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The International Coral Reef Marine Protected Area Network Meeting / 4th ICRI East Asia Regional Workshop was held from 17th to 19th of November 2008 in Shinagawa Prince Hotel, Tokyo, Japan.

1) The ICRI Regional Workshops have been held three times in East Asia Region in the past (i.e., 1996, Bali; 1997, Okinawa; and 2001, Cebu). The current workshop was held as the fourth holding of the ICRI Regional Workshop in East Asia region, with an objectives:

i) To bring together policy makers, MPA managers, experts and practitioners in East Asia and other regions to increase understanding of status and challenges of MPAs/MPA networks, and discuss on how East Asian countries can enhance developing MPA networks on coral reefs and related ecosystems toward 2012 WSSD/CBD’s MPA global targets through global, regional, national and local/site perspectives; and

ii) To plan the way forward until 2010 as a preparatory meeting including development of regional strategy and provisional TOR of possible meetings and activities in 2009 and 2010.

2) The workshop was co-hosted by the Ministry of the Environment, Japan and ICRI secretariat. A total of 65 participants attended the workshop. 10 East Asian governments and 28 organizations including international and regional organizations, academia and NGOs were represented as regular participants. In addition, there were 13 local observers, and 9 apologies of absence including 2 East Asian governments were received. 5 East Asian governments and 10 organizations were represented as ICRI members, and 5 East Asian governments and 18 organizations were non-ICRI members (ANNEX 1).

3) The final agenda of the workshop is attached in ANNEX 2. The three days workshop consisted of: informal sessions in Day 1 including welcome reception and poster session; case study presentations and parallel breakout session in Day 2; and continued breakout session and wrap up of the outcomes in Day 3. All the presentations including the one presented in the welcome reception and posters are available at Agenda and documents.
4) **Co-chair’s summary** was presented by co-chairs at the end of the workshop, and subsequently released to local press. Final document is available at [ANNEX 3](#).

5) **Provisional Plan 2009-2010** will be drafted based on the discussion in the workshop (plenary and breakout sessions). The plan describes some concrete actions to take until 2010 including development of the regional strategy, upgrade the regional MPA database, conduct regional review and gap analysis, and prepare for the regional social/management network mechanism. The draft Provisional Plan 2009-2010 will be prepared by the workshop’s secretariat (hereafter, secretariat) and circulated among participants for comments for one month period before finalization.

6) **Workshops in 2009 and 2010** were discussed. The workshop generally agreed to organize similar ICRI East Asia regional workshops in 2009 and 2010, respectively, to follow-up the discussion and implementation of the agreed Provisional Plan. The tentative candidate location for the 2009 workshop was suggested to be in Vietnam, and for the 2010 workshop in Thailand. The concept of these workshops will be included in the Provisional Plan 2009-2010.

7) **Working group** to conduct specific tasks between the workshops (i.e., after 2008 workshop until 2009 workshop) will be established. The tasks of the working group will be determined and described in the Provisional Plan 2009-2010.

### 1. Opening ceremony

Chair: Yoshihiro Natori

8) The workshop was co-chaired by Mr. Yoshihiro Natori of the United Nations University, and Dr. Vo Si Tuan of the Institute of Oceanography, Vietnam. The workshop was officially opened by the co-chairs.

9) **Mr. Masayoshi Yoshino, Vice Minister, Ministry of the Environment, Japan** welcomed the delegates to the workshop. Vice Minister outlined the importance and threats of coral reefs, and pointed out that current workshop is the first step of which Japan has expressed the development of “Coral Reef Network Strategy” in the 3rd East Asia Summit (Singapore, 2007). The Vice Minister concluded his speech by wishing the workshop to achieve fruitful discussion on the development of this strategy as part of East Asia’s regional activities toward CBD COP-10 (Nagoya, October 2010). See the speech at [Agenda and documents](#).

10) **Mr. Timothy Cipullo, U.S. Embassy Tokyo** gave opening remarks on behalf of the ICRI Mexico-US joint Secretariat. Mr. Cipullo thanked the Japanese government for organizing this workshop and welcomed the opportunity to join as the co-host of the workshop. He briefly explained the background and objectives of ICRI, and the current ICRI’s Action Plan during 2007-2009 under the Mexico-US Secretariat, which includes: to revitalize ICRI’s regional focus, including through thematic ICRI regional workshops, and to enhance Marine Protected Areas as a key conservation tool in ecosystem based management. See the speech at [Agenda and documents](#).
11) The co-chair presented the draft agenda for the workshop, which had been posted on the ICRIForum prior to the workshop and distributed to the participants as handouts. The draft agenda of the meeting was adopted as it was presented (ANNEX 2).

2. Key note presentations
Chair: Vo Si Tuan

12) **Dr. Susan Wells, an independent consultant** gave a key note presentation entitled “Regional and National Networks of Marine Protected Areas”. Dr. Wells reviewed the global backgrounds, status and challenges of international commitments on MPA networks, and made some key recommendations for the future development of regional and national MPA networks. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

13) **Dr. Richard Kenchington, Board of the International Coral Action Network (ICRAN)** gave a key note presentation entitled “Review of ICRI SEA Policies”. Dr. Kenchington overviewed the past ICRI policies regarding East Asia and South-East Asia which were adopted in the previous ICRI East Asia Regional Workshops and in ITMEMS 2 and ITMEMS 3, and made some recommendations on ICRI efforts in the region. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

14) **Dr. Chou Loke Ming, Professor, Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore**
gave a key note presentation entitled “Status and challenges of coral reef conservation and MPA networks in East Asia”. Dr. Chou reviewed the characteristics, significance, and status of coral reefs in East Asia, and regional activities on MPAs, and pointed out some future challenges in the region. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

15) Questions and/or comments were invited regarding the above three key note presentations. In discussion,

i) It was pointed out that public-private partnership was not mentioned in either of the presentations and stressed that the role of private sector is very important in driving the various platform that governments are building (e.g., CTI recognizes the role of private organizations and moving toward public-private relationships, although it is not clearly defined in its framework). On the other hand, potential concern about private initiatives has been raised taking the case in the Philippines where it resulted in marginalization of community-based initiatives and indigenous people.

ii) The case in Maldives was introduced as a good example of private sectors, where tourism industry is playing an important role in protecting about 100 resorts islands, and it was pointed out that there is a potential in outsourcing of management to private sectors. It was further pointed out that function of these areas should be more recognized as they aren’t currently recognized as protected areas because of the definitions of MPAs.

iii) A question on the status of sustainability of MPA networks was asked to the presenters. It was commented that science on MPA networks is premature and it is not yet well understood.
3. Workshop objectives and procedure

