.1.5 Mr. Narong informed the meeting that in Thailand a NTWG meeting had been convened to consider and agree on the content and the format for the NAPs, which had been adopted by all components and sub-components of the project. Thailand may compile the national action plans for all the habitat sub-components and components into one national action plan on coastal resources to be proposed to the cabinet for approval.

8.1.6 In reviewing the Thailand national action plan, Dr. Sansanee pointed out that an analysis of problems and threats existing in the wetlands sites should be included in the next draft of the NAPs, and these should be analysed in terms of how the actions would address these problems and threats in the South China Sea. A question was raised regarding the method of estimating the budgets for the NAPs. Mr. Narong stated the budget for Thailand was based on estimates by major agencies with previous experience in dealing with similar problems. It was further suggested a map of the coverage of the NAP should be included, and Part 3.1 of the Thailand NAP should list some existing policies and legislation and discuss their linkages with the draft NAP.

8.1.7 Professor Chen presented China's national action plan to the meeting and summarised the priority actions on wetland conservation along China's South China Sea coast. These priority actions included: the establishment of natural reserves bordering the South China Sea; to harmonise the wetland conservation system and management; to develop wetland conservation policy and legal system; to conduct research, evaluation and monitoring of ecological resources; to promote public awareness, education and training; to strengthen wetlands research; and to develop an information database system.

8.1.8 Mr. Chen noted that, a China Wetlands Conservation Action Plan (2000-2020) had been approved by, the State Forestry Administration, in 2000. Linkage of this draft action plan with the national wetland action plan should be strengthened. Furthermore he noted it would be difficult to get the central government to approve another national action plan and that it would be easier to adopt action plans at the level of the provincial governments.

8.1.9 Dr. Sansanee pointed out that China's NAP should analyse the inadequacy of the existing Wetlands Conservation Action Plan, in connection with the distribution, current status and threats to the wetlands, so that actions in the draft NAP should address the inadequacy to reverse the threats to the wetlands. It was also noted by the meeting that China's draft NAP lacked specific proposed actions to address the problems. For example, in the first priority action, i.e. to establish natural reserves, there was no proposed number of natural reserves or actions included in the action plan.

8.1.10 In response to various queries regarding the authority to adopt the wetlands action plan developed by China's wetlands sub-component, Professor Chen informed the meeting that further discussions and consultations should be conducted among various stakeholders in the three provinces bordering the South China Sea, Guangdong, Guangxi and Hainan. She stated the action plan should be submitted to the three provincial governments for adoption as sub-action plans to implement the China Wetlands Conservation Action Plan (2000-2020).

8.1.11 Dr. Mai outlined the content of Viet Nam's action plan, and noted that it included an overview of coastal wetlands, principles for wetlands management, objectives and actions and implementation arrangements for the NAP. He informed the meeting that various stakeholder and expert meetings had been convened to discuss the NAP, and seven drafts of the NAP had been developed. He further informed the meeting that Viet Nam's NTWG had decided to integrate the national action plans for all components and sub-components into an overall NAP.

8.1.12 It was noted by the Project Director that Viet Nam had demonstrated strong national coordination. As all the habitat types were closely linked with each other, it was important that all countries discuss the national action plans in the NTWG to ensure harmony and synergy between their contents. Other countries might wish to learn from the integrated approach taken by Viet Nam for the development of an overall action plan.

8.1.13 In response to a question regarding the criteria for the prioritisation of actions included in Viet Nam's action plan, Dr. Mai informed the meeting that the prioritisation was based on experiences gained during previous activities and the causal chain analysis conducted for wetlands degradation undertaken during the first phase of the project.

8.1.14 Mr. Dibyo Sartono informed the meeting that Indonesia had recently completed a national strategy for national coastal resources, based on which the draft NAP was developed under this project. The main actions included in the draft NAP include: establishment and development of a modern database; encouraging public participation; developing policy, law and its enforcement; institutional strengthening; education and public awareness; improving international cooperation and networking; financial aspects of coastal wetlands management; wise use of wetlands; restoration and rehabilitation; and climate change control.

