



**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**

**Seventh Meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee**

***Siem Reap, Cambodia, 14<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> November 2006***



First published in Thailand in 2007 by the United Nations Environment Programme.

Copyright © 2007, 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, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Illustration: Homepage of the SCS Meta-Database on [UNEPSCS.org](http://www.unepscs.org).

**For citation purposes this document may be cited as:**

*UNEP, 2007. Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/3.*

## Table of Contents

<b>1. OPENING OF THE MEETING .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 WELCOME ON BEHALF OF UNEP .....	1
1.2 WELCOME ADDRESS ON BEHALF OF THE CAMBODIAN GOVERNMENT .....	1
1.3 INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS.....	1
<b>2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 ELECTION OF OFFICERS .....	2
2.2 DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE TO THE MEETING .....	2
2.3 PROGRAMME OF WORK AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE MEETING.....	2
<b>3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5. REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL FOCAL POINTS REGARDING NATIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND OTHER PROJECT RELATED ACTIVITIES AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL INCLUDING THE STATUS OF THE NATIONAL ACTION PLANS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
5.1 CAMBODIA – MR. KOCH SAVATH.....	5
5.2 CHINA – PROFESSOR ZHENG GUANG HUANG.....	5
5.3 INDONESIA – MR. HENK UKTOLSEYA .....	6
5.4 MALAYSIA – MR. HASHIM DAUD .....	6
5.5 PHILIPPINES – DR. GIL JACINTO.....	6
5.6 THAILAND – MS. NIRAWAN PIPITSOMPAT .....	7
5.7 VIET NAM – PROF. DR. MAI TRONG NHUAN .....	7
<b>6. REPORTS FROM THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUPS AND REGIONAL TASK FORCES ON PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
6.1 REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON MANGROVES.....	7
6.2 REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON CORAL REEFS.....	8
6.3 REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON SEAGRASS.....	9
6.4 REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WETLANDS.....	10
6.5 REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON FISHERIES.....	11
6.6 REGIONAL WORKING GROUP ON LAND-BASED POLLUTION.....	11
6.7 REGIONAL TASK FORCE ON LEGAL MATTERS.....	12
6.8 REGIONAL TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC VALUATION.....	13
<b>7. CONSIDERATION OF THE REGIONAL TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC VALUATION (RTF-E) DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONALLY APPLICABLE “TOTAL ECONOMIC VALUES” FOR COASTAL ECOSYSTEM GOODS AND SERVICES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>8. REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL INSTRUMENTS AND MECHANISMS FOR MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>9. REVIEW OF THE REVISED DRAFT STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE REGARDING ITS’ FURTHER ELABORATION AND APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>10. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE DEMONSTRATION SITE AND PILOT ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>11. OPERATION OF THE PROJECT WEBSITE AND REGIONAL GIS AND META DATABASES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>12. STATUS OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMME .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>13. WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE FOR THE REGIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>16. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING .....</b>	<b>24</b>

### **List of Annexes**

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| <b>ANNEX 1</b> | <b>List of Participants</b>   |
| <b>ANNEX 2</b> | <b>List of Documents</b>  |
| <b>ANNEX 3</b> | <b>Agenda</b>   |
| <b>ANNEX 4</b> | <b>Recommended Plan for Mid-Term Evaluation of the Demonstration Sites and Pilot Activities</b> |
| <b>ANNEX 5</b> | <b>Revised Work Plan for the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee</b>                    |

## **Report of the Meeting**

### **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

#### **1.1 Welcome on behalf of UNEP**

1.1.1 The Project Director, Dr. John C. Pernetta opened the meeting, at 8.30 am on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2006, and welcomed participants on behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP, Dr. Achim Steiner; and the Officer-in-Charge of the UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Co-ordination, Mr. Olivier Deleuze.

1.1.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that there were a range of substantive matters requiring careful consideration by the RSTC, and that a key anticipated output of the meeting was a first draft of the regional Strategic Action Programme. He reminded participants that the Project was now entering the final two years and that it was unlikely that further funds would be made available to the Project through the Global Environment Facility.

1.1.3 Dr. Pernetta highlighted the fact that the RSTC would need to provide guidance to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) regarding the closure of the Project, including the reallocation of funds that, had not yet been released for the execution of activities, which it was clear would not now take place, to activities that could guarantee an output prior to the closure of the project.

1.1.4 Finally, Dr. Pernetta noted that the meeting would demand a considerable amount of work from the members both individually and collectively. He expressed the hope that despite the work load the meeting would be both enjoyable and productive and wished the members well in their deliberations.

#### **1.2 Welcome Address on behalf of the Cambodian Government**

1.2.1 Dr. Pernetta invited Mr. Koch Savath, National Technical Focal Point for Cambodia to address the committee on behalf of the Royal Cambodian Government.

1.2.2 Mr. Savath expressed his appreciation to the members of the RSTC for travelling to Cambodia for the meeting, and noted that it was great honour for the Kingdom of Cambodia to have the opportunity to host the meeting. He noted that the South China Sea Project had provided much guidance and support to the Cambodian Ministry of Environment in improving coastal and marine environmental management practices in Cambodia.

1.2.3 Mr. Savath noted the importance of many South China Sea Project activities, particularly the revision of the regional Strategic Action Programme, in improving the integration of environmental concerns into development planning at the national level. He expressed his hope that this meeting would be effective in formulating appropriate guidance for the ongoing implementation of project activities. Mr. Savath closed his address by welcoming participants to Cambodia and to Siem Reap, and extended a special thanks to UNEP/GEF and the Project Co-ordinating Unit for organising the meeting.

1.2.4 Dr. Pernetta thanked Mr. Savath and the Cambodian Ministry of Environment for their excellent logistical support to the organisation of the meeting.

#### **1.3 Introduction of Members**

1.3.1 The Project Director warmly welcomed the new members and alternates and invited participants to introduce themselves to the meeting. Members proceeded to introduce themselves, indicating their institutional affiliations and role in the project. The list of participants is provided in Annex 1 of this report.

## **2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING**

### **2.1 Election of Officers**

2.1.1 Members were reminded that during the last RSTC meeting in Batam, Indonesia in December 2005, Mr. Savath, National Technical Focal Point for Cambodia; Professor Huang Zhengguang, National Technical Focal Point for China; and Mrs. Wahyu Indraningsih, National Technical Focal Point for Indonesia; had been elected as Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur respectively.

2.1.2 Members recalled further that the rules of procedure state that, the RSTC shall elect, from amongst its' members, a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur who shall serve as officers for one year. The rules state further that, officers shall be eligible for re-election no more than once, and therefore Mr. Savath and Professor Huang were both eligible for re-election. It was noted that Mrs. Wahyu was unable to participate in the meeting and that a new Rapporteur would therefore need to be elected. Dr. Pernetta then called for nominations for Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Rapporteur.

2.1.3 Dr. Gil Jacinto proposed and the meeting agreed that Mr. Savath and Professor Huang be re-elected as Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, respectively, and Dr. Ong Jin-Eong seconded this proposal. Dr. Jacinto nominated Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan, National Technical Focal Point for Viet Nam as Rapporteur, and Mr. Narong Veeravaitaya, Chairperson of the Regional Working Group on Wetlands, seconded the nomination. There being no further nominations, Mr. Savath, Professor Huang, and Dr. Mai were duly elected by acclamation.

### **2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting**

2.2.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Vo Si Tuan, the Secretary of the Committee to introduce the documentation available to the meeting. Dr. Tuan reviewed the documents listed in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/Inf.2 and noted that these had been lodged on the project website and were also available to participants in electronic format. He briefly highlighted the items on the list of the discussion documents indicating the key issues requiring discussion and decision by the Committee. He noted that Members were invited to table any additional documents, and the full list of documents made available to the meeting is contained in Annex 2 of this report.

### **2.3 Programme of Work and Administrative Arrangements for the Conduct of the Meeting**

2.3.1 The Chairperson then invited Dr. Tuan to introduce the draft programme for the conduct of business contained in document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/Inf.3. Dr. Tuan briefed participants on the administrative arrangements for the conduct of the meeting, noting that the meeting was scheduled to take place over four days and that the Committee could form small working groups to elaborate on specific matters as the need arose. He noted further that formal sessions of the meeting would be conducted in English and in plenary.

## **3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA**

3.1 The Chairperson, Mr. Savath, introduced the Provisional Agenda prepared by the Project Co-ordinating Unit (PCU) for the meeting as document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/1, and the Annotated Provisional Agenda, document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/2 and invited members to propose any amendments or additional items for consideration by the committee.

3.2 There being no amendments or additional items proposed, the draft agenda was adopted as proposed and is attached as Annex 3 of this report.

## **4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS**

4.1 The Chairperson invited the Project Director to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/4 "*Status of the Administrative Reports from the Focal Points of the Participating Countries and Co-financing of the Project*" and to draw to the attention of the meeting any outstanding issues or matters requiring the attention of the Committee.

4.2 Dr. Pernetta reminded members that UNEP provides to the Specialised Executing Agencies in each country, cash advances on a six monthly basis to meet the costs of producing the national outputs specified in each Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), according to an agreed work plan and timetable. He noted that financial and progress reports are critical for the review of expenditures in relation to project activities and outputs, and to evaluate the extent to which, agreed government co-financing had been provided in cash and in-kind by the Specialised Executing Agency (SEA) concerned.

4.3 Dr. Pernetta drew the attention of the meeting to Tables 1 and 2 in the document. He noted that there were still a number of outstanding reports for 2005, including those from the Inter-Ministry Committee of China, and the SEAs for mangroves (Philippines), coral reefs (Malaysia), wetland (Indonesia and Malaysia), land-based pollution (China and Philippines), and fisheries (Thailand), as well as the executing agencies for the Legal (China) and Economic (Philippines) Task Forces, and demonstration sites (Trat mangrove site in Thailand). Regarding the submission of reports for the reporting period January-June 2006, Dr. Pernetta noted that only 21 (29%) reports had been received by the due date and that as of 14<sup>th</sup> October 2006 a total of 45 (64%) reports had been received by the PCU.

4.4 Dr. Pernetta further reminded members that audit reports for each calendar year are required under the United Nations (UN) financial rules and drew the attention of the meeting to Table 4 of the document. He noted that under the terms of the MoUs the focal ministries and Specialised Executing Agencies are required to submit independent audit reports of their expenditures within 90 days of the closure of the UN financial year (31<sup>st</sup> December).

4.5 Dr. Pernetta drew to the attention of the committee the fact that one audit report for funds advanced in 2002 remains outstanding, namely the report for the funds transferred to SEPA for national co-ordination activities. He highlighted the fact that one audit report (Malaysia, coral reefs) due on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 relating to cash advances and expenditures incurred prior to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 had still not been received.

4.6 With regard to the years 2004 and 2005, the Project Director noted that only three audit reports relating to cash held and expenditures incurred in 2004 remain outstanding. He noted further that of the 43 audit reports due on 31st March 2006 relating to expenditures during 2005, the PCU had only received 20 (47%) by 1<sup>st</sup> October 2006. He noted that in the case of five MoUs he had approved the conduct of biennial (i.e., 2005 and 2006) audits of expenditures due to the small sums involved (<US\$10,000). He noted further that 15 audit reports (35%) for cash advances during 2005 remain outstanding as of October 2006.

4.7 Regarding the status of the cash advances and reported expenditures of the IMCs and SEAs in the participating countries, during the period January 2002 to October 2006, Dr. Pernetta directed the attention of the meeting to Table 5 in the document. He noted that the total amount of cash advanced to the SEAs at the national level had been US\$4.8 million, of which US\$1.2 million was presently unaccounted for, being held by the Focal Ministries and SEAs. He noted further that a substantial proportion of these funds had been transferred since 30<sup>th</sup> June 2006 in support of the demonstration site activities and hence would not be accounted for by the SEAs until January 2007.

4.8 Dr. Pernetta noted that the greatest unaccounted cash balance was held by Indonesia (US\$296,418) followed by Thailand (US\$206,491), China (US\$175,197), Viet Nam (US\$151,341), Philippines (US\$127,020), Malaysia (US\$110,109) and Cambodia (US\$89,674). He noted that cases where money was transferred to a national institution but remained unspent as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008 would result in a serious administrative problem in that it would be necessary for the funds to be repaid to UNEP. He noted that such a situation was to be regretted since in addition to problems associated with the non-delivery of anticipated outputs, such funds are unavailable for re-allocation to activities such as additional demonstration sites.

4.9 In relation to co-financing, Dr. Pernetta noted on a more positive note that, substantial additional co-financing has been provided to the Specialised Executing Agencies over the last two years indicating a widespread and strong level of support at the national level for the activities of the project.

4.10 Mr. Hashim Daud noted that in the case of Malaysia, several SEAs had experienced difficulties in the execution of project activities, leading to several SEAs holding large sums of cash in hand. He acknowledged the need for the Malaysian focal points to improve the timeliness of financial and progress reporting.

4.11 Mr. Henk Uktolseya noted that the Indonesian Focal Ministry and many of the SEAs are involved in the implementation of a number of different projects at the national level, and that this had resulted in unanticipated delays in reporting during 2006. He advised the meeting that all reports would be finalised by mid-December 2006.

4.12 Dr. Jacinto informed the meeting that project activities are being implemented in the Philippines by SEAs that fall into two sub-groups, governmental (DENR) and university (UoP/MSI). He noted that few problems had been experienced with reporting from the University-based SEAs, and noted further that delays on behalf of the government-based SEAs may be due to the high turn-over of senior government officials in the Department of Natural Resources and Environment (DENR) since the commencement of the project. He noted that DENR has also recently begun conducting audits of management performance and project outputs as part of its normal auditing procedure, and suggested that this may explain some of the delay in the receipt of audit reports. He pointed out that much of the unaccounted cash balance in the Philippines was held by the demonstration sites and that these sums would be accounted for in early 2007.

4.13 Professor Huang noted that the Chinese Government has provided a high level of co-financing for the implementation of project activities in China. He noted that the high cost of audit reports in China was a concern of many of the SEAs, and noted that all reports would be submitted to the PCU by the end of the year. Mr. Savath noted that in the case of Cambodia, delays in the production of audit reports were also largely due to the high cost of audits relative to the overall funds transferred to the SEAs.

4.14 Ms. Nirawan Pipitsompat noted that she was unaware of many of the reporting delays in relation to Thailand and suggested that communication between the PCU and project component focal points should be copied to her for follow-up and action by her office. In this connection, Dr. Pernetta noted that the National Technical Working Group meetings were intended to provide a forum for the NTFP to be briefed on issues relating to the implementation of project activities, including any outstanding administrative reports.

4.15 Dr. Mai noted that delays in the production of audit reports in Viet Nam were due to an agreement reached with the PCU that audit reports could be produced for a two year period (2005 and 2006) due to the relatively small volume of funds transferred to the SEAs during 2005. He also noted that some of the delays in the production of progress and financial reports could be due to the restructuring of VEPA, which involved the transfer of staff responsible for the oversight of reporting from the Department of International Affairs to other departments.

4.16 In relation to the concerns raised regarding the cost of audit reports, Dr. Pernetta informed the meeting that he had written to UNEP headquarters in Nairobi in 2004 regarding the cash advance limit below which independent audit reports might be waived since it was obvious that the cost of independent audits was excessive in comparison with the volume of funds transferred. He noted that no concrete guidance had been received by the Project Co-ordinating Unit to date.