Chair: Vo Si Tuan

16) Mr. Keiji Nakashima, Coordinating Officer, Ministry of the Environment, Japan gave presentation entitled “Overall objectives and procedure – what to develop and achieve in 2008, and by 2010”. The presentation explained the proposed objectives, development procedure, and expected outcomes of the current workshop, and by 2010. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

17) Questions and/or comments were invited. In discussion,

i) The secretariat was asked to provide copies of: (a) the current presentation, (b) ICRI East Asian Seas Regional Strategy (Bali, 1996), and (c) ICRI Policy Agenda on MPA as a Strategy for Coral Reef Conservation and Management (Cebu, 2001), so that participants can refer to the proposed workshop objectives and procedures, and what was adopted in the past workshops. The secretariat has responded to distribute these copies as requested. These documents are also available at Agenda and documents.

ii) A question was asked whether non-MPA themes, such as monitoring and adoptive management, could be included in the regional strategy as MPA is not the sole solution for protecting coral reefs and related ecosystems. It was responded that, what will be included in the regional strategy depends on the discussion in the current and future workshops (i.e., 2008, 2009 and 2010) and such themes are likely to be discussed in the Group 3 (Information MPA networks) in the breakout session.

18) The Secretariat (Mr. Kohei Hibino) gave presentation entitled “Clarification of terminologies”. The presentation suggested to clarify the terms: “East Asia”, “MPA” and “MPA network”, to make sure that participants use these terms in same understanding at least in the current workshop. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

19) Questions and/or comments were invited. In discussion,

i) A question was raised on how the current workshop’s outcomes will fit in or supply to the CTI and vice versa. It was responded that it should be discussed in the current workshop where most of the CTI governments (i.e., Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Timor Leste) are represented. A possible holding of a joint meeting in order to feed into each other, learn from each other, and coordinating among various institutions, was suggested from the participant.

ii) It was pointed out that it would be useful to clarify whether the workshop is going to talk about MPAs in a sense of (a) no take zones, or in broader sense of (b) habitat protection (fishing under conservation regime), or (c) marine protection (fishery regime which may have conservation). In response to this, co-chair has suggested that current workshop shall avoid spending much time on definitions of MPAs in recognition that it varies among countries (thus not likely to meet the consensus), and that focus of the discussion should be more on practical actions.
4. Workshop A. Case study presentations on MPAs/MPA networks
Chair: Yoshihiro Natori

4-1. Local and site level

20) **Ms. Wendy Tan, Manager of the Locally Managed Marine Area Network** gave case study presentation entitled “The Locally Managed Marine Area Network (LMMA)”. The presentation introduced LMMA’s activities, successes and lessons learned as a network of community-based adaptive management in the Indo-Pacific regions including Philippines and Indonesia. See presentation at *Agenda and documents* and abstract at [ANNEX 4](#).

21) **Dr. Alan White, Marine Protected Areas Senior Scientist, Global Marine Initiative, The Nature Conservancy** gave case study presentation entitled “Scaling-up to MPA networks in the Coral Triangle: Lessons from the MPA Learning Network”. The presentation introduced the results and key findings of the study undertaken by the MPA Learning Partnership in the six major coral reef MPA sites in the Coral Triangle area. See presentation at *Agenda and documents* and abstract at [ANNEX 4](#).

22) Questions and/or comments were invited regarding the above two case study presentations. In discussion,

i) It was clarified that LMMA is not only active in the Pacific (i.e., Fiji) but also in East Asia where there are 15 LMMA sites in the Philippines and 12 sites in Indonesia.

ii) It was also clarified that LMMA and CTI are trying to work together in community involvement. It was added that an advantage of LMMA is that it is a diverse network and not exclusive by any means, thus open and looking for any opportunities for collaboration.

4-2. National level

23) **Dr. Antonio Manila, Chief, Wildlife Resources Division, Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines** gave case study presentation entitled “Marine Protected Area Support Network in the Philippines”. The presentation introduced about national legislations on MPAs, development of national multi-sectoral alliance to support MPA initiatives, transborder alliance, and future challenges. See presentation at *Agenda and documents* and abstract at [ANNEX 4](#).

24) **Ms. Nguyen Giang Thu, Vice Director, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Department of Science, Technology and Environment, Vietnam** gave case study presentation entitled “The process of proposal development of 15 MPA sites in Vietnam”. The presentation introduced national MPA social networks, process of protected area designation, and about the proposed national MPA network among listed 15 MPA sites. See presentation at *Agenda and documents* and abstract at [ANNEX 4](#).

25) **Ms. Cherryneta Yunia, Deputy Director of Conservation Areas, Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation, Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia** gave case study presentation entitled “Marine Protected Area networks in Indonesia”. The presentation introduced the status and
challenges of developing national network of MPAs from three different aspects, i.e., ecological networks, management networks, and coordinating networks. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

26) Mr. Tsunao Watanabe, Director, Nature Environmental Strategy Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment gave case study presentation entitled “Coral Reef MPA and Conservation Program in Japan”. The presentation introduced current status of and conservation activities on coral reefs and high-latitude coral communities, and explained that their immediate challenge is to develop the National Coral Reef Conservation Action Plan, which includes national MPA network, by 2010. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

27) The secretariat (Mr. Kohei Hibino) gave presentation entitled “Results of questionnaire survey”. The presentation summarized the results of the questionnaire survey undertaken before the workshop which were specifically targeted to participating East Asian governments. The results of feedbacks from all the participants were also introduced. The handouts of this presentation was distributed to participants for reference. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

28) Questions and/or comments were invited regarding the above four case study presentations and result of questionnaire survey. In discussion,

i) Comment was raised to the result of the questionnaire survey, that there is an interesting gap between what we want to talk about and what we want to achieve. For example, the result shows that we want to talk about “management effectiveness” and “ecosystem based management”, while expected outcomes is “mechanism for collaboration”.

ii) The comment was noted.