8.1.15 Mr. Dibyo Sartono noted that the action plan contained general statements and principles for wetlands management, and further revisions would be required according to the guideline provided by the PCU in UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/8. He further informed the meeting it was his understanding that the national coordinator would coordinate the national plans for different components/sub-components and integrate them into one action plan for the South China Sea. However, he also foresaw difficulties on the part of the Indonesian government in adopting the NAP, as Indonesia would have a new government in the near future, and it was uncertain how the new government would approve the NAP.

8.1.16 Mr. Dibyo Sartono noted difficulties in identifying and assigning implementing agencies for each action, as there were ambiguous responsibilities and institutional conflicts among various agencies. Ms. Mendoza responded that the Philippines government deals with co-operation among line agencies through inter-ministerial agreements and MoUs to define the responsibilities among the line agencies. Mr. Narong noted that when an action plan was adopted in Thailand, a primary implementing agency was identified and other supporting agencies were assigned responsibility to assist in the implementation of the action plan. The supporting agencies cannot apply for funding directly from the Ministry of Finance, but can apply from the primary implementing agency.

8.1.17 Mr. Dibyo Sartono raised a question regarding the limited capacity of the focal points of the wetlands sub-component to implement the national action plan at the national level. Ms. Mendoza noted that the focal points of the wetlands sub-component should try their best to facilitate and follow up the implementation of these action plans at national level. As the focal points of these project also play an important role in government decision-making, they should use their capacity and influence within the government to push for the implementation within their institution's mandate.

8.1.18 Dr. Sansanee pointed out that the Indonesian wetlands sub-component should have contributed to the development of the new national strategy for national coastal resources. It was not clear from the draft NAP what the key differences were between the draft NAP and the national strategy besides the different geographical coverage. The revised NAP should state clearly what would be the additional benefits of the NAP in relationship to the existing national strategy for national coastal resources.

8.1.19 Ms. Mendoza informed the meeting that a stakeholders' workshop, attended by participants from academia, NGOs and government agencies, was convened to develop the Philippines NAP, although it still remained partially incomplete. The action plan would be submitted to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and relevant local governments for approval. In the draft NAP, four major strategies were proposed, including conservation of wetland biological diversity, maintaining and improving the quality of existing wetland habitats and ecosystems and restoring degraded habitats; strengthening institutional partnerships in the management and protection of wetlands; improving the well-being of the local communities in and around wetlands.

8.1.20 It was noted that the justification for the Philippines NAP (part 4.0) only outlined biological factors, and analysis of socio-economic impacts on wetlands should be also included. It was also noted that the Philippines NAP contained five wetlands priority areas for conservation, but it did not include a brief summary of the national criteria for the selection of these five wetlands sites.

8.1.21 In response to a query regarding the conduct of cost-benefit analyses for the national action plans, Dr. Pernetta pointed out there existed two aspects to cost-benefit analysis. First was to identify what were the most cost-effective actions to address identified problems. The second was to calculate the costs of not taking action in terms of lost value consequent upon continuation of present degradation trends.

8.1.22 Following consideration of the NAPs by each country, the meeting proceeded to review and compare specific actions proposed in the draft NAPs. Dr. Pernetta suggested, that the meeting review the comparative table on the actions contained in mangrove national action plans. Members were requested to check whether the actions listed in the table were included in each action plan, if yes, what was the assigned priority.

8.1.23 The meeting agreed to adopt the table as a framework for comparison of the actions in the national action plans on wetlands, and considered, revised and checked the actions contained in the wetlands action plans. The revised comparative table is included as Annex 5 to this meeting report.

8.1.24 The meeting then considered the recommended content for the next draft of the NAPs, and considered UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5 provided clear guidelines regarding the further development of the NAPs, and adopted the document as the guideline to be followed in revising the NAPs. It was agreed the deadline for the submission of next draft of the NAPs should be during the second quarter of 2005.

8.2 Preliminary Review of the Targets and Goals Contained in the Framework Strategic Action Programme (1999)

8.2.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to introduce this agenda item. Dr. Pernetta drew the attention of members to the document "*Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea (1999)*". Dr. Pernetta noted that, this document was compiled as one of the initial requirements for the GEF funding, and that it had been approved by an intergovernmental meeting of the Co-ordinating Body for the Seas of East Asia, with the condition that the draft should be revised during the implementation of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project.