4.17 Dr. Anond suggested and Dr. Jacinto supported the proposal that, the RSTC make a recommendation to the Project Steering Committee regarding the cash advance limit below which the requirement for an audit report could be waived. Following lengthy discussion of this matter the meeting agreed to recommend to the PSC that:

*Where the anticipated costs of an annual audit are likely to: exceed 5% of the total sum transferred or the sum transferred does not exceed 10,000 US\$ in any one year, the requirement for an annual audit be waived.*

## **5. REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL FOCAL POINTS REGARDING NATIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND OTHER PROJECT RELATED ACTIVITIES AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL INCLUDING THE STATUS OF THE NATIONAL ACTION PLANS**

### **5.1 Cambodia – Mr. Koch Savath**

5.1.1 Mr. Savath informed the meeting that following the Fifth Meeting of the Project Steering Committee, six National Technical Working Group (NTWG) and four Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) meetings had been convened in Cambodia. He noted that the NTWG meetings had focused on how to promote co-operation at national and regional levels in order to achieve the project goals of reversing environmental degradation trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. He also noted that the outcome of the joint meetings of the management teams for the Phu Quoc – Kampot coral reef and seagrass demonstration site and the Trat Mangrove and Peam Krasop Mangrove/Wetland demonstration sites. He noted further that the NTWG provided general oversight and guidance to the implementation of demonstration site activities, and had reviewed the status of National Action Plans and national implementation of the GPA.

5.1.2 The IMC meetings in Cambodia had focused on the conduct of a consultative meeting on the implementation of demonstration site activities, the finalisation of National Action Plans, the development of shoreline management plans, and approaches to the strengthening of Integrated Coastal Zone Management initiatives in the country. Mr. Savath noted that the national language reports on mangroves, wetlands, coral reefs, seagrass, and land-based pollution had been published and distributed to stakeholders and relevant institutions. He noted that a delay had been experienced in the finalisation of the national language report on fisheries, due to many mistakes in the list of marine species included as an Annex to the Report.

5.1.3 Mr. Savath noted that the NAPs had been approved by internal meetings of the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. He noted further that revised NAPs had been finalised in Khmer language and submitted to the National Coastal Steering Committee for final approval. It was noted that a meeting would be convened in Sihanoukville during December 2006 for the formal signing of the coral reef and seagrass NAP.

### **5.2 China – Professor Zhengguang Huang**

5.2.1 Professor Huang noted that several IMC and NTWG meetings were convened in China following the Fifth Meeting of the PSC to provide guidance and oversight to the implementation of demonstration site activities and the finalisation of the NAPs for seagrass, mangroves, wetlands, and land-based pollution. He noted further that considerable efforts had been expended to finalise the medium sized project proposal for the Shantou Wetlands demonstration site, and that cash co-financing was also secured from local and central government for the implementation of activities at the Shantou site.

5.2.2 In relation to the co-financing of demonstration site activities, Professor Huang noted that funds are provided through the Ministry of Finance and administered by the State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA). He stated that 1,450,000 yuan in cash co-financing was provided to the Fangchenggang and Hepu demonstration sites during 2005 and 2006, and that 310,000 and 450,000 yuan had been allocated to the Shantou Wetland and Lindinyang Land-based Pollution sites. He noted further that an additional 450,000 yuan would be transferred to Fangchenggang and Hepu sites at the end of 2006. The Project Director noted that these high levels of co-financing are indicative of the high level of support from the Chinese Government to the project.

5.2.3 Dr. Pernetta asked Professor Huang what, in his view, would be the reaction of the Chinese Government and SEPA if the GEF Secretariat decided not to support the Shantou Wetland site, despite the GEF Secretariat having made a formal announcement during the First Regional Scientific Conference that funds would be made available in support of seven medium sized projects. Professor Huang noted that he had been advised informally that there might be some difficulties in obtaining final approval of the proposal from the GEF Secretariat and indicated that the Chinese Government and SEPA would be disappointed by this, although he indicated that in his view they would likely proceed with the project, albeit with reduced activities, using the funds obtained from Government sources.

### **5.3 Indonesia – Mr. Henk Uktolseya**

5.3.1 Mr. Uktolseya stated that in addition to the routine conduct of National Working Group Meetings, the main achievements resulting from the implementation of project activities in Indonesia since the Fifth Meeting of the Project Steering included: the signing of the Batu Ampar mangrove demonstration site document; stakeholder consultations for the promotion of the NAPs; the conduct of a workshop on the trade in hard coral and the contribution of this to coral reef degradation; establishment of the management board for the Bangka-Belitung demonstration site; stakeholder consultations on the identification of fisheries *refugia*; and the conduct of two workshops entitled “*The Brainstorming Forum Agreement of Regional Cooperation for Natural Resources and Marine Environmental Protection in the South China Sea Region*”.

5.3.2 Mr. Uktolseya informed the meeting that several NTWG and IMC meetings were convened during 2006 and noted that an important focus of these meetings had been the provision of direction and strategic guidance to the implementation of demonstration site activities. He noted further that an important outcome of the IMC meetings was the agreement that the local government agencies in the area of the demonstration sites would provide full support to the implementation of demonstration site activities, including improving public awareness of the work of the sites.

### **5.4 Malaysia – Mr. Hashim Daud**

5.4.1 Mr. Hashim reported that during the period December 2005 – November 2006, one IMC meeting (17<sup>th</sup> July 2006) and two NTFP meetings (5<sup>th</sup> December 2005 and 7<sup>th</sup> November 2006) had been convened to discuss *inter alia* issues associated with the implementation of project activities. In relation to the submission of administrative reports, Mr. Hashim noted that all financial and progress reports for the seagrass, and land-based pollution components and the focal ministry have been submitted to the PCU, and informed the meeting that reports for the coral reefs, and wetlands components were in the process of finalisation. He noted further that the seagrass SEA had printed and distributed 200 copies of the national seagrass report, and that the other three SEAs were currently finalising their reports for publication.

5.4.2 Dr. Pernetta noted that he was pleased to be able to report the participation of a representative of the Malaysian Forestry Department in the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves, and a representative of the Department of Fisheries, Malaysia in the Seventh and Eighth Meetings of the Regional Working Group on Fisheries. He thanked the Government of Malaysia for this support to the project.

### **5.5 Philippines – Dr. Gil Jacinto**

5.5.1 Dr. Jacinto stated that in addition to the conduct of routine National Working Group Meetings, the main achievements from the implementation of project component activities in the Philippines since the Fifth Meeting of the Project Steering Committee included: the implementation of demonstration site activities at the Masinloc coral reef and Bolinao seagrass demonstration sites; revision of National Reports and National Action Plans; the conduct of two orientation seminars and stakeholder consultations on the identification and establishment of fisheries *refugia*; an informal national workshop on regional cooperation; and the collation of information and data on the economic value of goods and services of coastal habitats bordering the South China Sea. Dr. Jacinto noted that: Dr. Miguel Fortes had recently resumed duties as focal point for the seagrass sub-component; a new focal point would be designated for the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters; and that the focal point for the land-based pollution component would likely be replaced in the near future.

5.5.2 Dr. Jacinto informed the meeting that the mangrove and wetland focal points had worked with the PCU and Mr. Takashi Otsuka of UNEP to finalise draft proposals for the Busuanga Mangrove and Malampaya Sound wetland demonstration sites to be funded as GEF medium-sized projects. He noted that no information regarding the Busuanga proposal had been received by the mangrove focal point since 21<sup>st</sup> August 2006. He noted further that the Malampaya Sound proposal was being revised based on comments received from Mr. Takehiro Nakamura of UNEP.

5.5.3 Dr. Jacinto noted that the Fourth IMC meeting was convened on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and provided a forum for the presentation of information regarding the progress of the project and decisions of the Fifth Meeting of the Project Steering Committee. He noted further that the Fifth Meeting of the IMC was tentatively scheduled for December 2006, and mechanisms for the approval and adoption of the sub-component plans as well as the preparation of the overall National Action Plan would be discussed during this meeting. He informed the meeting that, a proposal for the training course on coral reefs and seagrass, had been submitted to the PCU by the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines.

## **5.6 Thailand – Ms. Nirawan Pipitsompat**

5.6.1 Ms. Nirawan noted that the secretariat of the National Technical Working Group (NTWG) had organised two meetings of the working group in 2006. She noted that these meetings had: provided oversight and guidance to the SEAs in the finalisation of the National Action Plans; reviewed the implementation of demonstration site activities; and considered the outcomes of the informal national consultation workshops on the mechanisms for regional cooperation.

5.6.2 Ms. Nirawan informed the meeting that the Biodiversity Division of the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) had organised the second brainstorming workshop on legislation regarding marine and coastal resources management on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2006. She noted that the workshop was attended by, 35 participants from Thailand's Inter-Ministry Committee (IMC), members of the NTWG, project component focal points, and other experts. Regarding the finalisation of the NAPs, Ms. Nirawan reported that the SEAs responsible for each habitat sub-component had submitted their NAPs to ONEP for compilation into the overall Thailand NAP, which will be used as the guideline for marine and coastal rehabilitation in the Gulf of Thailand. Ms. Nirawan also reviewed activities conducted in relation to the Trat mangroves and Koh Chang coral reef demonstration sites.

## **5.7 Viet Nam – Prof. Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan**

5.7.1 Dr. Mai informed the meeting that the coral reef, mangrove, seagrass, wetlands, fisheries, and land-based pollution components have completed their NAPs, which are ready for publication following the convening by the Viet Nam Environmental Protection Agency (VEPA) of several meetings for their review. He noted that VEPA has also completed a GIS and meta-database system for each project component and that these would be posted on the VEPA website by the end of 2006.

5.7.2 Dr. Mai reviewed progress in the execution of activities at the Phu Quoc, coral reef and seagrass demonstration site. He stated that a joint meeting between the management teams of the Phu Quoc and Kampot habitat demonstration sites had been convened and had proved to be an effective means of improving collaboration between the two countries in the joint management of issues in the neighbouring marine waters of Viet Nam and Cambodia.

5.7.3 In parallel with the Phu Quoc coral reef and seagrass demonstration site VEPA has developed and implemented a project for environmental protection and natural resource conservation in Phu Quoc. Xuan Thuy National Park has developed and was implementing a project on ecotourism.

## **6. REPORTS FROM THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUPS AND REGIONAL TASK FORCES ON PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE**

### **6.1 Regional Working Group on Mangroves**

6.1.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Hangqing Fan to present the report of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves concerning activities over the last year including *inter alia*: the outcome of discussions during the seventh meeting; the status of project and demonstration site implementation; and the situation with regard to the development of inputs to the Strategic Action Programme.

6.1.2 Dr. Fan, Chairperson of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves (RWG-M) reported that the seventh meeting of the RWG-M was held in Pontianak, West Kalimantan Province, Indonesia, 4<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> September 2006 with participation for the first time of a representative from Department of

Forestry, Peninsular Malaysia, Mr. Koh Hock Lye. The outstanding matters raised included the absence of administrative reports from the Philippines since the first half 2005 and the absence of a final National Report from that country.

6.1.3 Regarding the National Action Plans, it was noted that further revisions had been undertaken by the time of the seventh meeting and the situation with regard to publication and formal approval of these plans as reported by the focal points, indicated that no NAP had been formally adopted by that date. Three (China, Thailand and Viet Nam) had been finalised and two (Indonesia, and Cambodia) were under final revision.

6.1.4 Dr. Fan further outlined: the process of developing inputs from the mangrove sub-component to the revised regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP); activities regarding the updating of the GIS and meta-databases; establishment of an e-forum on sustainable charcoal production, timber production, and mangrove foods; and preparation of inputs to the training course on mangrove and wetland management.

6.1.5 During discussion Professor Huang requested information regarding the integration of the NAPs and the SAP. Dr. Pernetta noted that the working group had developed tables to review the actions contained in the NAPs and reviewed these to determine appropriate actions at the regional level. He noted further that the regional working groups had discussed the threats, targets and potential actions during the last two meetings.

6.1.6 Dr. Ong queried how the costs of actions in the draft inputs to the SAP had been derived and it was noted that these were based on group discussion but the outputs would need to be validated and properly costed by the PCU once the final set of actions had been agreed. Dr. Pernetta noted that the actions had been drafted for the first time during the seventh meeting of the RWG-M.

6.1.7 Concerns were expressed regarding the content of Table 3, and in particular the column of percentages since those relating to the target rows were unrelated to a clear total. It was noted that these percentages were percentages of the existing areas in each category and it was agreed that this table required some revision and clarification. The RSTC noted that Tables 1 and 2, contained figures that reflected differences in the area of mangroves according to different authorities, and it was noted that the figures adopted by the RWG-M were those reported in the national reports and provided in the column headed "Current South China Sea Area" in Table 1.

6.1.8 Mr. Khalid noted that it was critical that differences between countries in the way in which "production" was measured needed to be stated such that data could be made comparable. He noted that the absence of standardised units of measurement, was causing problems in the economic valuation.

## **6.2 Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs**

6.2.1 Dr. Suharsono noted that during the seventh meeting of the Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs (RWG-CR) held in Kudat, Sabah, Malaysia a number of outstanding issues and matters, including delays in submission of audit and administration reports, signing of the second amendment to the MoU with Malaysia had been discussed. He noted further that the Indonesian Government had already adopted "*The National Policy and Strategy Action Plan*", encompassing 4 districts in the South China Sea geographic region and other countries had finalised their NAPs, with the exception of Malaysia.

6.2.2 Dr. Suharsono noted that the group had: reviewed the operation of the demonstration sites; developed inputs to the updating of the regional Strategic Action Programme; discussed the establishment of an e-forum; and discussed inputs to the training course on coral reef and seagrass management. He noted that the working group had developed two targets during the fifth and sixth meetings and noted further that as a consequence of problems with the nature of the data submitted, the targets were in fact invalid. The working group had discussed by e-mail the revision of the targets to take account of this problem and the outcome of these discussions would be discussed during the discussion of the draft SAP.

6.2.3 Regarding collaboration with the COBSEA Dr. Suharsono reported that Mr. Pachaimuthu from the EAS/RCU had recommended that the South China Sea meta-database be used as the basis for the meta-database component of the proposed coral reef facilitation framework, and suggested that the members of the RWG-CR could act as resource persons in the future elaboration of the facilitation framework. The South China Sea project, co-ordinated by the PCU, had agreed to expand the meta-database to encompass a larger geographic region, and change the search functions such that South China Sea users could distinguish South China Sea entries from those relating to other seas in Southeast Asia.

6.2.4 Dr. Anond Snidvongs noted that he was currently working with the SEA responsible for the Koh Chang demonstration site to link their site based high resolution GIS database to the regional database.

6.2.5 During discussion concerns were raised regarding the fact that the Tun Mustapha National Park demonstration project was still not operational and it was noted with regret that following the severe illness of Professor Ridzwan progress in finalising this proposal had been severely curtailed. The RSTC noted that the deadline for completion of the proposal was 31<sup>st</sup> August 2006 and that the most recent version was not acceptable for funding. The RSTC would therefore have to decide what to recommend to the PSC, regarding this proposal. It was agreed that under item 10, the RSTC would make a decision concerning recommendations to the PSC regarding this proposal. Dr. Anonds' view was that the proposal should not be supported further and that the funds should be reallocated to other activities.

6.2.6 A number of members raised concerns regarding the data presented in Table 1 of Annex 6 of the seventh meeting report and the Chairperson of the RWG-CR informed the meeting that revised targets had been agreed related to the area under management by 2015. Members agreed to re-consider this matter in greater detail under agenda item 9.

6.2.7 Dr. Jacinto and other members raised concerns regarding the column in Table 1 headed "Management types" and sought clarification regarding how the contents of this column compared with the contents of columns in the seagrass table for example headed "legal status". Dr. Suharsono noted that the management systems were different among the countries, some of which followed IUCN categories others did not. It was noted that in the meeting report of the RWG-SG, legal status rather than management type was used. It was agreed that Legal status was more logical and comparable between countries and Mr. Basiron suggested that the legal task force review could provide more information regarding the legal status of different categories based on the legislation in each country.

### **6.3 Regional Working Group on Seagrass**

6.3.1 Mr. Ouk Vibol, Vice-Chairperson of the Regional Working Group on Seagrass (RWG-SG) noted that: there were no outstanding administrative reports from the participating countries; all national reports, except that for Malaysia, had been published in local languages; and all NAPs, except that for Thailand's, would be adopted by the end of December 2006.

6.3.2 Mr. Vibol reported on activities at the demonstration sites and outlined the outcome of discussions regarding the: "*Framework for Assessing the Effects of Fishing in the Habitat Demonstration Sites*"; areas critical to the life-cycle of significant demersal fish species which use seagrass habitat as critical nursery areas in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand; review of the empirical values of goods and services derived from seagrass sites; development of inputs from the seagrass sub-component to the revision of the Regional Strategic Action Programme"; and comments concerning the regional training programme.