4-3. Regional and sub-regional level

29) Dr. Georgina Bustamante, Steering Committee member of the Caribbean MPA Management Network and Forum gave case study presentation entitled “CaMPAM: a network of people to serve a network of MPAs in the Wider Caribbean”. The presentation explained about the CaMPAM Network & Forum which is a network of MPA managers from 38 countries and territories of the wider Caribbean, and its activities including development of various communication and capacity building tools such as the Regional MPA database. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

30) Mr. Fabian Iyar, Chief Executive Officer of the Palau International Coral Reef Center gave case study presentation entitled “The Micronesia Challenge”. The presentation explained about the Micronesia Challenge’s conservation targets, regional structure, lessons learned, and potential prioritized indicators for regional measurement. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

31) Ms. Eny Budi Sri Haryani, Deputy Director for Rehabilitation and Utilization of Coasts and Marine Areas, Directorate of Marine, Coasts and Small Islands Affairs, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia gave case study presentation entitled “Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF)”. The presentation introduced about the CTI-CFF as a new
multilateral partnership by 6 countries in Coral Triangle area that aims to help safeguard the marine and coastal resources for their future generations with emphasis on the recently drafted Regional Plan of Action which includes goals and targets of the initiative. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

32) Dr. Porfirio Alino, Professor, Marine Science Institute, University of the Philippines gave case study presentation entitled “The South China Sea: An exemplar for achieving coral reef governance”. The presentation introduced about the UNEP-GEF’s South China Sea Project which is a regional framework participated by 7 countries and aiming to address environmental problems in South China Sea. Its management framework, status, and targets on coral reef conservation were explained. See presentation at Agenda and documents and abstract at ANNEX 4.

33) Questions and/or comments were invited regarding the above four case study presentations. In discussion,

i) Information was shared that there is an international initiative on mangroves in South East Asia, led by IUCN and UNDP, and more information are available in the website at: http://www.mangrovesforthefuture.org/

ii) Another information was shared by IUCN on recently developed “South Asia Managers tool kit”, a comprehensive and hands-on tool kit for MPA managers.

5. Workshop B. Parallel breakout session on the Provisional Plan

Chair: Vo Sı Tuan

5-1. Introduction of the breakout session - discussion on the Provisional Plan to implement in 2009 and 2010

Introduction of the breakout session

34) “Introduction of the breakout session” was presented by the co-chair. The presentation (See Agenda and documents) explained that:

i) The objective of the breakout session is to discuss and determine the Provisional Plan – an overall plan to implement in the next two years (2009 and 2010), including the development of the regional strategy and other corresponding outcomes.

ii) All the workshop participants will break up into three thematic groups based on sign ups before the workshop and each will be lead by co-facilitators: Group 1. Ecological MPA networks (Dr. Thamasak Yeemin & Dr. Shinichiro Kakuma); Group 2. Social/Management MPA networks (Dr. Porfirio Alino & Dr. Makoto Tsuchiya); and Group 3. Information MPA networks (Dr. Chou Loke Ming & Dr. Kazuo Nadaoka).

iii) Facilitators are requested to summarize the outcomes of their group’s discussions by using the report template and report back in Agenda item 7-1.
iv) Potential topics in each group have been identified by facilitators before the workshop from participants’ inputs by the questionnaire survey and the application form.

**Common and/or overarching matters about the regional strategy**

35) The co-chair invited comments on common and/or overarching issues about the development of the regional strategy (based on the presentation given at Agenda item 3-1). There were some initial discussion under this agenda item, and it was decided that, during the workshop:

i) Secretariat will prepare a list of possible common and/or overarching issues on the development of the regional strategy with each showing 3-4 options of choice to facilitate the discussion;

ii) Secretariat will clarify the purpose of development of the regional strategy; and

iii) Each groups in the breakout session will discuss about the concept and objectives of the regional strategy.

36) Based on these discussion and preparation, another round of discussion took place in agenda item 7-2. All the discussion regarding development of the regional strategy were summarized below:

**Objectives**

37) The co-chair clarified the rationale on why the regional strategy is needed as:

i) The existing regional strategy, particularly (a) ICRI East Asian Seas Regional Strategy (Bali, 1996) and (b) ICRI Policy Agenda on MPA as a Strategy for Coral Reef Conservation and Management (Cebu, 2001), showed that they are general strategy on overall coral reef conservation and/or not on “MPA networks”. Thus, we need to develop a regional strategy that makes MPA networks operational; and

ii) Most of countries in the region are not likely to meet the WSSD/CBD 2012 MPA target goals and requiring supports to the national level efforts, and thus, inputs regarding national policies and priorities to the regional strategy are needed.

38) In discussion,

i) It was pointed out that, from the beginning of ICRI, MPA has been mentioned in original documents (i.e., ICRI Call to Action and ICRI Framework for Action) as part of integrated coastal zone management (WSSD goal covers both issues). ICRI Framework for Action definitely refers to MPAs and the Regional Strategy from 1996 also refers to them. It was further pointed out that we need to clarify how MPAs relates to integrated coastal zone management.
ii) In response to this comment, co-chair have replied and clarified that, we may have some strategy on MPAs but they are not operational (therefore strategy that makes MPA networks operational is needed).

Timeframe

39) Timeframe of the regional strategy was discussed. In discussion,

i) Some other examples of timeframe were raised, such as: CTI is 10 years; and South China Sea Project is revised every 4 years.

ii) It was pointed out that: (a) timeframe depends on the content of the strategy; (b) Rolling strategy to be reviewed every few years is better; and (c) Combination of short-term strategy (2-5 years) to achieve immediate goals (i.e., WSSD/CBD 2012 target goals) and longer-term strategy (i.e., 2020) is appropriate.

40) In conclusion, it was agreed that regional strategy shall compose of two different timeframes: (a) short-term action plans with the timeframe until 2012 (to achieve WSSD/CBD targets); and (b) long-term strategy (i.e., 2020).

Title

41) Title of the regional strategy was discussed. It was pointed out that it may not be necessary to include “ICRI” in the title as only 5 participating countries in the region are ICRI members. Clarification were made to this point that ICRI is an informal process and association of governments and non-government organizations sharing a common purpose (to reverse the degradation of coral reefs and related ecosystems), and thus, participation of non-ICRI members in the workshop will not be a problem.

Length

42) Length of the regional strategy was discussed. The workshop was informed that the ICRI East Asian Seas Regional Strategy (Bali, 1996) was 11 pages in length and could be an indicative length for the regional strategy.

43) In conclusion, the length of the regional strategy should not be too long with maximum of 10 pages.

Level of agreement

44) The workshop discussed on what level of agreement should the regional strategy be aiming at. In discussion,

i) It was pointed out that it might not be worth getting government’s commitment as it would be time-consuming work, and that governments are already committed to WSSD/CBD targets. Thus, the strategy that we will make should focus on something more realistic that can assist achieving these committed targets.
ii) It was suggested that it is necessary to target the right level in the government, to those who implement the strategy rather than higher position in the government since they are not always in such a position.

iii) The need of getting this kind of strategy to the highest political level was stressed in a view that hardly any country is likely to meet the CBD target. It was also pointed out that the strategy should be disseminated to broad range of stakeholders, such as donors (to influence their programs).