8.2.2 Dr. Pernetta provided some background information regarding the development of the SAP, and outlined the major targets and goals contained in the document. He noted that a substantial portion of the SAP focused on a cost-benefit analysis of regional interventions using the economic values for ecosystem benefits and services compiled by Costanza *et al.* Members' attention was drawn to Table 4.1, page 31 of the SAP and Dr. Pernetta noted that seagrass had an enormous value for nutrient cycling compared with other habitats, and that it was his opinion that seagrass was overvalued, while other habitats might have been undervalued in this regard. One important task of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation (RTF-E) was to develop regionally applicable valuations of coastal habitats, using empirical data collected in the region and standardised approaches taken by the demonstration sites.

8.2.3 Dr. Pernetta noted that since the document was prepared five years ago, when the available data and information were not as comprehensive as at present it was necessary for each Regional Working Group to evaluate their goals and targets and revise them so that they were achievable and measurable. He suggested that the RWG-W revise the targets and goals for the wetland sub-component based on experience gained during the execution of the project over the past two and a half years. Members were requested to decide whether the target was achievable, or needed to be revised.

8.2.4 It was noted that the original target set in the draft SAP was unrealistic that "By the year 2005, to have management plans for all wetlands, excluding mangroves, in the Region, with emphasis on those in the coastal zones." There followed a lengthy discussion on possibilities to change the target to a measurable and more realistic one.

8.2.5 Dr. Sansanee pointed out that the other sub-components had maps of distribution of their habitats, while the wetlands subcomponent still lacked basic information on the areas and distribution of the five wetlands types defined in this project. A target might be to complete the assessment and inventory of wetland resources. Ms. Chen informed the meeting that, a distribution map of various

wetlands types would be produced by, the SEA START RC hence it was imperative for the focal points to submit data and information to the SEA START RC.

8.2.6 Mr. Narong suggested there were two possible approaches to come up with realistic and measurable targets for the SAP. The first approach was to decide on the number of sites or areas of wetlands with management plans by year 2010, if the original target of "all wetlands sites with management plans" was not realistic. The second approach was to consider developing some models for the sustainable use of wetlands in the region.

8.2.7 As the focal points did not have on hand details of the extent of wetland sites for each wetland type, it was agreed that the RWG-W should proceed, as a starting point, to decide the number of wetland sites with management plans. There followed an extensive discussion regarding the number of sites under management in each country.

8.2.8 The meeting considered that simply stating as a target the number of sites with management plans did not take into account the real environmental impacts or effectiveness of the management plans. Dr. Sansanee proposed to have two other targets for the SAP, i.e. the number of sites and total areas of wetlands sites with certain protection status and establishment of a regional monitoring system for wetlands in the seven participating countries.

8.2.9 The meeting agreed three proposed preliminary targets for the revised SAP, as follows:

1) By year 2010, to set up or update management plans for at least four lagoons, nine estuaries, eight tidal flats, and three peat swamps bordering the South China Sea. Table 1 summarises the number of the wetlands sites in each type to have management plans by 2010.

2) By year 2010, to increase the number of sites (?) or specified areas of wetlands (?) having protection status (non-hunting areas, nature reserves, marine protected areas, RAMSAR sites etc.). It was agreed the number of sites and total areas of the five wetlands types with varying forms of protection at the present time would be submitted by the focal points to the PCU prior to the convening of the next RWG-W meeting.

3) By year 2007, to have a regional wetlands monitoring scheme implemented in the seven participating countries of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project. The meeting agreed to further discuss the type of the monitoring scheme to be implemented through electronic discussions among the members.

Table 1 Preliminary target for the SAP: additional number of sites under management by the year 2010.

	Lagoons	Estuary	Tidal Mud Flats	Peat Swamp	Non-peat Swamp
Cambodia					
China	1	2	3		
Indonesia		1		1	
Malaysia					
Philippines	1	2	1		
Thailand		1	1	1	
Viet Nam	2	3	3	1	
Total	4	9	8	3	

8.2.10 It was noted that in order to further improve the SAP targets, some preliminary information should be provided to the members of the RWG-W for further elaboration of these draft targets. The meeting agreed to provide data on sites' names, wetland types, areas, management plans and management status, and the meeting further agreed to submit these data by mid November 2004. Ms. Mendoza pointed out the importance of communication and discussion to further develop the targets, and urged the members to undertake closer communication during the inter-sessional period.