6.3.3 Dr. Pernetta noted that unlike other groups, this regional working group was unable to work with a figure of total area of seagrass in the South China Sea, since the extent of seagrass beds was still not well known. Consequently the RWG-SG had presented areas of a number of sites, and developed targets in relation to what was known from these sites. Professor Huang noted that large areas of seagrass in China were located in the Hong Kong administrative area that were not included in the figures presented, and agreed with the approach adopted by the working group.

6.3.4 Regarding the ranking of regional threats made by individuals in the working group, the RSTC was of the opinion that these values were unlikely to be a reflection of a regional perspective on the part of individual members and that the method of ranking the threats took no account of the "weight" in terms of the proportion of seagrass found in each country and thus subject to national threats.

6.3.5 Dr. Pernetta recommended and the meeting agreed to establish specific small groups to review the individual components of the draft revised SAP. The small working groups would review, refine and amend the elements of the draft SAP as follows: mangroves, Dr. Fan and Mr. Savath; coral reefs, Dr. Suharsono, Dr. Tuan and Dr. Ong; seagrass, Mr. Vibol, Dr. Anond and Professor Huang; wetlands, Mr. Narong, Dr. Mai and Ms. Nirawan; fisheries, Mr. Paterson, Ms. Srisuda; land-based pollution, Dr. Gullaya, Dr. Jacinto, and Mr. Henk; economic valuation, Dr. Khalid, Dr. Pernetta; legal matters, Mr. Basiron and Mr. Hashim. It was further agreed that Dr. Pernetta would revise the programme of work overnight and report back to the meeting at the opening of the second days session.

#### **6.4 Regional Working Group on Wetlands**

6.4.1 At the commencement of the session Dr. Pernetta introduced the revised programme that included time for small group work on the components of the Strategic Action Plan. The meeting accepted this proposal and agreed to adopt this in place of the earlier programme of work.

6.4.2 Mr. Narong Veeravaitaya, Chairperson the Regional Working Group on Wetland (RWG-W) noted that Indonesian Focal Point for Wetlands had been ill and was consequently absent from the seventh meeting of the RWG-W held in Manila, Philippines, 18<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> June 2006. He noted that Malaysia's wetland focal point had been absent from the last three meetings of the Regional Working Group, and also the second Regional Scientific Conference.

6.4.3 Mr. Narong noted that only Cambodia had submitted copies of the national report to the PCU by the time of the seventh meeting but a number of other national reports had been published in 2006. He reported on progress in finalising the proposals of demonstration sites to be funded under the GEF Medium-sized Project (MSP) mechanism, indicating that only the Malampaya proposal had not been finalised. It was noted by the seventh meeting that some of the NAPs did not follow the guidelines regarding the contents agreed by the previous meetings of the RWG-W. Focal Points had agreed to revise the NAPs for submission for Government adoption in 2006. Mr. Narong noted that inputs to the SAP had been developed and revised in the seventh meeting and by e-mail communication and e-forum.

6.4.4 The members raised some concerns relating to the structure and content of Table 1, Annex 5 of the seventh meeting report on the status of management and suggested that the table needed to be re-structured and revised to make clear the categories of "legal status" and to separate this from the management status.

6.4.5 Concern was expressed regarding the absence of data relating to wetlands in Malaysia and the fact that the data from Indonesia were incomplete and in some cases fragmentary. Dr. Pernetta noted that in September 2006, the PCU was informed that Ms. Siti Hawa Yatim, the Director of the Biological Diversity Conservation Division, Department of Wildlife Protection and National Park, Malaysia had been designated as the new focal point for wetlands in Malaysia.

6.4.6 The members noted once again that the area of some inter tidal mudflats were excessively large and it was noted that it was impossible at this stage to ask the individuals concerned to amend these figures since they had failed to correct them over the last three years. Dr. Anond informed the meeting that the SEA START RC would help by estimating the areas of inter-tidal mudflats using the GIS data and that this could be completed by the end of this year. The meeting accepted this offer with thanks.

6.4.7 Dr. Ong raised some concern regarding the range of wetland types considered by the working group noting that non-peat swamps were in fact freshwater swamps and were not addressed through the proposed targets. The RSTC agreed that the most important categories of wetlands requiring attention at a regional level were inter-tidal mudflats and estuaries. Mr. Basiron suggested the removal of the proposed actions regarding the review and improvement of existing laws and policies, which overlapped with the actions of the RTF-L.

## **6.5 Regional Working Group on Fisheries**

6.5.1 Mr. Paterson noted that in accordance with the decision of the last meeting of the Project Steering Committee two meetings of the Regional Working Group on Fisheries (RWG-F) were convened in 2006 focussing on the development of a regional system of fisheries *refugia*. He noted that an important development in 2006 had been the participation of Ms. Chee Phaik Ean, Head of the Aquatic Ecosystem Section of the Malaysian Fisheries Research Institute.

6.5.2 In terms of the substantive work of the group, Mr. Paterson reported that key outputs and outcomes included: a checklist for use in determining if managed or unmanaged areas qualify as fisheries *refugia*; a framework for use in reporting information about candidate fisheries *refugia* sites; a preliminary framework for assessing the effects of fishing in the habitat demonstration sites; and revised national and regional activities for the implementation of the SAP.

6.5.3 Mr. Paterson reported that the key outputs and outcomes of the eighth meeting included: preliminary characterisation of 46 sites known to be critical spawning and nursery areas for important fish species; compilation of information regarding the distribution and abundance of the larvae of 28 important species in the Gulf of Thailand and the South China Sea; selection of 18 sites for inclusion in an initial system of fisheries *refugia*; a work plan and agreement to develop one pilot fisheries *refugia* site in each participating country by June 2007; and a preliminary syllabus for the training course on larval fish identification and early life-history.

6.5.4 Mr. Paterson noted that the "Regional Guidelines on the Use of Fisheries *Refugia*" had now been published as part of the ASEAN-SEAFDEC "Regional Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries in Southeast Asia" together with several articles promoting the fisheries *refugia* activity for publication in the SEAFDEC journal "*Fish for the People*". In this connection an online fisheries *refugia* information portal, which includes a GIS mapping system for the sharing of information regarding fisheries *refugia* sites had been developed on the project website.

6.5.5 Mr. Paterson noted that a collaborative programme of technical consultations, working group meetings, and training workshops, aimed at strengthening collaborative efforts to establish a regional system of fisheries *refugia*, had been discussed with SEAFDEC during August 2006 and the Regional Working Group on Fisheries had assisted in the organisation of a session at the FAO Asia-Pacific Fisheries Commission Consultative Forum Meeting (16th-18th August 2006) on the integration of fisheries and habitat management.

## **6.6 Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution**

6.6.1 Dr. Gullaya Wattayakorn, Chairperson of the Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution (RWG-LbP) reported that as recommended by the RSTC the membership of the Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution had been strengthened through the addition of two experts, Professor Law Ah Theem (Malaysia) and Dr. Zainal Arifin (Indonesia).

6.6.2 Dr. Gullaya indicated that there were serious delays in submission of administrative and substantive reports from a number of countries. The published national reports, in local languages, had not been received from China, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. A revised NAP in line with the agreements of the sixth meeting had not been received by the PCU from China, and the Philippines still had not submitted a first draft of the NAP. In addition, there were a number of weaknesses in some of the revised NAPs, which require amendment and/or expansion.

6.6.3 In response to the RSTC recommendation regarding pollutant loading in developing the targets for the revised SAP, the seventh meeting of the RWG-LbP noted that for some countries, estimates of load from point sources were available but there were few estimates for contaminants from non-point sources. It was suggested therefore that, it was difficult to define a target with respect to the load and hence it was not possible to address directly the concern of the RSTC. The Working Group decided to include a target to derive an estimate of total contaminant load arriving in the South China Sea marine basin. It was also agreed to amend the second target and replace the word "standard" with "criteria".

6.6.4 Dr. Gullaya noted that the model for carrying capacity of the South China Sea with respect to nutrient loading developed by SEA START RC had already been uploaded to the Project Website, together with a User Manual that provides guidance for running the model. In accordance with the RSTC's recommendation, the working group discussed possible collaboration with the COBSEA/GPA-LBA Project (*Determination of Pollution Loading from Land-based Sources by Using Modelling and GIS*). It was suggested that this model could be used to provide more realistic scenarios of future nutrient inputs that could be used in modelling eutrophication status of the coastal waters of the South China Sea and hence there was value in linking this model and its' outputs to the carrying capacity model developed by the South China Sea Project. It was agreed that the members of the RWG-LbP would provide data relating to additional catchments where possible, and that where appropriate the EAS/RCU would attempt to involve members of the RWG-LbP in such activities.

6.6.5 Dr. Tuan, raised concerns over the delays in submission of administrative and substantive reports from China and Philippines and recommended that the National Technical Focal Points of these countries should urge the focal points to implement the tasks as agreed in the MoUs. Dr. Anond noted that no additional data regarding monitoring activities and impacts on human health had been received from Thailand, Viet Nam, and Indonesia for up-loading to the GIS database. He also noted that no data had been submitted by any of the remaining countries. He suggested that he convene a brief meeting with the focal points for the components to streamline the fields contained in the GIS database since the majority of these were without entries at the present time.

6.6.6 Concern was expressed regarding the fact that the hotspots had been selected by the focal points, that they were not comprehensive and hence did not represent a "regional perspective" regarding the comparative importance of contaminants and sources in the South China Sea.

## **6.7 Regional Task Force on Legal Matters**

6.7.1 Mr. Nizam Basiron, Chairperson of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters (RTF-L) noted that in June 2006, Mr. Fernandino Y. Concepcion informed the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) that he had left the Philippine government service, since which time a new focal point had not been designated. He noted that in the last meeting neither China nor the Philippines were represented and that the Vietnamese alternate had only attended part of the meeting, and suggested that the RSTC urge the national focal points and national technical focal points to ensure continuity of membership, and participation in the meetings of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters.

6.7.2 Mr. Basiron reported that the Task Force had co-ordinated the convening of national consultation workshops and questionnaire surveys to seek informally the views of a cross section of government and non-government personnel regarding the need for strengthened regional co-operation. Extensive reviews concerning legal matters at global, regional and national levels had been conducted and this draft had been completed, and would undergo editing prior to its final publication. The final draft report on alternative regional cooperative mechanisms and instruments to further promote regional cooperation had also been completed and would be presented in more detail under agenda item 8.

6.7.3 Mr. Basiron further noted that the fifth meeting had: drafted the inputs to the Strategic Action Programme, proposing to develop a framework for co-operation in the management of the marine environment of the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand; and, agreed to organise a focus group meeting at the national level, in March 2007, to review the updated SAP and recommendations from the RTF-L and the seventh meeting of the RSTC and the sixth meeting of the PSC.

6.7.4 Dr. Jacinto informed the meeting that the second national consultation workshop in the Philippines had been convened in September 2006 and the report would be sent to the PCU soon. China had not organised its' second workshop and would nominate a new expert for the task force.

6.7.5 The meeting took note of the fact that the planned focus group meetings at the national level with a maximum number of participants not exceeding 15, including the national technical focal point and six focal points for the project sub-components, should be convened in the first quarter of 2007.

## 6.8 Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation

6.8.1 Dr. Khalid Abdul Rahim, member of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation (RTF-E) informed members that during the fourth and fifth meetings in 2006, members had drafted substantive texts and completed a draft of the regional guidelines for economic valuation. These guidelines are being edited by the PCU, and will be printed for use in the regional training course to be conducted in March 2007.

6.8.2 Dr. Khalid reported on progress in developing a regional database of empirical economic values of coastal goods and services and the methods to be used in standardising the data and deriving regional values from the compiled data sets. The RTF-E, in its' fifth meeting, considered the methods to be used and the required information from the regional working groups in order to complete a cost benefit analysis of action vs. non-action scenarios.

6.8.3 Dr. Khalid noted that the RTF-E, during its' fourth meeting, had considered the implementation of the training programme, especially the conduct of the training course on the economic valuation of coastal and marine resources. Based on the requirements and content outlined in the "Call for Proposals" the PCU conducted a review of the three proposals received and suggested, to the RSTC that the proposal from the Centre for Applied Economic Research (CAER), Kasetsart University, be selected. This recommendation was approved via email on 18 August 2006 on a non-objection basis.

6.8.4 Some discussion ensued regarding the standardisation of values per hectare in US dollars and the use of the Consumer Price Index for the year 2005 as the baseline for this standardisation.

## 7. CONSIDERATION OF THE REGIONAL TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC VALUATION (RTF-E) DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONALLY APPLICABLE "TOTAL ECONOMIC VALUES" FOR COASTAL ECOSYSTEM GOODS AND SERVICES

7.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Khalid, member of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation (RTF-E) to introduce document, UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/7 "Determination of Regionally Applicable 'Total Economic Values' for Coastal Habitats in the South China Sea" and to brief the committee on the agreed procedures for determining such values for use in determining the costs and benefits of action compared with non-action, under the SAP.

7.2 The attention of members was drawn to paragraphs 6.1.1 to 6.1.17 of the report of the fifth meeting of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation (UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.5/3) for a full account of the discussions leading to the proposed methods. Dr. Khalid noted that procedures and related methods to derive regional values of the goods and services from coastal habitats had been discussed and agreed during the fourth and fifth meetings of the RTF-E. These were based upon the derivation of a standardised real value and use of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for 2005 as the base year. Standard values were therefore derived as follows:

### *In local currency*

$$\text{STANDARD VALUE 2005 (SV}_{2005}) = \frac{\text{RAW VALUE DATA} * \text{CPI OF 2005}}{\text{CPI YEAR OF VALUATION}}$$

### *In US dollars*

$$\text{STANDARD US\$ VALUE 2005 (}^{\text{US\$}}\text{SV}_{2005}) = (\text{SV}_{2005}) * (\text{US DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE FOR 2005})$$

7.3 Dr. Khalid informed the RSTC that the RTF-E had also agreed the methods to derive a weighted value in cases where several values were available from one country. This involved using the values related to each resource stock as follows:

$$\text{WEIGHTED MEAN NATIONAL VALUE } ^{\text{US\$}}\text{MV}_{2005} = \frac{\sum (^{\text{US\$}}\text{SV}_{1, 2005} * \text{S}_1 + \dots + ^{\text{US\$}}\text{SV}_{N, 2005} * \text{S}_N)}{\sum (\text{S}_1, \dots, \text{S}_N)}$$

where  $^{\text{US\$}}\text{SV}_{1, 2005}$  = Standard US\$ Value of 2005 at Location 1

$\text{S}_1$  = Stock at location 1

$\text{N}$  = Number of values (locations) from the country concerned.

7.4 The Task Force had further agreed that the regional values could be derived in a similar manner to the weighted mean national value. In this instance, if values for total stock were not available then a surrogate such as the area of the habitat in each country could be used to weight on a regional basis the weighted mean national values.

**Regional Value of Resource A<sub>1</sub> is:**

$$R_{VA_1}^{-Kg} = \frac{[(S_{Ca} * MV_{Ca}) + (S_{Chi} * MV_{Chi}) + (S_{In} * MV_{In}) + (S_{Ma} * MV_{Ma}) + (S_{Ph} * MV_{Ph}) + (S_{Th} * MV_{Th}) + (S_{Vi} * MV_{Vi})]}{(S_{Ca} + S_{Chi} + S_{In} + S_{Ma} + S_{Ph} + S_{Th} + S_{Vi})}$$

Where **S** = The Stock  
**MV** = Weighted National Mean Value for countries: *ca* = Cambodia; *chi* = China;  
*in* = Indonesia; *ma* = Malaysia; *ph* = Philippines; *th* = Thailand; *vi* = Viet Nam.

7.5 In accordance with agreement of the RTF-E, total economic values for the four key habitats considered in the framework of the SAP would be derived from a summation of the individual Weighted Mean Regional Values per hectare for each good and service supplied by the particular habitat. The full range of goods and services for each of the habitats under consideration had been developed through an iterative process involving the individual Regional Working Groups and the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation. These were presented in Annex 1 of the UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/7. It should be noted that many of the "uses" identified by the Regional Working Groups appeared duplicative, and lack clarity of definition.