Reflection to policy & action

45) The question on how to make the regional strategy effectively taken up/reflected to each countries’ policy and action, was discussed. In discussion,

i) It was suggested that we should try to get the regional strategy reflected in all the countries’ national action plans because most countries don’t have them yet, and if it is reflected to national action plans, it will automatically get higher recognition.

ii) It was pointed out that, aside from trying to get the strategy reflected into policy, there needs to be a permanent focal point or a coordinator to actually implement and/or coordinate the existing and new activities.

46) In conclusion, Co-chair have explained that these comments and suggestions will be considered by the secretariat and incorporated in the draft Provisional Plan 2009-2010, and circulated to all participants for comments for one month period before finalization.

5-2. Parallel group discussions

47) All the workshop participants broke into three groups and the each group was led by the co-facilitators.

48) Participants have re-convened in the plenary room after the breakout session and co-chair explained about the next day’s session.

6. Workshop B. Parallel breakout session on the Provisional Plan (continued from Day 2)
Chair: Vo Si Tuan

6-1. Recap of Day 2 Workshop B

49) Before moving into recapturing of the results of Day 2’s breakout session, co-chair clarified the purpose and procedure of developing the regional strategy in Agenda item 5-1. Co-chair also clarified that the
regional strategy will incorporate the discussion and inputs from workshops in 2008-2010 and from respective countries in the region, and be finalized by 2010.

50) The facilitators of each group presented on what had been discussed in their group in the Day 2’s session and explained the plan for Day 3’s discussion. Following each group’s presentation, questions and/or comments were invited. In discussion,

i) A comment was raised to Group 3 (Information MPA networks) that it would be worthwhile asking each countries to develop their own database as the availability of data (in regional level) depends on countries’ ability to provide data. Thus, it could be mentioned in the regional strategy that countries would have to commit to data management.

ii) In response to the comment, the facilitator replied that this issue had been discussed in Group 3 on Day 2 and will further be discussed on Day 3. The discussion in Group 3 suggested that there needs to be some kind of rewarding system or incentives that countries may get motivated in collecting and sharing their data. It was pointed out that most of the national level database has different format and there is a challenge in combining them into regional level database.

6-2. Parallel group discussions (continued from Day 2)

51) All the workshop participants broke into three groups similarly as Day 2’s breakout session.

7. Workshop C. Plenary discussion on the Provisional Plan

Chair: Yoshihiro Natori

7-1. Report back from each groups

52) The facilitators presented the result of their group’s discussion using the report template. The summary of each group’s outcomes have been reviewed after the workshop by the facilitators and attached in Annexes.

53) Group 1. “Ecological MPA networks” presented their report (ANNEX 5) and questions and/or comments were invited. In discussion,

i) The group’s interpretation of CBD target was clarified as to achieve by 2012, at least 10% of each marine and coastal ecological regions to be effectively conserved.

ii) It was pointed out that, in terms of ecological network, connectivity between different ecosystems (e.g., terrestrial, marine, sea grass, coral reefs, mangroves) is important and should be considered. The facilitator has agreed to incorporate the idea in their discussion.

iii) The adequacy of modifying the CBD criteria on MPAs to gain regional MPA criteria on coral reefs
and related ecosystems was discussed. It was commented that it is sensible way to go rather than: (a) inventing a new criteria (which takes extensive time and efforts), and (b) adopting them directly (as it could be useful to assess them in the context of region).

iv) The Group 2’s facilitator commented that CBD target was discussed in their group and that they will continue to discuss this and seek to come up with some suggestions, particularly on: (a) how to achieve the regional gap analysis, and (b) where the 10% of ecological regions should be interpreted (based on understanding that definition is not clear).

v) It was pointed out that we should not delay the objectives of ICRI (to reverse the degradation of coral reefs) by being disturbed by CBD target which is not only for no-take MPAs but allowing 90% of ineffectively managed MPAs (from personal view that MPAs should be no-take zones).

54) Group 2. “Social/Management MPA networks” presented their report (ANNEX 6) and questions and/or comments were invited. In discussion,

i) An idea to organize regular workshops in the region was supported while the question was raised on how to gain funding to organize such workshops. The facilitator replied that the tentative idea is to make proposals for potential supporters and donor institutions.

ii) It was suggested that ICRI should seek for better solution to move these activities forward by referring to lessons learned in CTI where participating governments provide secretariat functions and NGOs are pushing the governments and donors.

55) Group 3. “Information MPA networks” presented their report (ANNEX 7) and questions and/or comments were invited. In discussion,

i) Question was raised from the Group 2 (where it spent lot of time talking about the lack of implementation structure for the regional strategy) as to what extent the IUCN WCPA-Marine’s regional mechanism (which was raised as potential mechanism for information sharing) can provide support. The WCPA Marine’s regional coordinator for the South-East Asian Seas replied that the regional mechanism has just started and still at an initial stage of development, i.e., website on MPA layers (and therefore not ready to provide support).

7-2. Proposal and discussion of draft Provisional Plan

56) The Secretariat have prepared a pair of list which picked up proposed action items and procedure to be undertaken until 2010 from reports that have been presented in Agenda item 7-1. The list was provided as a basis to discuss the contents to be incorporated in the draft Provisional Plan. All the proposed key action items were classified either under: (a) Regional strategy; (b) Regional MPA database; (c) Regional review and gap analysis; and (d) Regional social/management network mechanism. Co-chair have explained each suggested action and procedure, and invited comments.
### Regional strategy

57) Initially suggested actions and timeframe under this item were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review existing regional strategies and action plans</td>
<td>deadline/timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a context of ICRI and MPA networks</td>
<td>not proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial draft regional strategy to be ready for review</td>
<td>by mid 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft to be further reviewed and discussed in the 2009 workshop</td>
<td>by late 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize and adopt the draft after discussion and review in the 2010</td>
<td>by mid 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launched the regional strategy at the CBD COP-10</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Long-term strategic plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate discussion on developing the long-term strategic plan for</td>
<td>deadline/timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Training and capacity building programs for managers to improve</td>
<td>not proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operation of effective MPAs”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58) In discussion,

i) Secretariat was suggested to be the most appropriate body to produce the draft Provisional Plan, and participants to contribute in reviewing the draft. It was further suggested that there needs to be a reviewing process of existing strategies in the region before drafting the regional strategy.

ii) Suggestion were made that drafting, adoption and launch of the regional strategy should be ahead of suggested schedule in order to be in more formal position to launch it in 2010 with a benefit of experiences. The proposed modified timeline was: (a) draft to be ready and circulated to relevant people before the 2009 workshop for comments, (b) seek adoption at the 2009 workshop, and (c) if there are some modification needed after that, adopt the slightly revised version in early 2010.

iii) The secretariat generally agreed to draft the regional strategy and to try to be ready with the draft before 2009 workshop, but requested to participants to contribute in assisting the secretariat in drafting and reviewing process.