9. CONSIDERATION AND REVISION OF THE WORK PLAN AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS FOR THE PERIOD 2004 TO 2007

9.1 The Chairperson invited the Associate Expert to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG.5/10, *“Proposed work plan, and timetable for the Regional Working Group on Wetlands to June 2007”*. Ms. Chen noted the major tasks to be undertaken in the next phase of the project included:

- Implementation of approved demonstration sites;
- Development and adoption of national action plans;
- Elaboration of the Regional Strategic Action Programme;
- Promotion of regional coordination, dissemination of experiences and personnel exchange.

9.2 In the light of discussion of earlier agenda items and the activities for the next phase of the project, members were invited to consider the work plan for 2004-2007 and timetable 2004-2005 proposed by the PCU, contained in Table 1 and Table 2 of the document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG.5/10.

9.3 The meeting considered and agreed to adopt a revised work plan for 2004-2007 as contained in Annex 6 of this meeting report.

10. DATE AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS

10.1 Members recalled that the PSC had decided at its second meeting that future RWG meetings could only be convened at demonstration sites. It was noted that meetings in this second phase of the project were planned, to be held once per year. Members were invited to consider and agree upon the proposed time and place for the Sixth Meeting of the RWG-W.

10.2 The RWG-W agreed to convene the Sixth Meeting of the RWG-W on 12-16 September 2005. Regarding the choice of the meeting venue, it was noted that Cambodia had previously indicated its willingness to host the sixth meeting of the RWG-W. As the Cambodian focal point, Mr. Sok Vong, was unable to be present in this meeting, participants decided to consult with Mr. Vong regarding the possibility of hosting the meeting in Cambodia.

10.3 The meeting further agreed that in the event it was not possible to convene the meeting in Cambodia it would be convened in Thailand at the Thale Noi demonstration site.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Members' attention was drawn to the comments of the mid-term evaluation regarding the RSTC comments on the quality of the wetlands data used in the cluster analysis. The Project Director had compiled the comments and data tables made available to the third and fourth meetings of the RSTC into a single document distributed to all members as UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/11.

11.2 The RSTC had noted during its fourth meeting that a number of recommendations previously made had not been followed by the RWG-W in particular regarding the verification of the data, the enormously large size of some sites and the large number of wetland types included in some of the defined sites. Dr. Pernetta reminded members that the RSTC had recommended that no further sites be developed in the wetlands component until these issues had been satisfactorily resolved and a new cluster analysis completed. He further suggested that members might wish to focus attention only on the areas of the five wetland types that fall under the scope of work.

11.3 There followed a general discussion during which several members indicated their desire to up-date the information contained in the table and their willingness to do this as promptly as possible. It was agreed that updated site information and data should be submitted to the PCU and members of the RWG-W no later than November 15, 2004, following which the PCU would conduct another round of cluster analysis and site ranking.

12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

12.1 The Rapporteur, Mr. Dibyo presented the draft report of the meeting, which was considered, amended, and adopted as it appears in this document.

13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

13.1 Following an exchange of courtesies the Chairperson formally closed the meeting at 17:45 on 8th October 2004.

ANNEX 1

List of Participants

Focal Points

People's Republic of China

Professor Chen Guizhu
Institute of Environmental Sciences
Zhongshan University
135 West Xingang Road
Guangzhou 510275
Guangdong Province, China

Tel: (86 20) 8411 2293
Fax: (86 20) 8411 0692
E-mail: chenguizhu@yeah.net

Indonesia

Mr. Dibyo Sartono
Wetland International Indonesia Programme
JL Jend A Yani 53 BOGOR 16161
P.O. Box 254/BOGOR 16002
Indonesia

Tel: (62 251) 312 189
Fax: (62 251) 325 755
E-mail: wi-ip@indo.net.id; Awb@indo.net.id
dibyo@wetlands.or.id