7.6 Regarding *Cost-Benefit Analysis of Action as opposed to Non-action Scenarios* using the Total Economic Value for the habitats under consideration, it was noted that the benefit resulting from the implementation of the SAP would be an incremental benefit derived from the anticipated change (decline) in the rate of loss of each particular habitat. Therefore the data and information needed from the Regional Working Groups for the habitat sub-components to conduct the cost-benefit analysis should include:

- 1) Time series data of the rates of habitat loss and degradation;
- 2) Estimated rates of loss and degradation in high-pressure (non-action scenario) and low-pressured scenarios (action scenario);
- 3) The details of the actions contained in the SAP according to national and regional priorities, including the areas to be rehabilitated;
- 4) Investments and costs needed to undertake the actions and achieve the targets included in the SAP.

7.7 Queries were raised regarding: the involvement of the component and sub-component focal points in the collection of data based on different surveys; the lack of detail regarding the basis for determination of some indirect values such as carbon sequestration; and the consistency of the measurements and data between individual studies and between countries.

7.8 Dr. Pernetta reminded the meeting of the process used in collecting the data for economic valuation in the South China Sea project. He noted that in 2004 the economic focal points from participating countries had reviewed the information collected by the component focal points and subsequently undertaken a search of the literature for further data. He noted that the RTF-E had been tasked to provide guidance to the habitat working groups on the economic valuation of coastal goods and services, which had been achieved through completion of the guidelines. These were to have been applied in the demonstration sites to provide a comparable baseline data set, but delays in executing the demonstration activities had meant that data were not provided by the component focal points. He noted further that the purpose of undertaking the valuation studies was to produce regionally appropriate values to be used in place of those of Costanza *et al.* that had been used in the 1998 version of the SAP.

7.9 Dr. Pernetta noted that the habitat working groups had been asked for and had provided comments on the data compiled by the RTF-E hence there had been ample opportunity for feedback and interaction. It was noted that one issue that was being addressed by the RTF-E was the cleaning of the dataset, for example charcoal was priced in most countries per kilogram whilst in the Philippines the values were per cubic metre hence the values were not comparable. It was also noted

that some resources, for example, sipunculid worms had a high value in China and zero value elsewhere in the region. If the Chinese value was used for the whole extent of mangroves around the South China Sea then the resulting value would be greatly inflated, hence the need to weight the values according to the stock or an analogue such as area of habitat in order to derive a regional value.

7.10 Dr. Ong raised the issue of the complexity and variety of methods used to estimate gross and net carbon productivity, which meant that a clear statement regarding how the values were derived was required in order to ensure that they were comparable. Dr. Fan noted that published values for mangrove biomass production had been used in conjunction with a national value for carbon to determine the value of the carbon sequestration function.

7.11 In response to Dr. Jacinto's question regarding the costs of recovery or restoration, Dr. Pernetta noted that the total economic values generated through this project could be used for estimating recovery costs but that this was not the purpose for which they were being developed and indeed one method of estimating value was through a determination of the replacement costs of certain indirect use functions of habitat services.

7.12 Dr. Anond suggested that more detail was required regarding the methods used to standardise the data and there was a need to discuss the scenarios that would be used in the cost benefit analysis. Dr. Pernetta noted that two simple scenarios would be "Non-implementation of the SAP" i.e. a business as usual scenario and the second; complete implementation of the SAP meeting all the defined targets. The economic benefits of the latter would hopefully outweigh the estimated costs of implementing the SAP.

## **8. REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL INSTRUMENTS AND MECHANISMS FOR MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA**

8.1 The Vice-Chairperson invited Mr. Basiron, Chairperson of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters (RTF-L) to introduce documents: UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/8, "*Review of Instruments and Mechanisms for Strengthening Marine Environmental Co-Operation in the South China Sea*" and UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/9 "*Review of Legal Matters Pertaining to the Marine and Coastal Environment of the South China Sea*".

8.2 Mr. Basiron noted that document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/8 focused on possible alternative instruments and mechanisms to strengthen cooperation in the South China Sea marine basin and to implement the Strategic Action Programme (SAP). He noted further that the review encompassed consideration of the ecological need for, and legal duty of states, to cooperate regionally, as well as a summary of experiences from other regions. He summarised the options for strengthening cooperation in the South China Sea region outlined in the document, namely:

- 1) The SAP remains the primary cooperative instrument;
- 2) A regional framework convention modelled on the Regional Seas Programme conventions;
- 3) A combination of hard-law and soft-law instruments;
- 4) A regional framework agreement modelled on the UNECE water convention;
- 5) A unique process-oriented, "strategic" agreement.

8.3 Mr. Basiron noted that, during the Fifth Meeting of the RTF-L, members were invited to consider which of these options, or combination of options, should be recommended to the Project Steering Committee and included in the SAP. He informed the meeting that from the results of the second national consultative workshops, it appeared that the majority view was in support of the development of a legally binding regional agreement. In this connection he noted further that the Task Force considered that options 1 and 3 were less appropriate in the longer term as a mechanism to strengthen co-operation, and that, options 2 and 4 were potentially suitable for adoption in the region, with inclusion of elements from option 5.

8.4 Mr. Basiron noted that the RTF-L had defined the characteristics of an optimum framework, and identified components to be included as inputs to the regional SAP. He informed the meeting that the meeting agreed to recommend to the Project Steering Committee the development of a framework

for co-operation in the management of the marine environment of the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand, based on the following four components:

- 1) Principles and Policies
- 2) Regional Strategic Action Programme
- 3) Sub-regional and bi-lateral Agreements
- 4) Existing National Action Plans

8.5 Mr. Basiron proceeded to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/9 "*Review of Legal Matters Pertaining to the Marine and Coastal Environment of the South China Sea*". He noted that: the review was under final editing; it would be published by UNEP; and that, it was in three parts:

- 1) a review of the obligations of signatory states with regard to regional co-operation on environmental protection;
- 2) a review of regional and sub-regional agreements and soft laws regarding environmental protection with relevance to the South China Sea; and
- 3) a comparative analysis of the national legislation of the seven participating countries bordering the South China Sea.

8.6 Mr. Basiron drew the attention of the meeting to Annexes 5 and 6 of the report of the fifth meeting of the RTF-L, which contained a comparative analysis of countries' perspectives from the Informal National Consultations regarding mechanisms for cooperation, and the draft RTF-L inputs to the SAP.

8.7 The Chairperson invited members to: discuss the contents of these documents; consider the recommendations of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters; and, to formulate appropriate recommendations for the consideration of the Project Steering Committee.

8.8 In relation to the Review of Legal Matters Pertaining to the Marine and Coastal Environment of the South China Sea, Mr. Vibol noted that the Cambodian Fisheries Law contains specific provisions aimed at minimising the impacts of fishing on critical fisheries habitats such as coral reefs and seagrass. He noted further that similar protection was afforded to mangroves under the Cambodian Forestry Law. Dr. Pernetta indicated that the primary focus of the Cambodian Fisheries Law was to regulate and manage fisheries activities and not to conserve or sustainably use coral reefs and seagrass, hence the protection afforded by the law was indirect rather than direct.

8.9 Concerning the formulation of advice to the Project Steering Committee regarding the form of a mechanism for improving regional co-operation, Mr. Basiron reminded the meeting that the RTF-L had recommended that Options 2 and 4, with some elements of Option 5, might provide for the development of a suitable framework for the region. A number of concerns were raised regarding the difficulties associated with the development of such an instrument and Dr. Pernetta reminded the group that the results of the second consultation workshops suggested that the majority informal view was in support of the development of a legally binding regional agreement. He cautioned the committee against too hasty a rejection of such an approach since the evidence suggested that approaches adopted to date had proved inadequate with regard to developing a successful, sustainable management regime in the South China Sea.

8.10 Ms. Nirawan noted that the outcomes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Brainstorming Workshop on Laws and Legislation Regarding Marine and Coastal Resource Management convened in Thailand on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2006, suggested that Thailand would prefer a non-legally binding mechanism for enhanced regional co-operation. She highlighted some of the challenges Thailand faced in ratifying the Convention on Biological Diversity, noting that in her view it might take a considerable period of time to ratify any legally-binding instrument in Thailand. In this connection, Mr. Uktolseya noted that several past attempts to establish legally-binding instruments in relation to co-operation in environmental management in the ASEAN region had been unsuccessful.

8.11 Dr. Anond queried whether the RSTC should be considering political issues and suggested that the RSTC should provide clear technical and scientific guidance to the PSC and that in his view the evidence suggested that past approaches had not halted environmental degradation and that therefore a new approach might be appropriate at this time. Dr. Pernetta confirmed that it was in fact the role of the RSTC to provide the best possible scientific and technical advice to the PSC.

Dr. Jacinto agreed with this and noted that in his view the recommendations of the RTF-L were technically sound and that based on past experience and information contained in the discussion documents the approach suggested by the RTF-L was perhaps necessary in order to effect actions that would improve the management of the South China Sea.

8.12 There followed a *tour de table* during which participants indicated whether in their view the group should be considering the substance or the political implications of the RTF-L recommendations. The group was unanimous in agreeing that the RSTC should only be concerned with the substance of the recommendations, and on this basis the meeting endorsed the recommendations of the RTF-L regarding the development of a framework for co-operation in the management of the marine environment of the South China Sea and the four components to be contained therein.

## **9. REVIEW OF THE REVISED DRAFT STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE REGARDING ITS' FURTHER ELABORATION AND APPROVAL**

9.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Pernetta to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/10, "*Revised Draft Strategic Action Programme*" and to provide the committee with a background to the origin of the elements of the Programme.

9.2 Dr. Pernetta reminded the meeting that during the development of the present South China Sea Project, COBSEA and the participating countries had endorsed a draft Strategic Action Programme on the understanding that this would be revised during the course of implementation of the project. He noted that a primary, anticipated output of the project was a revised SAP, and that if an endorsed SAP was not completed prior to the completion of the project then the GEF would deem the project to have failed.

9.3 Dr. Pernetta noted further that over the past three years the national committees and regional working groups had considered both the content, and the process for adoption of, the National Action Plans and that the plans had been analysed and compared as the basis for the identification of inputs to the regional Strategic Action Programme. He informed the meeting that these inputs were presented in the annexes of the various regional meeting reports and had been consolidated in a single document attached to document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/10 as Annex 1.

9.4 Dr. Pernetta noted that the existing SAP inputs were unsuitable in their present format for submission to a political forum at either the national or the regional level. He suggested that each section needed to be edited, streamlined and presented in a more concise and precise manner, with the supporting elements relegated to Annexes. He noted that the PCU had edited and re-formulated the mangrove inputs as a possible model for the other components of the SAP (attached as Appendix 1 of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/10). Dr. Pernetta then proceeded to present the outline of the 1999 Draft SAP, which he suggested was overly complicated, and suggested that a simpler outline be adopted for the revised SAP.

9.5 The meeting proceeded to review the contents of the draft elements contained in Annex 1 and in view of the complexity of the issues and the level of detailed consideration required it was suggested, and the meeting agreed that, small sessional working groups would be formed to revise the individual SAP elements for the collective review of the meeting.

9.6 Outputs of the sessional working groups were presented to a plenary session of the Committee following an evening and morning session of group work. The Committee collectively reviewed the inputs and it was agreed that any further revisions of the SAP inputs would be made available to the Project Director on the morning of Friday 17<sup>th</sup> November. During discussion various points were raised regarding additional amendments or revisions that would be required.

9.7 In relation to the SAP inputs of the mangrove sub-component it was noted that the contents of Table 1 in terms of the percentages should be clarified and possibly Table 1 should be divided into two tables.

9.8 Dr. Pernetta raised a concern relating to the prioritisation of regional threats to coral reefs using rankings provided by individual members from different countries that, have differing coral reef areas. It was agreed that the prioritisation of the threats on a regional basis should be weighted on the basis of the actual area of coral reefs in each country. In this connection, Dr. Pernetta queried why coral reef areas of 464,000 ha and 39,287 ha had been reported for the South China Sea coastlines of the Philippines and Indonesia, respectively, since intuitively he would have anticipated a greater area of coral reef in Indonesia than the area reported. Dr. Suharsono responded that, the coastlines of East Sumatra and West Kalimantan were dominated by large rivers, and hence the coastlines were soft substrate dominated by mangroves. It was agreed that figures for coral reef areas should be checked for all countries.

9.9 Similar concerns were raised regarding the weighting of the threats in the seagrass component of the SAP, while considerable discussion of the coverage of the wetlands component resulted in general agreement that this should focus on estuaries and inter-tidal mudflats.

9.10 There followed an extensive discussion regarding the content of the land-based pollution component inputs. It was noted that the proposed activities attempted to address a wide range of pollution related issues and that potentially many of these overlapped with activities undertaken under the framework of other projects and programmes, including PEMSEA. It was noted by Mr. Basiron that land-based pollution was generally a national level issue rather than a transboundary one and that the group should be very specific on what activities should be included in the regional Strategic Action Programme. Dr. Pernetta noted and Dr. Anond agreed that land-based pollution was not the most significant problem in the South China Sea and indeed that the carrying capacity model for nutrients suggested that this was not a major threat in the short-term. In this connection it was suggested that unique actions should be identified for inclusion in the SAP that would address issues not addressed through other mechanisms and programmes such as, for example, the carrying capacity and long distance transport of heavy metal contaminants in the South China Sea marine basin.

9.11 The Committee recognised that the elements for inclusion in the SAP from both the fisheries and land-based pollution components should clearly indicate the manner in which the SAP complemented rather than duplicated the work of other organisations, programmes and projects. In this connection it was recognised that the work of the fisheries working group in developing the *refugia* concept was indeed unique and innovative in that it addressed the dependence of fish stocks on coastal habitats and the impacts of fishing activities on the habitats themselves. Both SEAFDEC and FAO recognise this approach as being unique.

9.12 It was agreed that the small groups would further revise the elements and provide these to the Project Director in order that he could compile the next draft for consideration by the Project Steering Committee next week. It was noted further that the document would be revised on the basis of the comments of the PSC and circulated for review during December/January 2007. It was further agreed that a timetable for the revision of the draft would be elaborated under agenda item 11.

## **10. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE DEMONSTRATION SITE AND PILOT ACTIVITIES**

10.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Tuan, Senior Expert to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/11, *"Progress in Implementing the Demonstration Site and Pilot Activities"* and to report on the current status of these activities, including plans for the mid-term evaluation of progress. Dr. Tuan informed the meeting that ten demonstration sites and two pilot activities were operational under the framework of the South China Sea Project. He noted that these include sites in two transboundary areas between Cambodia and Viet Nam; and Cambodia and Thailand. He directed the attention of the members to Table 1, which indicated the dates of signature of the MoU or the addenda to the MoUs and the component/sub-component(s) to which each site belongs.

10.2 Dr. Tuan noted that most proposals for the execution of the demonstration sites had been delayed due to a prolonged process of proposal development and finalisation of budgets, resulting for example in the operational document for Batu Ampar being signed only in September 2006. He noted that a revised proposal for the Tun Mustapha Park Coral Reef Site in Sabah had been received by the PCU at the end of October 2006, but noted further that this proposal was not acceptable due in part to a lack of information regarding the proposed management framework for the site.

10.3 Regarding the pilot activity for the testing of a blast fishing detection device, Dr. Tuan informed the meeting that the proposal had been evaluated by three marine acoustics experts as recommended by the RSTC in the sixth meeting. He noted that these evaluations once received by the PCU were circulated amongst the full membership of the RSTC and noted further that the PCU received comments on the evaluations from more than 70 percent of RSTC members. Only 17 percent of the members who responded were willing to support the proposal and a further 8% indicated support conditional upon revision of the proposal to accommodate the comments of the evaluators. The remaining 75 percent of members indicated that based on the expert evaluations they were unable to support the proposal. Several members noted that the key factor in their decision not to support the proposal had been the fact that the device would not provide for the real-time detection of blast fishing.