### Regional MPA database

59) Initially suggested actions and timeframe under this item were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish working group</td>
<td>at this workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get commitment from the participating governments to contribute in MPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database development by verifying and providing the data</td>
<td>by January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize and agree the development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Conclude the contract (between JWRC-WorldFish Center)
- Finalize the regional MPA database by December 2009
- Launched the regional MPA database at the CBD COP-10 October 2010

Coral reef mapping
- Conduct mapping of coral reefs in the region using satellite images deadline/timeframe not proposed

Collaboration for science based actions
- Initiate discussion on building a network of collaboration for science based actions to fill the gap of the lack of available scientific information required for ecosystem based management deadline/timeframe not proposed
- Discuss about this in details in the 2009 workshop

Regional information sharing network
- Discussion about possible development of information sharing network in details in the 2009 and 2010 workshops

60) In discussion,

i) The workshop did not have comments in particular on the proposed actions, timeframe and requests.

**Regional review and gap analysis**

61) Initially suggested actions and timeframe under this item were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional review and gap analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish working group (volunteers from Group 3)</td>
<td>at this workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Get commitment from the participating governments to contribute in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducting the regional review and gap analysis in providing information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and reviewing the draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initial draft and TOR (including identifying the consultant) to be ready</td>
<td>by December 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Requirements about regional level gap analysis (i.e., CBD) to be reviewed</td>
<td>by April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TOR of the working group (volunteers from Group 3) to be ready and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed; Contract with the consultant finalized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progress report to be submitted to and reviewed in the 2009 workshop</td>
<td>Mid-late 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draft to be agreed and finalized</td>
<td>by March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Launched the regional review and gap analysis at the CBD COP-10</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and modification of CBD criteria on MPAs/MPA networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The working group (volunteers from Group 1) to review and modify CBD</td>
<td>deadline/timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria on MPAs and MPA networks in a perspectives of the region and</td>
<td>not proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coral reefs and related ecosystems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draft review and proposed modification to be circulated to participants for comments</td>
<td>deadline/timeframe not proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss about this in details</td>
<td>in the 2009 workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62) In discussion,

i) Question was raised on whether there will be any funds available to conduct the regional review and
gap analysis.

ii) Japanese government has replied that Japan is planning to fund this activity by hiring a consultant(s) to conduct the drafting process. It was also mentioned that Japan is planning to fund other relevant activities such as mapping of coral reefs. Japan suggested other countries or organizations to consider providing additional funding to support these activities.

iii) Regarding review and modification of CBD criteria, it was suggested that it would also be helpful to review other criteria and guidelines, such as IUCN WCPA-Marine ones.

iv) Group 1 suggested to provide the results of their review and proposed modification of CBD criteria to Group 3 for their inputs to conduct regional review and gap analysis.

**Regional social/management network mechanism**

63) Initially suggested actions and timeframe under this item were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social/information network</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue discussion among the Group 2 to clarify the need for social/information network in the East Asian Seas Region</td>
<td>deadline/timeframe not proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Workshop for Assessment of MPA Management Effectiveness</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake initial review on protocols and standards of management effectiveness on social and governance MPA networks</td>
<td>December 2008 – April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake analysis on results of the initial review</td>
<td>May – September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposal of “Regional Workshop for Assessment of MPA Management Effectiveness” to provide appropriate protocol at /regional/national/site level to each country in the region” to be ready for review</td>
<td>by the 2009 workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64) In discussion,

i) Clarification were made that, Group 2 members will continue the discussion and come up with an initial plan or a concept note on social/information network by middle of 2009.

ii) Further clarification were made from Group 2 on the regional workshop for assessment of MPA management effectiveness that: (a) PEMSEA 2009 meeting (November 2009, Manila) was suggested to be the target location for the workshop, (b) potential people who could organize and facilitate the workshop are already identified by the group, and (c) there is a concern that there are no funding to organize the workshop and therefore fund raising might be necessary.

iii) It was suggested that social network and information network should be combined as it is dealing on similar issues. While it was commented from Group 2 that we need to think about types of networks in the regional strategy - whether we should have an overall network of separate networks (i.e., Group 2 talked about different objectives of the networks where information network was suggested to be for
collecting information and database, and social network is for a learning network), and that the network has to happen at multiple levels (i.e., government levels and site managers levels)

iv) In addition, Group 2 pointed out that we need to clarify what is the need for the social network in the region as there are lot of networks already in place.

65) In conclusion,

i) The workshop generally agreed to incorporate proposed actions and procedure in the draft Provisional Plan by reflecting the discussions.

ii) The secretariat will revise the draft Provisional Plan 2009-2010 based on comments received during the workshop and circulate it to all the workshop participants for comments for one month period, and finalize it after discussion and revision.

iii) The working group will be established to continue discussion and/or to follow-up specific tasks as proposed in the group discussion. The form (i.e., whether the 3 groups will maintain and work separately, or to make one combined working group by interested people, etc.) and terms of reference (tasks, timeframe, members, etc.) for the working group has not been clearly determined. Therefore, these will be considered among Co-chairs, facilitators and secretariat and draft TOR will be circulated to participants for comments before finalization.

8. Workshop D. Plenary discussion on plans for 2009 and 2010 meetings
Chair: Vo Si Tuan


66) Initial draft terms of reference (TOR) for 2009-2010 meetings was prepared by the secretariat and shown on the screen and comments were invited.

67) **Time and location for 2009 workshop:** Candidate time and location for the 2009 workshop was invited. In discussion,

i) Vietnam indicated possible hosting of the 2009 workshop in Vietnam either in Hanoi (October to November is the best season) or at coastal cities where MPAs are around (available from January to October). However, it was noted that it needs to go through formal procedure and decision is subject to the official request from the secretariat and approval in its government.

ii) Vietnam suggested to have local informal working group to work with secretariat in order to plan and arrange the workshop flexibly and effectively.
iii) Japan offered to support the next workshop and work with government of Vietnam to arrange details to realize good progress.

68) **Time and location for 2010 workshop:** Candidate time and location for the 2010 workshop was invited. In discussion,

i) It was suggested that it could be held back to back with the 2nd Asia Pacific Coral Reef Symposium (APCRS2) which is due to be held in 2010, in Phuket of Thailand, and

ii) The chair of APCR2 has replied that it could be possible and indicated that the suggestion will be taken back to Thailand for consideration.

69) **Co-chair and facilitators:** Suggestions for co-chairs and facilitators in 2009 and 2010 workshops were invited. In discussion, two optional suggestions were raised:

i) Secretariat to contact the host country and decide who is most appropriate, and

ii) Maintain the same (current) co-chair and facilitators taking into account that working group(s) which is expected to be led by facilitators will have to report back in the next workshop.