Philippines

Ms. Marlynn M. Mendoza
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau
NAPWNC Compound
North Avenue, Diliman
Quezon City, Philippines 1101

Tel: (632) 925 8950; 9246031; 09 16747 5492
Fax: (632) 924 0109
E-mail: mmmendozapawb@netscape.net;
mmendoza@i-manila.com

Thailand

Mr. Narong Veeravaitaya
Department of Fishery Biology
Faculty of Fisheries, Kasetsart University
50 Paholyothin Road, Bangkok
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 579 5575 ext. 315; 01 741 0024
Fax: (66 2) 940 5016
E-mail: ffnrv@ku.ac.th

Viet Nam

Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan
Viet Nam National University, Hanoi
165 Khuong Trung Street
Thanh Xuan, Hanoi, Viet Nam

Tel: (844) 834 2015; 853 1142; 849 1334 1433
Fax: (844) 834 0724
E-mail: nhuanmt@vnu.edu.vn;
mnhuan@yahoo.com

Mr. Duong Thanh An²
Viet Nam Environmental Protection Agency (VEPA)
67 Nguyen Du Street
Hanoi, Viet Nam

Tel: (844) 822 9728; 851 2934; 849 1353 9591
Fax: (844) 822 3189
E-mail: dtan@nea.gov.vn; ongbavn@yahoo.com

Regional Experts

Dr. Sansanee Choowaew
Programme Director
(Natural Resource Management)
Mahidol University
Faculty of Environment and Resource Studies
Salaya, Nakhonpathom 73170, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 441 5000 ext. 162
Mobile: (66) 01 645 1673
Fax: (66 2) 441 9509
E-mail: enschw@mucc.mahidol.ac.th

Mr. Chen Liwei, Program Officer
Freshwater and Marine Programme
WWF-China Program Office, Room 1609
Wenhua Palace, Laodong
Renmin Wenhua Gong
Dongcheng District, Beijing 100006, China

Tel: (86 10) 6522 7100 ext 238
Mobile: (86) 136 5104 6407
Fax: (86 10) 6522 7300
E-mail: lwchen@wwfchina.org

² Mr. An Duong Thanh served as the alternate member for Viet Nam focal point in the first day of the meeting.

Observer

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

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

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

UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination

Mr. Takashi Otsuka
Task Manager, Asia and the Pacific
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552 (Official)
P.O. Box 47074 (Personal)
Nairobi 00100, Kenya

Tel: (254 20) 624 380
Fax: (254 20) 624 041 / 624042
E-mail: Takashi.Otsuka@unep.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. Unchalee Rodsomchit
Programme Assistant
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
2nd Floor, Block B, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

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

ANNEX 2

List of Documents

Discussion documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/1	Agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/2	Annotated Agenda
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/3	Report of the Meeting
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/4	Current Status of Outputs of the Specialised Executing Agencies for the Wetlands Sub-component During the First Phase of the Project.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/5	Current Status of Budgets and Reports from the Specialised Executing Agencies in the Participating Countries.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/6	Draft Amendments to the Memoranda of Understanding to Cover the Period July 2004 to June 30 th 2007.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/7.Chi	China's Shantou Wetland Proposal
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/7.Phi	Philippines Malampaya Wetland Proposal
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/7.Tha	Thailand Thale Noi Wetland Proposal
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/7.Vie	Viet Nam Xuan Thuy/Balat Wetland Proposal
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/8	Review of National Action Plans for Wetlands
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Cam	Cambodian Coastal Wetlands Strategy and Action Plan
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Chi	National Action Plan of China on Wetlands
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Ind	National Strategy and Action Plan for Coastal Wetlands Management.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Phi	Action Plan for Philippines Wetlands in the South China Sea 2004-2010.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Tha	Draft National Action Plan on Wetland Management in the Gulf of Thailand under the UNEP/GEF/SCS Project.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/9.Vie	National Strategic Action Plan for Conservation and Sustainable Development of Viet Nam Coastal Wetlands in Period of 2004-2010.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/10	Proposed Work Plan and Timetable for the Regional Working Group on Wetlands to June 2007.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/11	Regional Scientific and Technical Committee Comments on Wetlands Data.