10.4 He noted further that the proponents had been advised of the deliberations of the sixth meeting of the RSTC and fifth meeting of the PSC regarding this matter and had been provided with copies of the expert evaluations and invited to comment on these and the decisions of the PSC. The proponents had advised the PCU that they were currently unable to make comment mainly due to the serious illness of one partner, Professor Ridzwan, from the University Malaysia Sabah.

10.5 Dr. Tuan drew the attention of the Committee to the status of the demonstration site proposals for the habitat component funded via the medium sized project mechanism. He noted that five proposals have been finalised and submitted to UNEP DGEF, and that these had been revised following informal technical review by the GEF Secretariat. They had been subsequently approved by the UNEP/GEF Divisional Review and Oversight Committee (DROC) in March 2006.

10.6 Members were advised that following the new GEF Processing Guidelines in the framework of GEF IV, the Project Coordinating Unit, working closely with UNEP/DGEF officers of the International Waters Focal Area based in Nairobi, had prepared Project Identification Forms (PIFs) for re-submission of these proposals. At the end of October 2006, the PCU was advised that the five PIFs would not be submitted to the Secretariat until mid-November 2006.

10.7 Dr. Tuan further informed the committee that the network of demonstration sites of the South China Sea Project included four self-funded projects nominated by participating countries as follows:

- Local Area Coastal Resources Management (LACRM) Community Project, Kampot province, Cambodia;
- Coastal Habitats and Resources Management (CHARM), Thailand;
- Thi Nai Lagoon Sanctuary, Binh Dinh province, Viet Nam;
- Cham Islands Marine Protected Area, Quang Nam province, Viet Nam;

10.8 Dr. Tuan drew the attention of members to Table 3 of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/11, regarding the progress in implementing the demonstration sites and pilot activities. Overall only 14.6% of the total financial allocation had been spent at the level of the national executing agencies but 35% of the allocation had been transferred by UNEP to the SEAs. Based solely on transfers from UNEP to the national executing agencies, activities must be behind schedule since almost all projects were near the mid-point of the scheduled timetable and work plan, hence 50% of the allocations should have been transferred by now. This picture was however, worse when reported expenditures by the SEAs are compared with the funds transferred by UNEP. At any one point in time expenditures should equal or exceed 50% of the funds transferred if the work plan was on schedule. In only 6 of the 14 funded activities was this the case, and in only two (Hepu, China and Phu Quoc, Viet Nam) of those six, are activities considered to be on schedule as reported in the six monthly progress reports.

10.9 It was noted that Monitoring and Evaluation Plans in the operational plans of the demonstration sites and pilot activities require mid term evaluations to determine whether the projects are meeting the timetables, work plans and overall objectives. Members were invited to consider and approve the draft plan for monitoring and mid term evaluations of operational demonstration sites and pilot activities prepared by the PCU as Annex 1 of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/11. During discussion it was proposed and agreed that at the same time the self-evaluation was forwarded to the PCU it should be forwarded to the National Technical Focal Point comment upon the contents. The meeting agreed to accept the Draft Plan for Monitoring and Mid-Term Evaluation of the demonstration sites and pilot activities, with the proposed amendment regarding the dispatch of the self-evaluation to the National Technical Focal Point. The amended plan is attached as Annex 4 to this report.

10.10 Dr. Tuan outlined the figures for Government co-financing of the demonstration sites and pilot activities as indicated in Table 4 of document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/11. The total reported co-financing to date is 18.8% of the original total estimate, which is higher than the expenditure of the GEF grant (14.5%). Despite this the figure is low in comparison with the elapsed time suggesting once again that overall activities are behind schedule by around 20-30%.

10.11 It was recognised that the high co-financing figures for Mu Koh Chang, Hepu and the Phu Quoc demonstration sites suggested strong government support in implementing activities at these sites. Whilst in the case of the Fangchenggang mangrove site substantial co-financing (>125,000 US\$) had been received but has not been reported to date and was consequently not included in Table 4.

10.12 Dr. Tuan further noted that co-financing was also available for some medium sized project sites although these had not yet been approved by the GEF. The Shantou wetland site for example, had already received 810,000 RMB from the State Environment Protection Agency of China in the years 2005 – 2006 to implement the activities designed in the project document. The local government of Ninh Thuan Province (Viet Nam) had also provided funds to the Ninh Hai demonstration site for implementing coral reef monitoring, updating the GIS database at site level and establishing a pilot activity on community-based coral reef management. This total co-funding was equivalent to some 20,000 US\$ for 2005 – 2006.

10.13 Dr. Tuan informed the RSTC that the Second Mayors' Roundtable was successfully concluded in Beihai, Guangxi, China, on 8th June 2006. Four Provincial Governors, ten Mayors, and more than forty national focal points and technical managers and staff from 22 demonstration sites met in Beihai during 6th – 8th June 2006 to share their experience and good practice in implementing the demonstration site activities and in integrating environmental management into local coastal development. A total of 22 presentations were made during the two days of formal meeting.

10.14 The participants considered the Roundtable a valuable forum for both political and technical people from the local governments to meet at the regional level in order to strengthen political support for the demonstration sites and regional exchange of experiences. The meeting urged UNEP to convene such meetings on an annual basis as far as the project budget allowed. The meeting further agreed that during the inter-sessional period local government officials and demonstration site managers would engage in continuous exchange of information, experience and practices via a Mayors' Roundtable e-forum to be established at the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project website. In addition it was agreed that they would individually and collectively engage in the activities planned within the framework of the regional staff exchange and training programme.

10.15 Members of the RSTC were requested to consider and provide recommendations to the Project Steering Committee regarding actions to be taken: in the case of demonstration sites or pilot activities that are unlikely to be completed by June 30th 2008; in the case of the Tun Mustapha Park and blast fishing detection proposals; with regard to the medium sized project proposals; and possible reallocation of funds in support activities other than those for which they were originally budgeted. In making these recommendations the members were reminded that the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee had no authority to approve financial allocations, but did have a responsibility to advise the Project Steering Committee regarding the wise use of funds, where activities appear in their view unlikely to be completed according to schedule.

10.16 Dr. Tuan suggested that the first task before the RSTC was to consider how to deal with the Tun Mustapha Park demonstration site proposal and the blast fishing detection device proposal. Dr. Anond suggested that the RSTC recommend to the PSC that funds for the blast fishing and Tun Mustapha Park be reallocated to other activities, as it was unlikely at this stage that operational documents for these projects could be finalised and the activities completed by the end of the project.

10.17 Dr. Jacinto suggested that the funds allocated for these activities should be re-allocated to the medium sized project sites if these did not receive support from the GEF. He suggested further that priority should be given to those sites, which had already received co-financing and were operational.

10.18 A lengthy discussion ensued during which it was suggested that the available funds be divided equally between the five sites. The Project Director however indicated that this was not the basis on which the GEF operated and that if equity had been the intention then there would have been sufficient funds to conduct one seagrass, one coral reef and one mangrove site in each of the

seven countries rather than the three sites in each habitat as approved by the GEF. The Committee finally agreed that the PCU would:

- lodge the medium sized project proposals on the website for review by the RSTC;
- contact the project proponents regarding which if any activities could be completed with substantive outputs by June 2008 and what proportion of the budget would be required for this purpose;
- prepare recommendations for the RSTC, regarding the prioritisation of sites to receive funds

10.19 Regarding delays in implementing the approved demonstration sites and pilot activities Dr. Tuan recommended and the committee supported the suggestion that the NTFP of the participating countries had a responsibility to speed up progress and ensure completion of tasks in time for closure of the project. Dr. Suharsono suggested that National Technical Focal Points should urge focal points and site managers to improve the timeliness of their reporting in order to enable the PCU to close the project accounts on time.

10.20 Dr. Mai suggested that the RSTC recommend the PSC to write officially to the GEF supporting the medium sized project proposals. Dr. Pernetta suggested that it would be more appropriate for the GEF Political and Operational Focal Points to write, but that they would need to ensure that the medium sized projects had been prioritised in the resource allocation framework if they were to be funded through the biological diversity portfolio of the GEF. It was also noted that the Strategic Priorities of GEF IV were different from those of GEF III and the medium sized projects had been written from the Phase III perspective.

## **11. OPERATION OF THE PROJECT WEBSITE AND REGIONAL GIS AND META DATABASES**

11.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Paterson to introduce document, UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/12 "*Evaluation of the Utility and Functionality of the Project Website*" and report on the current status of the project website and developments with regard to the regional GIS and meta-databases, in particular their accessibility with respect to remote up-dating of content.

11.2 Mr. Paterson noted that the South China Sea Project Website <www.unepscs.org> was initially developed during the preparatory phase of the project for the online storage and download of meeting documents. He reminded the Committee that in July 2005, the PCU had decided to re-develop the project website with an aim of improving:

- Communication between project partners,
- The extension of project news and information to project partners,
- Accessibility to project outputs, and
- Project partner contributions to the site.

11.3 Mr. Paterson noted that the South China Sea Project Website now features a range of tools aimed at improving communication between project partners and for extending project news and information to the project's partner network and other interested parties. He noted further that these tools include: a partner network contacts database; information pages for each regional working group, task force, and demonstration site; an electronic discussion forum; a "Blog"; RSS news feeds; and an online help desk.

11.4 Mr. Paterson informed the meeting that a range of information tools have been developed by the project and are available on <unepscs.org> for use in improving accessibility to these outputs, including the:

- South China Sea Document Repository,
- Online South China Sea Meta-Database,
- Online South China Sea Geographical Information System,
- Online Nutrient Carrying Capacity Model for the South China Sea,
- Online South China Sea Projects Database,
- Meta-Database Template,
- Regional Guidelines Section,
- South China Sea Multi-Media Centre, and the
- Fisheries *Refugia* Interactive Mapping Tool.

11.5 Mr. Paterson presented a summary of the usage of the website during 2006. He noted that there appeared to be a high level of interest in the website and the work of the project from outside the partner network. He informed the meeting that the site had received 8,246 unique visitors from 1<sup>st</sup> - 30<sup>th</sup> September 2006, and that these visitors had accessed 36,820 individual pages and downloaded a total number of 768 documents during the same period. He noted that usage and contributions to the site from individuals within the partner network were modest in comparison and informed the meeting that only 15 project component focal points or experts had participated in the website's e-forum and that only 5 partners had contributed materials for inclusion on the site over the past year.

11.6 Mr. Paterson noted that the development of the website had not been without its difficulties. He informed the meeting that due to a computer system failure at SEA START RC the main database file for the website had become corrupted, resulting in a considerable amount of time being expended by the PCU in the re-development of the site. He noted that this led to the identification of some serious security issues regarding the management of the project's meta-database, and that the Project Director had subsequently decided that the project website and databases should be relocated on a commercial web server whilst the website was stabilised.

11.7 Mr. Paterson pointed out to the meeting that many of the databases and tools associated with the website, including the Meta-database, regional GIS, Projects Database, Nutrient Carrying Capacity Model, Document Repository, and E-Forum are valuable information tools that might serve the region beyond the life of the South China Sea Project. In relation to this Mr. Paterson suggested that the RSTC may wish to consider: how these tools can be sustained beyond the completion of the project; how to encourage members of the South China Sea network to contribute more fully to the website, with a view to assuming responsibility in the longer term for the maintenance of sections of the site; and the longer-term management of the site, including deciding on where the website and associated databases should be located.

11.8 Dr. Anond noted that the website and project databases had developed into a large information resource and it may not be practical for SEA START RC to continue to host this, as his centre operated on project related funds and did not have any regular recurrent budget to support such activities. He suggested that following closure of the project individual focal ministries or Specialised Executing Agencies might be able to assume responsibility for management of parts of the site.

11.9 Dr. Jacinto suggested that the main challenge to ensuring the longer-term sustainability of the site would be the provision of content from within or outside the partner network, and the time involved in management of the site. In terms of the low usage of the E-Forum facility he noted that in his experience these are not effective in the generation of substantive discussion and in terms of generating interest perhaps the discussions should be broadened to include current issues relating to the South China Sea.

11.10 Dr. Anond noted that only one IT-related workshop had been convened during the life of the project and that was held in 2002 in relation to the development of the regional GIS database. He suggested that it might be appropriate to convene a regional workshop to introduce website managers and technical staff in the Focal Ministries and SEAs to the project website and databases with the aim of improving their use of these resources and considering future support to maintaining the website following closure of the project. Dr. Pernetta indicated that financially it would be possible for the project budget to support such an initiative.

## **12. STATUS OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMME**

12.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Pernetta to introduce document, UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/13 "*The South China Sea Training Programme*" and to highlight planned activities for 2007. It was noted that the report of the sub-committee of the RSTC was included in the information documents for the meeting and that the discussion documents also included the proposal for the regional training course on management models and strategies for coral reef and seagrass ecosystems received from the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines and a lecture outline/programme submitted by Dr. Ong Jin-Eong on behalf of Universiti Sains Malaysia for a Sustainable Mangrove Management course.

12.2 Dr. Pernetta informed the meeting that the training programme had been developed by, a sub-committee of the RSTC, comprising Dr. Jacinto, Dr. Suvaluck Satumanatpan, and Dr. Ong that had met in the PCU offices in Bangkok in February 2006. He noted that this programme had been circulated to the RSTC and approved by the committee on a no objection basis and had subsequently been considered by each Regional Working Group and Task Force.

12.3 Dr. Pernetta noted that the National Technical Focal Points had an important role to play in co-ordinating the nomination of participants for training courses proposed by the various focal points and SEAs in each country. He informed the meeting that letters would be sent to all members of the network in the week beginning 27<sup>th</sup> November 2006 informing them of the programme of courses and requesting that course participants be nominated.

12.4 Dr. Mai noted that the training programme document provided an adequate summary of the rationale for the identification of training needs. He noted that the staff exchanges, particularly the in-service training of staff of national focal agencies of participating countries at the PCU Office had been particularly valuable in the case of Viet Nam.

12.5 Mr. Uktolseya raised a question regarding the possibility of conducting additional national level training courses. Dr. Pernetta noted that funds had been allocated for the conduct of National "echo" seminars, and reminded the meeting that participants in the Regional Training Courses would be responsible for convening seminars at the national level. He noted that national language training materials developed for the "echo" seminars could be used for additional in-country training activities as appropriate.

12.6 The Project Director noted that the training programme as approved, contained an outline for a joint training course on mangroves and wetlands, and suggested that the preliminary proposal presented by Dr. Ong may not satisfy the training needs with respect to wetlands that were identified by the RWG-W during its seventh meeting. Dr. Ong introduced the preliminary outline for a training course on sustainable mangrove management prepared in collaboration with the University Sains Malaysia (USM). Dr. Ong noted that the two weeks allocated to the joint training course would in his view be insufficient to adequately cover both mangroves and wetlands in sufficient depth, and therefore he would suggest that the training course be split into one mangrove and one wetland.

12.7 There followed a lengthy discussion regarding the appropriateness of running separate mangrove and wetland courses. The RSTC was of the view that provided sufficient funds were available to support both courses then one wetland and one mangrove training course should be run. Dr. Pernetta noted that the Regional Expert on Wetlands, Dr. Sansanee had indicated during the seventh RWG-W meeting that depending upon the timing of the course she could be available to participate as a resource person and that Mahidol University could potentially serve as the implementing entity for the course. It was noted that Dr. Ong would work with USM to elaborate the proposal for the mangrove training course and that Dr. Pernetta would contact Dr. Sansanee upon his return to Bangkok to ascertain the interest of Mahidol University in acting as the implementing entity for the wetlands training course.

12.8 In relation to the proposal submitted by the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines for the coral reef and seagrass training course it was agreed that members of the RSTC would make comment on this by 1<sup>st</sup> December 2006. Dr. Pernetta noted in relation to this proposal that nearly all resource persons for this course were from the University of Philippines and that he would have hoped for a wider diversity of specialists from other countries to act as resource persons for a regional training course.

### **13. WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE FOR THE REGIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

13.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretary to introduce document UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.6/14 "*Proposed Work Plan and Timetable for the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee*" and any amendments resulting from the discussions and agreements reached under preceding agenda items.