70) **Expected participants** in the 2009 and 2010 workshops were suggested to include:

i) local managers and stakeholders,

ii) other relevant programs (Group 2 suggested to identify other programs which we should work with), and

iii) local leaders/ head of the district, etc.

71) **Provisional agenda for 2009 and 2010 workshops** were discussed. In discussion, below agenda were suggested to be included:

i) Review of the progress from 2008 workshop particularly on the action items agreed in the Provisional Plan,

ii) Draft regional strategy (draft outline in 2009 and final draft in 2010) for review, including prospective deadlines for further review, and

iii) Expected outputs from each workshop.

72) In conclusion,

i) The workshop agreed to organize another ICRI East Asia Regional Workshops in 2009 and 2010, respectively. The workshop generally agreed that the form of the workshop could be similar to current workshop.
ii) The possibility as well as arrangement of the workshop in 2009 and 2010 will be discussed between the secretariat and government of Vietnam and Thailand.

iii) The secretariat will revise the draft TOR based on comments received during the workshop and circulate it to all the workshop participants for comments for one month period, and finalize it after discussion and revision.

9. Wrap up of the meeting

Chair: Yoshihiro Natori

Workshop summary

73) The draft Co-chair’s summary which summarized the workshop procedures and outputs were prepared by Co-chairs, facilitators and secretariat. The draft was read out by paragraphs to paragraphs, and comments for any suggested changes were invited.

74) The draft Co-chair’s summary was adopted by the workshop by reflecting some suggested minor changes.

Close of the workshop

75) In closing, the Co-chairs thanked the participants for their active participation and contribution in the discussion. Acknowledgement was also extended to the government of Japan for their generous hard work and leadership in hosting the workshop, providing secretariat functions to prepare and arrange all the workshop settings, and supporting the travel to enable participation of some participants; and to facilitators for their hard work in facilitating the breakout session and compiling the reports.

76) The government of Japan echoed to Co-chairs’ acknowledgement and thanked to the Co-chairs for their hard work in chairing throughout the workshop which enabled achieving fruitful outcomes, and reiterated the Japanese government’s commitment to continue hosting the workshops in 2009 and 2010, supporting corresponding activities, and to continue the efforts to enhance MPA networks in collaboration with the East Asian countries.

77) The Co-chairs reiterated that the draft Summary Report, the draft Provisional Plan 2009-2010, and the draft TOR for the 2009 and 2010 workshops will be prepared by the secretariat based on comments and suggestions during the workshop, and circulated to all participants for comments for one month period before finalization. These documents will be submitted to the next ICRI General Meeting due to be held in April 2009, in Thailand. All the presentations (oral and poster) in the workshop as well as corresponding background documents will be made available on ICRIForum shortly by the secretariat.
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<td>Marisa</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:MARISA_ARAMAKI@env.go.jp">MARISA_ARAMAKI@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Rie</td>
<td>Fukakusa</td>
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<td>Kishino</td>
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<td>Y</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:DAIZABURO_KURODA@env.go.jp">DAIZABURO_KURODA@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keiji</td>
<td>Nakashima</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KEIJI2_NAKASHIMA@env.go.jp">KEIJI2_NAKASHIMA@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoichi</td>
<td>Sakurai</td>
<td><a href="mailto:YOICHI_SAKURAI@env.go.jp">YOICHI_SAKURAI@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Toshio</td>
<td>Torii</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TOSHIO_TORII@env.go.jp">TOSHIO_TORII@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
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<td>Tsunao</td>
<td>Watanabe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TSUNAO_WATANABE@env.go.jp">TSUNAO_WATANABE@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
<td>Tsuyoshi</td>
<td>Kanda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Takeda.Shingo@jica.go.jp">Takeda.Shingo@jica.go.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
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<td>Shingo</td>
<td>Takeda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Takeda.Shingo@jica.go.jp">Takeda.Shingo@jica.go.jp</a></td>
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<td>Malaysia</td>
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<td>Ghazali</td>
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<td>Takashi</td>
<td>Kuboi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TAKASHI_KUBOI@env.go.jp">TAKASHI_KUBOI@env.go.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco Guide Cafe</td>
<td>Yasushi</td>
<td>Izawa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ceo@webman.jp">ceo@webman.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan Wildlife Research Center</td>
<td>Masaaki</td>
<td>Yoneda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:myoneda@jwrc.or.jp">myoneda@jwrc.or.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
<td>Satoshi</td>
<td>Chikami</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chikami.Satoshi@jica.go.jp">Chikami.Satoshi@jica.go.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Big Bird</td>
<td>Hibina</td>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td><a href="mailto:h-chiba@ss.iij4u.or.jp">h-chiba@ss.iij4u.or.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa ReefCheck &amp; Research Club</td>
<td>Mariko</td>
<td>Abe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shark@xc4.so-net.ne.jp">shark@xc4.so-net.ne.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizuoka University</td>
<td>Yoshimi</td>
<td>Suzuki</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seysuzu@ipc.shizuoka.ac.jp">seysuzu@ipc.shizuoka.ac.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oceanic Wildlife Society</td>
<td>Naoko</td>
<td>Namizaki</td>
<td><a href="mailto:namizaki@ows-npo.org">namizaki@ows-npo.org</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision &amp; Spirit for Overseas Cooperation Co., Ltd</td>
<td>Tomoshi</td>
<td>Ichikawa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ichikawa-t@vsoc.jp">ichikawa-t@vsoc.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoshiteru</td>
<td>Yano</td>
<td><a href="mailto:homeostasis2@ybb.ne.jp">homeostasis2@ybb.ne.jp</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soken</td>
<td>Kuroda</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jyunichi</td>
<td>Komiya</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touma</td>
<td>Suganuma</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# FINAL AGENDA