Information documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/Inf.1	List of Participants
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/Inf.2	List of Documents
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/Inf.3	Draft Programme
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.5/Inf.4	Specially Managed Project Reviews (SMPR) 2004.
UNEP EAS/RCU	<i>Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea</i> (Draft Version 3, 24 February 1999) East Asian Seas Regional Coordinating Unit. 69pp.
J. Michael Bowers and Su Jilan	Mid-Term Evaluation of GEF Project No. GF/2730-02-4340 Entitled "Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends In the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand" July 2004.

Global Environment Facility Secretariat Operational Guidance for Preparation and Approval of the
Medium-sized Projects.

The following documents are supplied in published form.

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.2/3	Second 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. Siem Reap, Cambodia, 31 st May – 2 nd June 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.2/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.2/3	Second 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. Phu Quoc Island, Viet Nam, 3 rd – 6 th May 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.2/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Fisheries 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. Manila, Philippines, 26 th – 29 th April 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.4/3.
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 <i>“Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”</i> . Report of the Meeting. Guangzhou, China, 30 th March – 2 nd April 2004 UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.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/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/RWG-W.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Wetlands 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. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 15 th – 18 th 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/RWG-CR.4/3	Fourth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Coral Reef 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-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.

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. 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 Mid-year Progress Reports, Expenditure Reports, Audits and Budgets
 - 5.2 Extension of the Memoranda of Understanding for the Specialised Executing Agencies
- 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. DEVELOPMENT OF DEMONSTRATION SITE PROPOSALS FOR THE WETLANDS SUBCOMPONENT**
 - 7.1 UNEP/DGEF Comment on Demonstration Site Proposals for Approved Sites
 - 7.2 Consideration of Activities for Sharing Experience and Information between Demonstration Sites
- 8. REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS AND CONSIDERATION OF THEIR INPUTS TO THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME FOR THE SOUTH CHINA SEA**
 - 8.1 Review of National Action Plans
 - 8.2 Preliminary Review of the Targets and Goals Contained in the Framework Strategic Action Programme (1999)
- 9. CONSIDERATION AND REVISION OF THE WORK PLAN AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS FOR THE PERIOD 2004 TO 2007**
- 10. DATE AND PLACE OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS**
- 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING**
- 13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

ANNEX 4**Medium-Sized Project Proposal Request for Funding**

AGENCY'S PROJECT ID:
GEFSEC PROJECT ID:
COUNTRY:
PROJECT TITLE:
GEF AGENCY: UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES):
DURATION:
GEF FOCAL AREA: International Waters
GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM: OP8 (Waterbody-based)
GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITY: IW-1 (Catalyzing Financial Resources for Implementation of Agreed Actions)
ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: November 2004
IMPLEMENTING AGENCY FEE:

FINANCING PLAN (US\$)	
GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT	
Project	
PDF A*	-
SUB-TOTAL GEF	
CO-FINANCING**	
GEF Agency	-
Government	
Bilateral	-
NGOs	-
Others	-
Sub-Total Co-financing:	
Total Project Financing:	
FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY IF ANY:	
<small>* Indicate approval date of PDFA ** Details provided in the Financing Section</small>	

CONTRIBUTION TO KEY INDICATORS OF THE BUSINESS PLAN:

The proposed project belongs to the International Waters Focal Area and within the three strategic priorities of this focal area it is relevant to "IW-1: Catalyze financial resource mobilization for implementation of reforms and stress reduction measures agreed through TDA-SAP or equivalent processes for particular transboundary systems." During the implementation of UNEP/GEF project entitled "Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand (hereafter SCS Project)," which goes along with the TDA-SAP process in the region, it was agreed among the 7 participating countries that 24 demonstrations on habitat management activities in the region would provide a measurable impacts and contribution to environmental degradation trend in the reverse the transboundary water body. Nine (9) out of 24 were already catalysed through the SCS Project and this proposed project adds another demonstration for the regionally agreed activity.

RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:

Name

Title/Position in the Government

Date: (Month, day, year)

This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for a Medium-sized Project.