13.2 The Regional Scientific and Technical Committee considered and approved the proposed work plans and timetables of the Regional Working Groups and Task Forces as approved by them during their most recent meetings.

13.3 The Committee then considered and developed a work plan and timetable for the amendment, revision, review and finalisation of inputs to the revised Strategic Action Programme. It was agreed that three drafts would be prepared incorporating inputs from various sources between the end of the sixth Project Steering Committee meeting and the end of May 2007. The detailed work plan and timetable are contained in Table 1 of Annex 5 of this report.

13.4 The meeting then considered the timing of the eighth meeting of the RSTC and agreed that this should revert to the earlier timing of the second week of December; noting that, the seventh meeting had been brought forward one month due to the timing of the PEMSEA Congress which conflicted with the normal period during which the RSTC and PSC meetings were held each year. It was agreed to recommend to the Project Steering Committee that the eighth RSTC meeting be convened from 11<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> December and the PSC meeting from 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> December 2007.

13.5 In the light of this decision it was proposed that the Third Mayors' Roundtable be convened from 12<sup>th</sup> - 13<sup>th</sup> November inclusive, followed immediately by the Third Regional Scientific Conference from 14<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> inclusive.

13.6 The agreed schedule of meetings is contained in Table 10 of Annex 5 of this report.

#### **14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

14.1 The Chairperson invited members to raise any other matters requiring discussion and consideration under this agenda item.

14.2 It was noted that the group had not discussed the location of the next RSTC and PSC meetings and it was noted further that neither Thailand nor Malaysia had officially hosted these meetings to date. It was suggested that should either of these countries wish to offer to host the next meeting this would be appropriate and that the matter should be left to the decision of the Project Steering Committee

14.3 Dr. Pernetta noted that the present officers could not be re-elected at the next meeting since they had already served the maximum number of terms in office and that it would make the arrangement of travel much easier if the group were to elect their officers in advance, since the Chairperson had to attend the PSC meeting following the RSTC meeting.

14.4 Dr. Gil Jacinto proposed that Dr. Mai, National Technical Focal Point for Viet Nam be elected as Chairperson. Mr. Basiron nominated Dr. Ong as Vice-Chairperson and Mr. Uktolseya proposed that Dr. Gullaya be elected as the Rapporteur. These nominations were approved by acclamation as officers for the eighth meeting of the RSTC.

14.5 No further items of business were proposed.

#### **15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING**

15.1 The Rapporteur, Dr. Mai, presented the draft report of the meeting prepared by the Secretariat during the meeting. The draft was considered, amended, and adopted as it appears in this document.

#### **16. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

16.1 Prior to the closure of the meeting the Chairperson invited members to make any closing remarks. The Vice-Chairperson, Professor Huang expressed thanks to the Royal Government of Cambodia for hosting the meeting and for the warm and friendly welcome that had been accorded members of the Committee. He thanked the PCU staff for their efficient support to the organisation and execution of the meeting.

16.2 Dr Suharsono expressed thanks to the PCU staff on behalf of all members for their support to the organisation of the meeting. These sentiments were supported by: Dr Mai, Mr. Uktolseya, Mr. Narong and Dr. Fan. Dr. Jacinto noted that this was the second to last meeting of the committee and noted further that having attended all meetings to date he had noted that the quality of discussions and the atmosphere had steadily improved throughout the course of the project. Dr. Khalid thanked the officers for their excellent conduct of the business of the meeting and expressed his pleasure at being able to be present in the meeting a view, which was echoed by Mr. Basiron.

16.3 Dr. Srisuda expressed her pleasure at the opportunity to see first hand the work of the South China Sea Project and her thanks for the invitation to participate as an observer in the meeting. Dr. Gullaya thanked the PCU staff for their support and in particular Khun Unchalee for her support in making the travel arrangements and preparing the documents for the meeting. Ms. Nirawan noted the warm atmosphere of the meeting and thanked Mr. Savath and the Government of Cambodia for the friendly welcome and warm hospitality. Mr. Vibol expressed pleasure at being able to participate in the meeting and for the active participation of all members. Dr. Mai thanked all members for their participation and support during the meeting.

16.4 The Project Director thanked all members for their constructive inputs to the work of the committee and for the warm and collegial atmosphere that had prevailed over the four days of the meeting. He thanked Mr. Savath and the Government of Cambodia for their excellent arrangements in hosting the meeting and wished members well for the coming year.

16.5 Mr. Savath expressed deep and sincere thanks to all the friends in the meeting for their hard work and successful inputs to ensuring a successful outcome to the meeting. He noted that the outcome of the meeting was of significance to achieving the common goal of reversing environmental degradation trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. He thanked the organisers especially the UNEP/GEF for the financial support to the convening of the meeting; the expert members for their support; and Khun Unchalee for her arrangements both administrative and documentary.

16.6 Mr. Savath declared the seventh meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee closed at 1705 on the afternoon of 17<sup>th</sup> November 2006.

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

Mr. Koch Savath, Deputy Director General Technical  
Affaires, Ministry of Environment  
#48 Samdech Preah Sihanouk  
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmon  
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Tel: (855) 12 787088  
Fax: (855 23) 215925  
E-mail: kochsavath@yahoo.com

**Indonesia**

Mr. Henk Uktolseya, Expert  
Assistant Deputy for Marine and Coastal  
Destruction Control  
Ministry for Environment, Indonesia  
Jalan DI. Panjaitan Kav.24, A Building, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Kebon Nanas, Jakarta 13410, Indonesia

Tel: (62 21) 8590 5638; (62) 0811 936261  
Fax: (62 21) 8590 4929  
E-mail: pkepl@menlh.go.id

**Philippines**

Dr. Gil Jacinto  
Marine Science Institute  
University of the Philippines  
1101 Dilman  
Quezon City  
Philippines

Tel: (632) 922 3944  
Mobile: (63) 0917 811 8172  
Fax: (632) 924 7678  
E-mail: gilj@upmsi.ph

**Viet Nam**

Prof. Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan, Vice-President  
Vietnam National University, Hanoi  
144, Xuan Thuy Road, Cau Giay District  
Hanoi, Vietnam

Tel: (844)7547715, 853 1142  
Mobile: (84) 9 1334 1433  
Fax: (844) 7547724  
E-mail: nhuanmt@vnu.edu.vn;  
mnhuan@yahoo.com

**People's Republic of China**

Mr. Zhengguang Huang, Senior Engineer  
South China Institute of Environmental Sciences,  
SEPA  
7 West Street, Yuancun  
Guangzhou, 510655, China

Tel: (86 20) 85528748; (86) 13 809771424  
Fax: (86 20) 85524439; 8552 8748  
E-mail: georgehuang@scies.com.cn

**Malaysia**

Mr. Hashim bin Daud, Director  
Marine and Water Division  
Department of Environment, Malaysia (DOE)  
Level 2, Podium 2, Block 4G3 Precint 4  
Federal Government Administrative Centre  
62574, Putrajaya, Malaysia

Tel: (603) 8871 2104  
Fax: (603) 8888 4070  
E-mail: hd@doe.gov.my

**Thailand**

Mrs. Nirawan Pipitsompat  
Senior Environmental Officer  
Biological Diversity Division  
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental  
Policy and Planning  
60/1 Soi Phibunwattana 7, Rama VI Road  
Bangkok 10400, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 2656636  
Fax: (66 2) 265 6640; 2656638  
E-mail: nirawan\_p@hotmail.com

### Chairpersons of the Regional Task Forces

Mr. Mohd Nizam Basiron  
**Chairperson RTF-L**  
Maritime Institute of Malaysia  
Unit B-06-08-B-06-11  
Megan Phileo 2  
12, Jalan Yap Kwan Seng  
50450 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia

Tel: (603) 2161 2960; 012 380 6246  
Fax: (603) 2161 4035; 2161 7045  
E-mail: nizam@mima.gov.my

Dr. Khalid Abdul Rahim, Professor  
**Member RTF-E**  
Faculty of Economics and Management  
University Putra Malaysia  
43400 UPM, Serdang  
Selangor, Malaysia

Tel: (603) 8946 7646  
Mobile: (60) 012 942 9090  
Fax: (603) 8948 6188  
E-mail: khalid@pop.jaring.my;  
khalid@econ.upm.edu.my

### Chairpersons of the Regional Working Groups

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

Tel: (86 779) 206 5609; 205 5294;  
Mobile: (86) 13977939731  
Fax: (86 779) 206 5609; 2095566  
E-mail: fanhq@ppp.nn.gx.cn; fanhq666@126.com

Dr. Suharsono  
**Chairperson RWG-CR**  
Puslit OSEANOGRAFI-LIPI  
Head of Research Center for Oceanography - LIPI  
Pasir Putih 1 Ancol Timur  
Jakarta UTARA, Indonesia

Tel: (62 21) 64712287; 6471 3850 ext. 202;  
Mobile: (62) 0811 904806  
Fax: (62 21) 64712287; 6471 1948  
E-mail: shar@indo.net.id; yos103@yahoo.com  
director-rco@indo.net.id

Mr. Ouk Vibol  
**Vice-Chairperson RWG-SG**  
Deputy Chief of Fishery Conservation  
Fisheries Administration  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries  
186 Norodom Boulevard  
PO Box 582, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Tel: (855 23) 216 244 Mobile: (855) 12 836 376  
Fax: (855 23) 221 485  
E-mail: aims1@online.com.kh

Mr. Narong Veeravaitaya, Lecturer  
**Chairperson RWG-W**  
Department of Fishery Biology  
Faculty of Fisheries, Kasetsart University  
50 Phanolyothin Road, Bangkokhen,  
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 942 8701 ext. 106  
Mobile: (66) 1 741 0024  
Fax: (66 2) 940 5016  
E-mail: ffnrv@ku.ac.th

Dr. Gullaya Wattayakorn  
**Chairperson RWG-LbP**  
Marine Science Department  
Chulalongkorn University  
Phayathai Road  
Bangkok 10330, Thailand

Tel: (662) 218 5407; 218 5409  
Mobile: (66) 01 812 2112  
Fax: (662) 255 0780  
E-mail: gullaya@chula.ac.th; gullaya@gmail.com

### Regional Expert Members

Dr. Anond Snidvongs, Director  
Southeast Asia START Regional Centre  
Chulawich I Building, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Henri Dunant Road  
Bangkok 10330, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 218 9464-7; (66) 086042 8915  
Fax: (66 2) 251 9416  
E-mail: anond@start.or.th

Professor Ong Jin-Eong  
4 Green Crescent  
11600 Penang  
Malaysia

Mobile: (60) 16 4836 240  
Fax: (604) 6565125  
E-mail: mangroves@yahoo.com

### Observer

Ms. Srisuda Jarayabhand, Co-ordinator  
United Nations Environment Programme  
East Asian Seas Regional Coordinating Unit  
(UNEP, EAS/RCU)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Block B, United Nations Building  
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue  
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (662) 288 1905  
Fax: (662) 281 2428  
E-mail: jarayabhand@un.org

### Project Co-ordinating Unit Member

Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director  
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit  
United Nations Environment Programme  
2<sup>nd</sup> 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/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit

Dr. Vo Si Tuan, Senior Expert  
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit  
United Nations Environment Programme  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Block B, United Nations Building  
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue  
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (66 2) 288 2084  
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094  
E-mail: vo@un.org

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

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

Ms. Unchalee Pernetta, Programme Assistant  
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit  
United Nations Environment Programme  
2<sup>nd</sup> 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/RSTC.7/1	Agenda.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/2	Annotated Agenda.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/3	Report of the Meeting.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/4	Status of the Administrative Reports from the Focal Points of the Participating Countries and Co-financing of the Project.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Cam	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of Cambodia.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Chi	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of China.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Ind	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of Indonesia.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Mal	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of Malaysia.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Phi	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of Philippines.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Thai	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of Thailand.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/5-Vn	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of Viet Nam.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-M	Report of the Chairperson for the Regional Working Group on Mangroves.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-CR	Report of the Chairperson for the Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-SG	Report of the Chairperson for the Regional Working Group on Seagrass.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-W	Report of the Chairperson for the Regional Working Group on Wetlands.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-F	Report of the Chairperson for the Regional Working Group on Fisheries.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-LbP	Report of the Chairperson for the Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-RTF-E	Report of the Chairperson of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/6-RTF-L	Report of the Chairperson of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/7	Determination of Regionally Applicable "Total Economic Values" for Coastal Habitats in the South China Sea.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/8	Review of Instruments and Mechanisms for Strengthening Marine Environmental Co-Operation in the South China Sea.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/9	Review of Legal Matters Pertaining to the Marine and Coastal Environment of the South China Sea.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/10	Revised Draft Strategic Action Programme.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/11	Progress in Implementing the Demonstration Site and Pilot Activities.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/12	Evaluation of the Utility and Functionality of the Project Website.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/13	The South China Sea Training Programme.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/14	Proposed Work Plan and Timetable for the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee.

#### Information documents

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/Inf.1	List of Participants.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/Inf.2	List of Documents.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.7/Inf.3	Programme.

UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.6/Sub-Comm First Meeting of the Sub-committee of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee of the UNEP/GEF Project "Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand". Report of the Meeting. Bangkok, Thailand, 6<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> February 2006.

**The following documents are supplied in published form**

ASEAN/SEAFDEC	Regional Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries in Southeast Asia. Supplementary Guidelines on Co-management using group user rights, fisheries statistics, indicators and Fisheries <i>Refugia</i> .
UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.5/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Project Steering Committee. UNEP/GEF/SCS/PSC.5/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Seagrass UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Wetlands UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on the Fisheries UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Mangroves UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.6/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.6/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.4/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.4/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.4/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.4/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/PKWS-Trat.1/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the First Joint Meeting between the Management Teams of the Peam Krasop Wildlife Sanctuary and Trat Demonstration Sites. UNEP/GEF/SCS/PKWS-Trat.1/3.

UNEP/GEF/SCS/PQ-Ka.1/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the First Joint Meeting between the Management Teams of the Kampot and Phu Quoc Demonstration Sites. UNEP/GEF/SCS/PQ-Ka.1/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.5/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-E.5/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.5/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Regional Task Force on Legal Matters. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RTF-L.5/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.7/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-CR.7/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.7/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Fisheries. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-F.7/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.7/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Land-Based Pollution. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-LbP.7/3
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.7/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group for the Mangrove Sub-component. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-M.7/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.7/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group for the Seagrass Sub-component. UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-SG.7/3.
UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.7/3	Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Working Group on Wetlands UNEP/GEF/SCS/RWG-W.7/3.

#### **Documents received during the meeting.**

<b>Cambodia</b>	Cambodia's National Coordinating Activities 2005 – 2006, 5pps. hard copies. Distributed in the meeting.
<b>Indonesia</b>	National Policy, Strategies, Programs, Action Plans and Activities of Coral Reef Management in Indonesia. Ver. 2.0, Jakarta, June 2005, publication 20 copies.
<b>Malaysia</b>	Report of National Technical Focal Point (NTFP), Malaysia, 1pp, hard copies and diskette. Distributed in the meeting.
<b>Philippines</b>	Report of the National Technical Focal Point of the Philippines, 6pps, hard copies. Distributed in the meeting.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Viet Nam Report on the Activities of UNEP/GEF Project "Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand", 4pps, hard copies. Distributed in the meeting.