## Monday, 17th November (Day 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Tokyo city tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Poster and Exhibit set-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal pre-meeting poster session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Welcome reception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Tuesday, 18th November (Day 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td><strong>1. Opening ceremony</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 - Welcome remarks (Co-chairs: Yoshihiro Natori and Vo Si Tuan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 - Opening remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mr. Masayoshi Yoshino, Vice Minister, Ministry of the Environment, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mr. Timothy Cipullo, U.S. Embassy Tokyo (on behalf of ICRI Secretariat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 - Adoption of agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35</td>
<td><strong>2. Key note presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 – Regional and National Networks of Marine Protected Areas (Susan Wells)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 - Review of ICRI SEA Policies (Richard Kenchington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 - Status and challenges of coral reef conservation and MPA networks in East Asia (Chou Loke Ming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td><strong>3. Workshop objectives and procedure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 - Overall objectives and procedure – what to develop and achieve in 2008, and by 2010 (NAKASHIMA Keiji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 - Clarification of terminologies (Kohei Hibino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td><strong>4. Workshop A. Case study presentations on MPAs/MPA networks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 - Local and site level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.1 - The Locally Managed Marine Area Network (LMMA) (Wendy Tan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 - Scaling-up to MPA networks in the Coral Triangle: Lessons from the MPA Learning Network (Alan White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;As / Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 - National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1 - Marine Protected Area Support Network in the Philippines (Antonio Manila)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 - The process of proposal development of 15 MPA sites in Vietnam (Nguyen Giang Thu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 - Marine Protected Area networks in Indonesia (Cherryta Yunia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.4 - Coral Reef MPA and Conservation Program in Japan (WATANABE Tsunao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.5 - Results of questionnaire survey (Kohei Hibino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;As / Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 2

| 14:10 | **4.3 - Regional and sub-regional level**  
4.3.1 - CaMPAM: a network of people to serve a network of MPAs in the Wider Caribbean (*Georgina Bustamante*)  
4.3.2 - The Micronesia Challenge (*Fabian Iyar*)  
4.3.3 - Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF) (*Eny Budi Sri Haryani*)  
4.3.4 - The South China Sea: An exemplar for achieving coral reef governance (*Porfilio Alino*)  
Q&As / Discussion |
| 15:00 | **5. Workshop B. Parallel breakout session on the Provisional Plan**  
5.1 - Introduction of the breakout session – discussion on the Provisional Plan to implement in 2009 and 2010 (*Co-chairs*)  
5.2 - Parallel group discussions (*Facilitators*):  
  - Group 1. Ecological MPA networks (*Thamasak Yeemin & Shinichiro Kakuma*)  
  - Group 2. Social/Management MPA networks (*Porfilio Alino & Makoto Tsuchiya*)  
  - Group 3. Information MPA networks (*Chou Loke Ming & Kazuo Nadaoka*)  
Q&As / Discussion |
| 18:00 | End of the day |

### Wednesday, 19th November (Day 3)

| 9:00 | **6. Workshop B. Parallel breakout session on the Provisional Plan** (continued from Day 2) |
| 9:20 | 6.1 - Recap of Day 2 Workshop B (*Co-chairs, facilitators*)  
6.2 - Parallel group discussions (continued from Day 2). |
| 12:00 | Lunch |
| 13:30 | **7. Workshop C. Plenary discussion on the Provisional Plan**  
7.1 - Report back from each groups (*Facilitators*)  
Q&As / Discussion  
7.2 - Proposal and discussion of draft Provisional Plan (*Co-chairs*)  
Q&As / Discussion |
| 16:00 | **8. Workshop D. Plenary discussion on plans for 2009 and 2010 meetings**  
8.1 - Terms of reference for 2009 – 2010 meetings (*Co-chairs*)  
8.2 - Next 2009 regional workshop  
Coffee Break |
| 17:30 | **9. Wrap up of the meeting**  
9.1 - Workshop summary (*Co-chairs*) |
| 18:00 | 9.2 - Close of the workshop |
Co-chair’s Summary
The International Coral Reef Marine Protected Area Network Meeting /
4th ICRI East Asia Regional Workshop
17th – 19th November 2008, Shinagawa Prince Hotel, Tokyo, Japan

The workshop was convened by Japan’s Ministry of the Environment and the ICRI Secretariat, and was attended by 10 East Asian government representatives and 26 groups including international and regional organizations, academic bodies and NGOs totaling 65 participants (among whom 13 were local observers). The workshop was co-chaired by Mr. Yoshihiro Natori of the United Nations University and Dr. Vo Si Tuan of Vietnam’s Institute of Oceanography. A summary of the workshop is given below.

1. Participants
   - ICRI members: 6 countries and states; 10 organizations
   - Non-ICRI members: 4 countries and states; 16 organizations

2. Background
The East Asian region (Northeast and Southeast Asia) encompasses a wide range of rich, diverse marine and coastal ecosystems including the Coral Triangle – the global center of marine biodiversity. Coral reefs and related ecosystems sustain the vast majority of livelihoods as well as the economic health of these coastal nations. Yet many of these reefs are seriously endangered, and urgent action needs to be taken to improve conservation and management. The Marine Protected Area (MPA) system is recognized as one of the most effective tools in conserving such marine and coastal ecosystems. In this context, the international community committed itself to developing representative networks of MPAs by 2012 at WSSD and CBD COP 7.

ICRI East Asia Regional Workshops have so far been held three times, and have developed regional policy documents such as the East Asia Seas Regional Strategy (1996, Bali), the Okinawa Declaration (1997, Okinawa) and the East Asia Policy Agenda on Marine Protected Areas as a Strategy for Coral Reef Conservation and Management (2001, Cebu). However, the actual implementation of these policies has often not received subsequent follow-up. Although there have been many ongoing regional and national initiatives and programs and some tangible progress has been made in East Asia on MPAs/MPA networks, most countries are still at the stage of development toward MPA global targets, and many challenges still need to be addressed.

3. Objectives
The workshop was convened with the aim of improving the conservation of coral reefs and related ecosystems by developing a coral reef MPA network in the East Asia Region. The objectives of the workshop were as follows:

i. To bring together policy makers, MPA managers, experts and practitioners related to MPAs that contain coral reefs and related ecosystems in East Asia and other regions to increase understanding of the status and challenges facing MPAs/MPA networks with these ecosystems, and to discuss how East Asian countries can enhance such MPA networks to meet the 2012 targets from a global perspective.

ii. To act as a preparatory meeting for the purpose of planning the way forward to 2010, including the development of a regional strategy and provisional TOR for possible meetings and activities in 2009 and
4. **Keynote presentations**

Dr. Wells reviewed the global background, status and challenges of international commitments relating to MPA networks, and made recommendations including the enhancement of collaboration and co-ordination as well as the adoption of a harmonized, stepwise approach. Dr. Kenchington gave an overview of the ICRI regional policies made in previous workshops (i.e., Bali 1996, Okinawa 1997 and Cebu 2001) and the regional caucuses of ITMEMS 2 and 3, and pointed out that MPA is a major element in Southeast Asian ICRI project work, yet there are many challenges remaining. Professor Chou reviewed the characteristics, significance and status of coral reefs in East Asia and regional activities relating to MPAs. He pointed out that only 8% of Southeast Asian reefs lie within MPAs, and only 1% within MPAs that are effectively managed, meaning that further efforts are needed.