Name & Signature

IA/ExA Coordinator

Project Contact Person:

Ahmed Djoghlaif,
 Assistant Executive Director and Director
 Division of GEF Coordination
 United Nations Environment Programme
 P.O. Box 30522
 Nairobi, Kenya

IA: Takashi Otsuka
 Task Manager, Asia and the Pacific
 Division of GEF Coordination
 United Nations Environment Programme
 P.O. Box 30522
 Nairobi, Kenya

EA: Name

Address

Date: (Month, Day, Year)

Tel. and e-mail: gefinfo@unep.org

PART I – PROJECT SUMMARY**A. SUMMARY****Rationale****Observed problems****Objectives****B. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP****B.1 COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY****B.2 COUNTRY DRIVENNESS****C. PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY****C.1 PROGRAM DESIGNATION AND CONFORMITY****C.2 PROJECT DESIGN**

- Project rationale and objectives
- Expected project outcomes, with underlying assumptions and context
- Activities and financial inputs needed to enable changes

	Activities	Lead organisation	Cost (US\$)	Outputs/ Indicators for activities
1.	Activity 1		No need	
1.1			####	
1.2			####	
1.3			####	
	Sub-total		####	
2.	Activity 2		No need	
2.1			####	
2.2			####	
2.3			####	
2.4			####	
2.5			####	
	Sub-total		####	
	Total			

C.3 SUSTAINABILITY**C.4 REPLICABILITY****C.5 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

- Stakeholder identification
- Information dissemination and consultation
- Stakeholder participation

Main activities	Stakeholder involved
1.1	Who?
1.2	
1.3	

C.6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

- Execution performance
- Project Impact

Indicator	Means of Verification

* Monitoring and evaluation will be carried out in accordance to the **Logframe**.

D. FINANCING**D.1 FINANCING PLAN**

- Budget summary
- Implementation plan

D.2 COST EFFECTIVENESS

- Incremental cost analysis

D.3 CO-FINANCING

*Letter of commitment from co-financier should be attached.

Co-financing Sources				
Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount (US\$)	Status
Sub-Total Co-financing				

E. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

- 1) CORE COMMITMENTS AND LINKAGES
- 2) CONSULTATION, COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN AND AMONG IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, EXECUTING AGENCIES, AND THE GEF SECRETARIAT, IF APPROPRIATE.

Proposed Management of Activities**PART II – SUPPLEMENTAL ANNEXES (TO BE INCLUDED FOR TARGETED RESEARCH PROPOSALS ONLY)**

ANNEX A BRIEFLY OUTLINE THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS TO BE TESTED IN THE PROJECT.

ANNEX B EXPLAIN HOW THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF EXISTING OPERATIONAL PROGRAMS, OR THE ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL NEED FOR NEW OPERATIONAL PROGRAMS.

ANNEX C ESTABLISH THE INCREMENTALITY BY DESCRIBING THE BASELINE FOR RELEVANT RESEARCH.

Part III – RESPONSE TO REVIEWS

- A - CONVENTION SECRETARIAT
- B - OTHER IAS AND RELEVANT EXAS
- C - STAP

ANNEX 5

Comparative Analysis of National Action Plans for Wetlands³

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

³ The rating for the priority of each action—Vh: very high, H: high, M: Medium, L: low, X: not included.

ANNEX 6

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

Table 1 Preliminary Work plan for 2004-2007.

[illegible]

Table 2 Schedule of Meetings for 2005. (RWG = Regional Working Group; -M = Mangroves; -CR = Coral reefs; -SG = Seagrass; -W = Wetlands; -F= Fisheries; LbP = Land-based Pollution; RTF-E = Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation; RTF-L = Regional Task Force on Legal Matters) (H = United Nations Holidays)

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M								
January							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
									H																	H												
February			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28								
										Chinese NY													RSTC EXCOM	H														
March			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31					
			RTF-L-3																																			
April						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30			
											H							H					RTF-E-3															
May	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31							
																							H															
June				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30					
July						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		
																							RWG-LbP-6															
August		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31						
		RWG-M-6												H									RWG-CR-6															
September					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30				
									RWG-F-6							RWG-W-6														RWG-SG-6								
October						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		
November			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30						
			Ramadan			H										RSC-2																						
December					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31			
									H					RSTC-6			PSC-5												Xmas	H								