## **ANNEX 3**

### **Agenda**

- 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**
  - 1.1 Welcome on behalf of UNEP
  - 1.2 Welcome Address on behalf of the Cambodian Government
  - 1.3 Introduction of Members
- 2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING**
  - 2.1 Election of Officers
  - 2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting
  - 2.3 Programme of Work and Administrative Arrangements for the Conduct of the Meeting
- 3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA**
- 4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS**
- 5. REPORTS FROM THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL FOCAL POINTS REGARDING NATIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND OTHER PROJECT RELATED ACTIVITIES AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL INCLUDING THE STATUS OF THE NATIONAL ACTION PLANS**
  - 5.1 Cambodia - Mr. Koch Savath
  - 5.2 China - Professor Zhengguang Huang
  - 5.3 Indonesia - Mr. Henk Uktolseya
  - 5.4 Malaysia - Mr. Hashim Daud
  - 5.5 Philippines - Dr. Gil Jacinto
  - 5.6 Thailand - Ms. Nirawan Pipitsompat
  - 5.7 Viet Nam - Prof. Dr. Mai Trong Nhuan
- 6. REPORTS FROM THE REGIONAL WORKING GROUPS AND REGIONAL TASK FORCES ON PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE**
  - 6.1 Regional Working Group on Mangroves
  - 6.2 Regional Working Group on Coral Reefs
  - 6.3 Regional Working Group on Seagrass
  - 6.4 Regional Working Group on Wetlands
  - 6.5 Regional Working Group on Fisheries
  - 6.6 Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution
  - 6.7 Regional Task Force on Legal Matters
  - 6.8 Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation
- 7. CONSIDERATION OF THE REGIONAL TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC VALUATION (RTF-E) DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONALLY APPLICABLE "TOTAL ECONOMIC VALUES" FOR COASTAL ECOSYSTEM GOODS AND SERVICES**
- 8. REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL INSTRUMENTS AND MECHANISMS FOR MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA**
- 9. REVIEW OF THE REVISED DRAFT STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE REGARDING ITS' FURTHER ELABORATION AND APPROVAL**
- 10. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE DEMONSTRATION SITE AND PILOT ACTIVITIES**

11. OPERATION OF THE PROJECT WEBSITE AND REGIONAL GIS AND META DATABASES
12. STATUS OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMME
13. WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE FOR THE REGIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING
16. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

## ANNEX 4

### Recommended Plan for Mid-Term Evaluation of the Demonstration Sites and Pilot Activities

#### BACKGROUND

The operational plans for execution of activities at all demonstration sites include provision for a mid-term evaluation in addition to the routine due diligence monitoring that takes place through the provision of six monthly progress and expenditure reports to the PCU acting on behalf of UNEP, the GEF Implementing Agency. Since the first of the demonstration sites are, at least in theory almost half way through their execution, a plan and schedule for the conduct of the mid-term evaluations was developed by the PCU for the consideration and approval of the Seventh meeting of the RSTC.

The plan for the mid-term evaluation was considered, amended and approved as contained in this annex.

#### PROPOSED TIME SCHEDULE

**Table 1 Proposed schedule for the conduct of the mid-term evaluations of the demonstration sites and pilot activities.**

Name/country	Date of signing MOU/Addendum	Mid term evaluation	Self assessment submission date
Fangchengang / China	21 April 2005	Jan. 07	5 Jan. 07
Trat Province / Thailand	16 June 2005	Jan. 07	14 Dec. 06
Batur Ampar / Indonesia	04 Sept 2006	June 07	10 May 07
Koh Chang / Thailand	01 July 2005	Jan. 07	07 Dec. 06
Belitung / Indonesia	25 May 2006	May 07	10 April 07
Masinloc / Philippines	24 August 2005	June 07	10 May 07
Phu Quoc / Vietnam	26 July 2005	Jan. 07	14 Dec. 06
Hepu / China	16 April 2005	Dec. 06	07 Dec. 06
Bolinao / Philippines	28 Sept. 2005	June 07	10 May 07
Kampot / Cambodia	19 April 2006	April 07	10 March 07
Peam Krashop / Cambodia	16 March 2006	April 07	10 March 07
Batam / Indonesia	10 Dec. 2005	March 07	10 Feb. 07
LingDingYang / China	3 March 2006	April 07	10 March 07

#### PROCEDURES IN CARRYING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Three to five steps in the evaluation process are envisaged, depending upon the progress in execution:

- A self assessment by the Site Manager and Management Board;
- Review of the outcomes by the Project Co-ordinating Unit and National Technical Focal Point;
- Appointment of independent evaluator(s) if required;
- Site visits by the PCU and evaluator(s)
- Finalisation and agreement of a revised work plan and timetable if required.
- Summing up and lessons learnt in implementing the demonstration sites and pilot activities

##### 1. Self - assessment report

A self-assessment report should be completed by the Site Manager in consultation with the Focal Point following the template attached as Appendix 1 to this Annex. The self-assessment should be approved by the Management Board, then submitted to the PCU and the National Technical Focal Point by the date indicated in Table 1, above.

The first part of the report (items 1 to 3) provides general information regarding the demonstration site or pilot activity, including name, contact details and duration of the activities. Following this general information the project objectives and the extent of progress towards meeting those objectives and generating the outcomes, should be itemised in detail in Table 4.

Item 5 of the template requires the provision of information regarding administrative matters that reflect progress in implementing the tasks in the operational plan of each demonstration site or pilot activity. Analysis of the reasons for delays in submitting reports is useful to Site Managers and Focal Points in order to address challenges in project management at the site level.

In Table 5.1, the dates of acceptance by the PCU of the sixth monthly reports and annual audit reports, should be entered together with the reasons for delays, where these have occurred.

In Table 5.2 information regarding the cash advances and expenditures should be provided including the date on which the advance was received and the total amount received. In the fourth column headed Expenditure/Advance the percentage of each advance that was spent during the relevant six-month period should be entered. For example if an advance of 40,000 US\$ was made and 32,000 was spent during the six months this represents an expenditure of 80%. In all cases where more than 10% of a cash advance was not spent the reasons for the delays should be stated in the final column.

Table 5.3 provides the opportunity to provide information regarding co-financing. Government co-finance was used as a parameter in ranking and selection of demonstration sites in the framework of the South China Sea Project. It is also an indicator of commitment by the government in implementing a regional approach at the site level. Information related to the receipt of co-finance, possibility of additional sources and challenges in mobilising co-finance are critical in drawing lessons learnt for sustainability of the project outcomes.

The operational plan of each demonstration site or pilot activity includes an Annex containing a Stakeholder Involvement Plan. Each self-assessment report needs to evaluate how this plan has been developed and implemented (Table 5.4) and provide any lessons learnt (good practices or challenges) in involving stakeholders at the site level. In most operational plans specific activities were assigned to individual stakeholder groups, did these groups execute the tasks? If not, why not?

Each operational plan contains details regarding concrete outputs that are to be produced at various points during the work plan. These might be maps or publications, GIS or other databases, meeting or technical reports and public awareness materials. In Table 5.5 provide information regarding the status of planned outputs and any additional or unplanned outputs achieved to date.

Table 6 entitled Performance of the demonstration site or pilot activity requires the site manager and focal points to provide information regarding project performance based on verification of outcomes using indicators developed by the GEF International Water Focal Area. These are generally grouped into three classes, but outcomes are not identical in each demonstration site. Site managers should therefore add or delete rows as appropriate, using the objectives and relevant outcomes contained in the operational plan of the demonstration site including outputs and indicators listed in 4 - Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. When rating performance please use a six-point scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Include comments on feasibility and/or challenges encountered.

**Process Outcomes and Indicators** demonstrate frameworks or processes established by the activity that improve the institutional capacity to manage conflicting uses of space and resources. Such outcomes do not in and of themselves deliver stress reduction or improved environmental quality or quantity. For example, establishing a management board does not reduce stress or improve the aquatic environment, but does provide a social environment within which environmental improvement might be achieved.

**Stress Reduction Outcomes and Indicators** characterise and quantify specific reduction in environment/water resources stress e.g. reduction in pollutant release; more sustainable fishing levels and/or practices through reductions in fishing pressure; increased areas and rates of habitat restoration or protection.

**Environment State Outcomes and Indicators** demonstrate improvement in the states of environmental/water resources as well as associated socio-economic improvements. For a number of demonstration sites and pilot activities, Environmental State indicators were developed and could be used for tracking in the Mid-term evaluation.

At the end of the report (item 7), the management team needs to provide recommendations regarding actions taken or required to solve problems and/or challenges in order to improve project implementation and ensure that the objectives are met.

## **2. Review of the outcomes by the Project Co-ordinating Unit**

The staff of the Project Co-ordinating Unit will review the self-assessment reports as will the National Technical Focal Point (NTFP). Where the NTFP does not agree with the content of self evaluation report they shall immediately communicate their concern to the PCU. The PCU will send the self-assessment reports to the appropriate regional working group for their review and comment. Written response to the self-assessment will be provided within 15 working days of receipt by the PCU and will indicate whether in the view of the PCU a full independent evaluation and site visit are required.

## **3. Appointment of independent evaluator(s) if required**

If required, the Focal Point and Site Manager will propose the names of three evaluators from the region of whom the PCU will recommend one for appointment by the focal point. If requested to do so the PCU will provide advise regarding suitable regional consultants who have experience in project monitoring and evaluation.

The draft Terms of Reference for mid-term evaluators is attached as Appendix 2 to this Annex.

## **4. Site visits by the PCU and evaluator(s)**

Where progress is deemed to be inadequate and the appointment of independent evaluators is recommended by the PCU, site visits by the evaluator and a PCU staff member shall take place simultaneously. These shall culminate in a meeting of the evaluators with the management board to discuss actions required to ensure that the objectives stated in the operational plan are met within a reasonable time frame.

Where progress is deemed to be adequate and potential best practices have been identified that might be of value elsewhere in the region a member of the PCU staff may visit the site to work closely with the site manager and focal point in documenting the practice for dissemination in the region.

## **5. Finalisation and agreement of a revised work plan and timetable if required**

As noted under item 4 above the independent evaluator and PCU staff member shall, during the site visit prepare a revised work plan and timetable that will be presented to the Management Board prior to the completion of the site visit.

## **6. Summing up and lessons learnt in implementing the demonstration sites and pilot activities**

The PCU will document identified best practices in a form comparable to that used by the GEF International Waters IW-Learn Project for dissemination via the project website and institutional websites in the participating countries. Site Managers and Focal Points will be requested to translate into local languages these short notes to ensure their effective dissemination and use at the local level in country.

**SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION**

**1. Name of Demonstration Site**

**2. Specialised Executing Agency and contact details**

2.1 Specialised Executing Agency:

2.2 Site Manager:

2.3 Focal Point:

**3. Project duration:**                      months                      **Start date:**

**4. Project objectives and progress made towards meeting the project objectives**

Project objectives/outcomes	Brief statement of progress to date
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

**5. Administrative matters in implementing the demonstration site or pilot activity**

5.1 Six Month Progress and Expenditure Reports - Status

Reports	Date accepted	Reason of delays
Sixth monthly reports for the period July - Dec. 2005		
Sixth monthly reports for the period Jan. - June 2006		
Sixth monthly reports for the period July - Dec. 2006		
Annual audit report		

5.2 Cash advance and expenditure

	Date	Amount (US\$)	Expenditure/advance (%)	Reason of delays
First advance				
First expenditure				
Second advance				
Second expenditure				
Third advance				
Third expenditure				
....				
Total advance				
Total expenditure				

5.3 Co-finance

Activities	Planned		Actual		Percentage Actual/Planned	
	In Kind (man/days)	In cash (US\$)	In Kind (man/days)	In cash (US\$)	In Kind (man/days)	In cash (US\$)
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
Etc. Add rows as needed						
<b>TOTAL</b>						

Please provide:

- a narrative regarding any shortfall, or additional sums received;
- Information regarding the sources of co-financing;
- Possibilities regarding future additional sources; and,
- Any challenges in mobilising co-finance from central and local governments, and other sources

5.4 Stakeholder Involvement

Name of stakeholder group	Task assigned in the operational plan	Actual actions to date
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
....		

Please provide a narrative on the role and importance of each stakeholder group in implementing activities at the demonstration site, and perspectives/challenges for further involvement

5.5 Outputs

Planned Output	Due date	Actual date
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

6. Performances of the demonstration site or pilot activity

Project performance	Indicator – means of verification	Anticipated completion	Status to Mid term	Self rating & comments
<b>Process outcomes</b>				
Establishment of policy - making body, e.g. Multi-sectoral Management Board	Name of body, No. of meetings, participants			
Management plan development and approval	Approved by local government			
Legislation/regulation revision and adoption	Adopted by relevant government body			
Establishment of Institutional arrangement for long term management at local level	Formally established by authorised body			
Financial sustainability	Mechanism in mobilising fund, additional amount			
<b>Stress reduction outcomes</b>				
Zoning and practice for sustainable fishing area, fisheries <i>refugia</i> , marine protected areas, no take zone	Area (ha, km <sup>2</sup> )			
Habitat under sustainable use	Area, %			
Reduction of illegal fishing	Number, %			
Reduction of pollution at local level ( <i>mainly for pollution pilot activities but also for habitat demo site if any</i> )	(Point source pollution (kgs). Non-point source (area treated with best practice)			
Level of management of pollution sources at local level ( <i>mainly for pollution pilot activities but also for habitat demo site if any</i> )	Amount of reduction of sewage, solid waste, number of water treatments			
Capacity building at local levels	No. trained manpower, facilities and equipments, additional funding			
Enforcement mechanism established	Mechanisms (community involvement, sectoral...) No. of guards...			
Monitoring system developed for long term use to assess sustainability of projects	Human capacity, facilities, fund, methodology			
<b>Environment state outcomes</b>				
Health of habitats	Use ecological indicators designated to different habitats			
Water quality	Identified through criteria standards			
Socio-economic well-being	Income, alternative livelihood, public awareness, health			

**7. Recommendations**

- On demonstration site execution (close, re-structure, work plan and budget revision)
- To the PCU
- To the Inter-ministry Committee and National Technical Working Group

**8. Signatures**

**Site Manager  
Board**

**Focal Point**

**Chairperson of Management  
Board**

Date: .....

Date: .....

Date: .....

**Appendix 2**

**Mid – Term Evaluation of the (Name of the Site) Demonstration Site / Pilot Activity of the  
UNEP GEF Project entitled:  
“Reversing Environment Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”**

**DRAFT TERM OF REFERENCE FOR MID-TERM EVALUATORS**

**1. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

To evaluate the progress towards, and achievement of stated objectives and outcomes following one and a half years (one year) of implementation; the overall performance to date; and the determine the likelihood that the final objectives will be met within the remaining time available.

Where it is the opinion of the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) that progress has been inadequate the evaluator in consultation with the assigned PCU staff member, the site manager and the focal point will develop a revised work plan and timetable and present this to the management board.

**2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The scope of the mid-term evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the operational plan of the demonstration site project. The evaluators will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The evaluation will diagnose problems and suggest any necessary corrections and adjustments. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the objectives of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project.

**3. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Under the overall guidance of the Project Director of the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project, the evaluator(s) shall undertake a mid-term evaluation of the project during the period XX to XX.

The evaluation will comprise the following elements.

1. A summary evaluation of activities the project undertaken to date and a determination of progress towards achievement of its objectives.
2. An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the project outputs produced to date in relation to expected results.
3. Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any associated initiatives (*i.e.*, additional contributory or ancillary activities) undertaken by governments beyond those specified in the operational plan.
4. An evaluation of the timetable of activities and the allocation of financial resources to project activities and a determination of their consistency with the operational plan. Where activities and/or outputs have been delayed the cause of the delay should be identified, and where appropriate remedial actions proposed.
5. Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first half of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Management Board and their appropriateness in terms of the objectives of the project.
6. An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration provided by the Management Board. This evaluation should include specific reference to:
  - a) Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various related stakeholders involved in project arrangements and execution;
  - b) The mechanisms established under the project, their effectiveness and their consistency with the plans and provisions of the operational plan;

- c) The effectiveness of project management in terms of assignment and execution of project activities, and flexibility of management in terms of responsiveness to the need for changes in financial allocations, timing of activities, or mode of operation;
  - d) The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the Management Board in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in project execution;
  - e) Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes; and
  - f) Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
7. An assessment of the extent to which external scientific and technical information and knowledge have influenced the execution of the project activities.
  8. An analysis of the extent to which project implementation mechanisms developed and approved by the Management Board have been implemented.
  9. An evaluation of the status in mobilizing co-financing to support project activities and ensure financial sustainability.
  10. Specification of any deficiencies in project performance, administration and management that warrant correction with associated recommendations.
  11. A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met.
  12. Recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall project work plan and timetable for the purposes of enhancing the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.

#### **4. RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION**

- 4.1 One consultant shall be engaged to undertake the evaluation working concurrently and in consultation in the period **XX to XX**.
- 4.2 At the commencement of the evaluation process, the consultant shall, in close consultation with the Project Director, and Site Manager, agree upon a work plan and timetable for the conduct of the evaluation.
- 4.3 The Demonstration Site Management Board undertakes to provide office space and internet access to the consultant during the period spent by them in the project office.

#### **5. THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT SHALL COMPRISE**

1. A concise summary not exceeding two pages, including findings and recommendations
2. A detailed evaluation report with sections corresponding to items 1 - 12 of article 3 of these terms of reference the detailed report without annexes should not exceed 15 pages.
3. A set of annexes prepared by the consultant, either individually or jointly, on specific topics deemed appropriate by the consultants. The annexes should correspond to, and amplify the contents of the sections of the main report.

The report together with the annexes, shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

## 6. RATING PROJECT SUCCESS

6.1 Where possible, the evaluation will rate the success of the project in a semi-quantitative manner with respect to the following indicators:

- **Timeliness:** the extent to which the activities have been completed or conducted according to the agreed work plan and timetable;
- **Achievements:** the extent to which the outputs and outcomes specified in the operational plan have been produced or met (the evaluator should highlight any unplanned additional outputs or outcomes which have been achieved but were not originally planned); and
- **Impacts:** the extent to which the project overall has influenced, individual, institutional and/or governmental, attitudes and perceptions.

6.2 This rating shall be semi-quantitative and shall be conducted on a scale of 1 to 5 with one (1) being the highest (most successful) and five (5) the lowest rating. The evaluators shall specify in the report the nature of the scale used. E.g. 1 = 90-100%; 2 = 70-90%; 3 = 50-70%; 4 = 40-50%; 5 = <40%.

## 7. OUTPUTS OF THE EVALUATION

The outputs of the evaluation will be a final, evaluation report to the UNEP GEF Project Coordinating Unit (PCU).

Drafts of all sections of the report together with the associated annexes will reach the PCU (specifically, the addressee listed below) within 5 working days following completion of the evaluation, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

An electronic version of the final evaluation report will reach the PCU within 20 working days following completion of the evaluation and will be addressed to:

Dr. John Pernetta, Project Director,  
UNEP/GEF Project Co-ordinating Unit,  
United Nations Environment Programme,  
United Nations Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Block B,  
Rajadamnern Avenue, Bangkok 10200, Thailand  
Tel: (66 2) 288 1886  
Fax: (66 2) 288 1094  
E-mail: pernetta@un.org

## 8. DEFAULT PROVISIONS

In the event of the consultant defaulting on his/her personal services contract entered into pursuant to these terms of reference, the PCU may, in consultation with the Focal Point, terminate the contract in writing and pay only a proportion of the fee appropriate to the outputs delivered.

## ANNEX 5

### Revised Work Plan for the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee

#### BACKGROUND:

Each year the regional working groups and task forces up-date their work plans and timetables according to progress achieved during the previous year. These revised work plans and schedules are presented to the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee for their review and approval.

In addition, the RSTC is responsible for scheduling tasks and activities that fall within their responsibility and during the seventh meeting a work plan for the finalisation of the draft Strategic Action Programme was developed and approved as contained in Table 1.

Tables 2 to 9 inclusive present the revised work plans for the working groups and task forces whilst Table 10 presents a revised schedule of meetings for the approval of the sixth meeting of the Project Steering Committee.

#### REVISED WORK PLANS AND TIMETABLES FINALISED DURING THE MOST RECENT REGIONAL WORKING GROUP AND TASK FORCE MEETINGS

During the second phase of the project, national activities programmed include:

- *National committee meetings;*
- *National Technical Working Group meetings;*
- *Maintain and update national meta database;*
- *Act as information source regarding specific components and sub-components to the Inter-ministerial Committees, the Regional Working Group and the RSTC;*
- *Publication of national reports completed in the first phase of the project;*
- *Implementation of demonstration sites' and pilot projects' activities;*
- *The development and implementation of national action plans.*

Regional activities include:

- *Regional Working Groups, Task Forces, and PCU meetings.*
- *The updating and elaboration of the Regional Strategic Action Programme.*
- *Regional synthesis of data and information.*
- *Promotion of regional coordination, dissemination of experiences and personnel exchange.*

Some SEAs still have outstanding obligations arising from the original MoUs, such as the publication and distribution of national reports, and submission and updating of GIS data and information.

Taking into account the unfinished activities the Regional Working Groups and Task Forces have rescheduled their individual work plans during the last round of regional meetings, based on the current status of work and realistic estimates of the time needed for completion of planned activities.

#### Habitat Component

Activities to be undertaken under the habitat component include:

- *Development and adoption of national action plans habitat sub-components;*
- *Elaboration of Regional Strategic Action Programme;*
- *Implementation of demonstration site activities;*
- *Updating of regional GIS database, and correction of meta-database inaccuracies;*
- *The implementation of the regional training courses related to habitat component;*

Tables 1.1-1.4 include the work plans and timetables for each of the four habitat sub-components, as agreed respectively by the regional working groups' meetings.

### **Fisheries Component**

Activities to be undertaken under the fisheries component during the operational phase of the project include:

- Develop national & regional action plans for a regional system of *refugia*;
- Prepare and submit proposal(s) to the competent national authorities for the establishment of these *refugia* for fish stocks of transboundary and regional significance, to be adopted by the governments;
- Participate, through the Regional Working Group in oversight of the blast fishing trials and where appropriate advise national and local authorities on the practicality of its wider adoption in the participating countries; and
- Assist, through the Regional Working Group on Fisheries in the preparation of a comprehensive regional synthesis of data and information regarding fisheries in the South China Sea.

Table 6 presents the work plan and timetable till the end of 2007, as agreed during the seventh meeting of the Regional Working Group on Fisheries.

### **Land-based Pollution Component**

The main activities to be undertaken under the Land-based Pollution component during the operational phase of the project include:

- Develop national & regional action plans for addressing the impacts of land-based pollution;
- Prepare and submit to the competent national authorities a National Action Plan to be adopted by the governments;
- Participate, through the Regional Working Group in revision and finalisation of the regional Strategic Action Programme and where appropriate advise national and local authorities on the costs and benefits of action in the participating countries;
- Assist, through the Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution in the preparation of a comprehensive regional synthesis of data and information regarding pollution in the South China Sea;
- Model carrying capacity of land-based pollution in the South China Sea;
- Implementation of pilot activities;
- Implementation of the training programme component related to land-based pollution.

Table 7 summarises main activities to December 2007, as agreed during the sixth meeting of the Regional Working Group on Land-based Pollution.

### **Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation**

Future activities of the Regional Task Force on Economic Valuation (RTF-E) should include:

- Finalisation and printing of a regional guidelines on economic valuation of goods and services from coastal habitats;
- Development and updating of regional datasets on the value of goods and services from coastal habitats, and generation of regional values using regionally agreed method and procedure;
- Cost-benefit analysis of action vs. non-action scenarios;
- Implementation of the regional training course on economic valuation.

The fifth meeting of the RTF-E agreed on a preliminary timetable for the initiation and completion of the above activities, as shown in Table 8.

## **REGIONAL TASK FORCE ON LEGAL MATTERS**

The fifth meeting of the Task Force decided to complete the following activities during the period of 2006-2007:

- Publish a regional review on legal matters, building upon previous outputs and outcomes of the Task Force since 2003.
- Convene a focus group meeting in March 2006 review the first draft SAP, consider the recommendations of the RTF-L regarding regional cooperation, and formulate recommendation to Ministry of Environment to adopt the SAP.
- Draft and finalise inputs to the SAP regarding legal aspects of marine environmental cooperation in the South China Sea.

Since the conclusion of its third meeting, the Task Force has made significant progress in carrying out the activities. All MoUs related to legal matters expire on 30 June 2006. These MoUs need to be extended urgently to allow agreed activities to be carried out in a timely manner.

Table 9 includes the work plan of the Task Force during the period of 2006-2007, as agreed by the fifth meeting of the Task Force.

## **IMPLEMENTATION PLANS OF DEMONSTRATION SITES AND PILOT ACTIVITIES**

All demonstration sites and pilot activities were originally planned to be launched early 2004 in the original Project Document. Due to late start of the project, the operational phase was automatically postponed to the second half of 2004. However, no demonstration site activity was launched by the end of 2004. Three demonstration site project documents were signed during the first half of 2005, five signed during the second half of 2005, and five in 2006. As of today, the project document for Tun Mustapha Park, Sabah has not been finalised. The reasons for these delays are outlined above. In addition none of the seven medium-sized projects (MSPs) has been approved by the GEFSec, and it is uncertain when these project proposals will be approved.

The late signing of these demonstration site project documents poses great challenges to the implementation agencies at the national level to complete the activities within agreed timetables. The delay in the approval of the MSPs could further complicate the overall project work plan, as the PCU would provide initially overall monitoring, financial reporting and administrative support to the implementation of these seven MSPs and arrangements would have to be made to transfer responsibility to Nairobi following closure of the main project document in 2008. The Regional Scientific and Technical Committee should urge national implementing agencies to carry out the activities as agreed in the project document and to avoid any further delays.





**Table 3 Work Plan and Time Table for Coral Reef Sub-component to 2007.** [Cam = Cambodia; Ind = Indonesia; Mal = Malaysia; Phi = Philippines; Tha = Thailand; Vie = Viet Nam.]

Quarter Month	2004		2005				2006				2007			
	3	4	1	2	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	J F M	A M -J	J A- S	O N- D
National Committee meetings	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
National Technical Working Group		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
RWG-CR meetings	X				X	X				X				
Provide information to RWG-CR and RSTC														
Maintain of national metadata base														
<b>Regional Databases</b>														
National revisions & up-dates of meta-data and GIS data submitted										30 Aug				
Up-loading to data-bases and presentation on Line in interactive mode						X				x				
Publication of National Reports in local language										Mal, Tha - Sep				
Publication of NAPs										Cam-Sep	Vie, Phi Mal-Dec			
<b>Regional Publication of Nat. Rpts. in English</b>														
PCU draft for focal pt review (10 days)							Draft							
Printing and distribution										x				
<b>Regional synthesis of data and information regarding the distribution and status of coral reefs (see UNEP/GEF/SCS/RSTC/ExComm.2/3)</b>					X					X				
<b>National Action Plans and SAP</b>														
Complete second draft of NAP										Mal				
Final draft of NAP				Vie	Cam Tha	Phi				Phi				
Submission for adoption of NAPs (contributing to SAP targets)							Vie		Tha, Cam, Phi		Mal			
National public meetings and workshops for NAP							Mal	Tha	Cam Mal Phi	Ind	Cam Mal	Phi	Ind	
Provide guidance to NTWG & IMC on the Coral Reef component input to SAP							X							







**Table 5 Work plan for Wetlands Sub-component during 2006-2007.**

	2006				2007			
	1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q	1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q
<b>National Wetlands Committee meetings</b>								
<b>National Technical Working Group meetings</b>								
<b>Meetings of RWG-W</b>								
<b>Complete outstanding tasks of the original MoU</b>								
Publication of national wetland reports in national languages								
Publication of the full set of national reports (English)								
Maintain and update GIS data and information								
Maintain and update national and regional meta-databases								
<b>Finalisation and implementation of demonstration site proposals</b>								
Revise and finalise the Malampaya demonstration site proposal			15 July					
Implement demonstration site activities								
<b>Adoption and implementation of national action plans</b>								
Finalisation of national action plans			31 <sup>st</sup> July					
Public and stakeholder meetings for the publicity of the national action plans								
Adoption of national action plans								
Implementation of national action plans								
<b>Finalise Strategic Action Programme</b>								
Draft revised SAP outline								
Provision of data and information on economic value of coastal wetlands		1 <sup>st</sup> July						
Input from members to the Regional Expert for the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft SAP			31 <sup>st</sup> July					
E-forum discussion on the further elaboration of the SAP								
The regional expert compile and submit the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft to the PCU the end of August 2006			31 <sup>st</sup> Aug.					
PCU edit and format the final draft for the consideration of the seventh meeting of the RSTC (14-17 Nov. 2006)								
<b>Implementation of the regional training programme</b>								
Selection of implementing agency/institute								
Finalisation of the syllabus and training materials								
Finalisation and signing of the MoU between UNEP and the selected implementing agency								
PCU send a letter to the national technical focal point regarding the regional training programme								
Nomination of trainees			31 July					
Conduct the regional training course					Feb.07			
Conduct the national echo seminars					Mar 07			





**Table 7 Work Plan for the Land-based Pollution Component to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2007 as agreed in the Seventh Meeting of the RWG-LbP<sup>1</sup>.**

Year	2005						2006				2007			
	3			4			1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Quarter														
Month	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	J - M	A - J	J - S	O - D	J-M	A-J	J-S	O-D
<b>National Activities</b>														
National Committee meetings														
National Technical Working Group														
RWG-LbP meetings									X					X
Provide data to RWG-LbP and RSTC														
<b>Submit final version of National Reports for publication by UNEP<sup>2</sup></b>			Thai, Ind						Chi-31 Aug					
<b>Publication national reports in local language</b>		Vie	Tha				Cam		Chi, Mal, Ind-Sept					
<b>Update and Maintain National Meta- database</b>				X	X	X				X				
<b>Provide and/or Update Meta-database on-line</b>									10 Sept					
<b>Provide and Update data in GIS format to regional Database</b>						X			30 Sept	X				
<b>Implementation of Pilot Activities</b>														
<b>Further Elaboration of the SAP</b>														
Provide guidance to IMC on the pollution component input to SAP														
With stakeholders review/revise plan to implement the Strategic Action Plan	<i>Dependent on SAP development</i>													
<b>Development and Finalisation of NAPs</b>	X	X												
Revised draft of NAPs		Cam Tha Vie	Ind		Mal									
Final draft of NAPs of Cam, Ind, Mal, Tha & Vie									X					
Revised NAP from China									15 Sept					
First draft of NAP from the Philippines														
Public Meeting for dissemination of NAPs														
Final draft of the Regional Overview of LbP	X	X	X	X						30 Oct				
<b>Provide inputs from focal points to Dr. Anond</b>									30 Sept					
<b>Modelling Carrying Capacity of South China Sea from Land-based Pollution</b>	X	X												
<b>Implementation of pilot activities</b>														
<b>Participation in the training programme</b>														

<sup>1</sup> Acronyms used in this table: Cam-Cambodia, Chi-China, Ind-Indonesia, Mal-Malaysia, Phi-Philippines, Tha-Thailand, Vie-Viet Nam.

<sup>2</sup> Philippines will inform the PCU timeframe for submission and publication of national report, and draft of national action plan following consultation with national working group.



**Table 9 Preliminary Work Plan and Timetable for RTF-L during 2006 - 2007.**

Month	2006				2007						
	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sixth Meeting of the RTF-L									x		
<b>1. Finalise and sign the amendment to the MoUs</b>											
1.1 Cambodia and Indonesia	x										
1.2 Malaysia		x									
1.3 Viet Nam		x									
1.4 China	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
1.5 Philippines	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
1.6 Thailand			?								
<b>2. Publish a regional review on legal matters</b>											
2.1 Finalise the review	x										
2.2 Integrate the three parts and edit the text and post on the website			x								
2.3 Format and print the review						x					
<b>3. Convene a second informal national workshop to review the outcomes of the questionnaire survey</b>											
3.1 Organise and convene the workshop		VN									
3.2 Organise and convene the workshop, China, Philippines		?									
3.3 Prepare and submit the workshop report to the RTF-L and PCU			VN	Ch Ph							
3.4 PCU review of reports and clarification				x							
<b>4. RTF-L inputs to the SAP</b>											
4.1 Formulation of draft inputs and recommendations	x										
4.2 Post draft SAP on the website		x									
4.3 RSTC and PSC review of the draft SAP			x								
4.4 PCU revision of the draft and dispatch to all project members					x						
4.5 Convene the focus group workshop to review the updated SAP and recommendations from the fifth RTF-L meeting											
4.6 Submit the report and recommendations of the focus group workshop to the PCU								x			