5. **Case study presentations on MPAs/MPA networks**

Case studies of MPAs/MPA networks on coral reefs and the related ecosystems at each level were presented, and good practices as well as the issues involved were shared.

- **Local and site level**
  
  The LMMA Network is a local community network in the Pacific Ocean area and East Asia regions, and consists of 342 MPA sites for which it facilitates adaptive management. Meetings were introduced in which local communities play central roles, and the importance of capacity development for resource management was mentioned. Dr. White reported on the research results of site investigations performed in major coral reef areas of the Coral Triangle, which showed that illegal fishing and overfishing had a great impact on coral reefs. The necessity of developing systems that consider economic benefits for local communities was also stated.

- **National level**
  
  On a national level, representatives from the Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia and Japan reported on their activities, current status and future challenges toward coral reef conservation, as well as on the background of their development of MPA networks. The Philippines first pointed out that it is the world’s major hotspot in terms of endangered marine biodiversity, and also reported on its legislation regarding the environment and its development of multi-sectoral networks and trans-border alliances among the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia. Future challenges were also raised, including the strengthening of coastal law enforcement and institutionalized MPA incentives for good performance. Then, Vietnam introduced its domestic social networks and its process of PA legislation, including a plan to develop MPA networks involving 15 listed MPA sites. Future challenges identified included the need for institutional MPA network management among governments, capacity building and livelihood development for local residents in and around MPAs. Indonesia outlined its background and current status and challenges in terms of MPA networks. It requested cooperation among local site activities and CTI operations and the further implementation of existing initiatives. The need to promote nature conservation as well as shortages of financial and human resources were also mentioned. Japan reported its current status in terms of domestic MPAs and future challenges, including the need to enhance related legislation.

- **Regional and sub-regional level**
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The CaMPAM Network includes MPA managers from 38 countries and territories of the wider Caribbean. Its representative explained the development of a regional MPA database, communication tools and capacity building, and reported that there is no trans-boundary MPA system, although several countries have developed national MPA systems. The Micronesia Challenge involves five countries, and introduces conservation targets and common indicators. The Coral Triangle Initiative was organized by six countries, and its drafted goals, targets and regional action plans were explained. The South China Sea Project (carried out by UNEP and involving seven countries bordering the South China Sea) was also mentioned, and the project’s numerical targets on coral reef conservation and the frameworks of designated national plans were introduced.

6. Breakout session

- In order to discuss the specific topics of the Provisional Plan for 2009 and 2010, the participants separated into three groups. The co-facilitators in each group are described below.
- Ecological MPA networks (Facilitators: Prof. Thamasak Yeemin, Dr. Shinichiro Kakuma)
- Social/Management MPA networks (Facilitators: Prof. Porfirio Alino, Prof. Makoto Tsuchiya)
- Information MPA networks (Facilitators: Prof. Chou Loke Ming, Prof. Kazuo Nadaoka)

7. Provisional Plan 2009 – 2010

- The Provisional Plan to develop a regional strategy and other associated activities until 2010 was drafted based on a compilation of the results of discussions in the plenary and breakout sessions. The draft will be circulated to workshop participants, and will be agreed on after a one-month discussion and revision period. The key points are listed below.
- Development of a regional strategy
  The participants agreed to develop a regional strategy based on the discussions conducted at this workshop, 2009 and 2010 workshops and corresponding activities (a–c). The strategy consists of (1) a short-term action plan until 2012 to facilitate and assist national efforts, and (2) a longer-term strategy until 2020 or later. The draft regional strategy will be prepared prior to the 2009 workshop along with the content to be discussed at the workshop. The following items were suggested as potential key topics for the regional strategy:
  - Common targets
  - Identification of priority areas
  - Criteria for MPA/MPA networks
  - Recommendations on sub-regional-level ecological MPA networks
  - Ecosystem-based management
  - Mechanism for collaboration
  - Management effectiveness
  - Regional information-sharing networks
- Regional review and gap analysis (a)
  The participants agreed to conduct a regional review and gap analysis of MPA networks on coral reefs and related ecosystems to clarify the distance to be covered toward the 2012 target by using inputs from questionnaire surveys, case study presentations (oral and poster), and by upgrading the MPA database. It was agreed that a consultant or consultants would be hired to conduct the drafting task, and that workshop
ANNEX 3

participants (in 2009 and 2010) would review the document. The TOR of the review and gap analysis will also be determined. Japan has offered to seek the provision of funding to hire a consultant, and it was noted that supplementary donations are welcome. It was suggested that the draft should be ready by December 2009, and that the review process should be finalized by March 2010. The review and gap analysis will be launched at CBD COP 10.

- Consideration for social/management networks (b)
The workshop decided to propose the Regional Workshop for Assessment of MPA Management Effectiveness to review experiences regarding existing management effectiveness assessment protocol at regional, national and site level in each of the region’s countries, and to develop related recommendations. This is the first step in strategic plans for a social/management network to support effective MPA management. The development of short- and long-term strategic plans to implement training and capacity building programs for managers was suggested to improve the effectiveness of MPA operation. Discussion on these plans will be continued to clarify the focus, goals and appropriate levels for potential social/information networks in the region.

- Upgrade of the MPA database (c)
The workshop agreed to upgrade the MPA database to enable the development of a detailed working plan and follow up on the progress of MPAs containing coral reefs. It was suggested that ReefBase (a World Fish Center project) and Japan are the most appropriate MPA database hosts for the next phase of development. Finalization of the database by December 2009 was proposed, and its launch at CBD COP 10 in Nagoya in October 2010 was suggested. The development of the information-sharing network will remain under continuous discussion in 2009 and 2010.

8. **2009 and 2010 meetings**
- The participants reached a general agreement to organize further ICRI East Asia Regional Workshops in 2009 and 2010 to implement the above-mentioned Provisional Plan, and have drafted Terms of Reference (TOR) for these meetings. The draft will be circulated to all workshop participants and ICRI Ad Hoc Committee members for comments, and will be finalized after discussion and revision a month later. The main points are as follows:
- Vietnam offered to host the next workshop subject to official request and approval. The time and location will be discussed between the local government and the Secretariat, and will be announced to the relevant parties. The form of the workshop will be similar to that of the current workshop.
- It was suggested that the 2010 workshop should be held back to back with the 2nd Asia Pacific Coral Reef Symposium (Phuket, Thailand). The time and location will be discussed by the relevant parties, and will be finalized at the 2009 workshop. It is assumed that the form of the 2010 workshop will be similar to those of the 2008 and 2009 workshops.
- Japan suggested the provision of funding to cover major costs such as those of the venue, Secretariat functions, travel support, etc. for the 2009 and 2010 workshops, although no decision will be made until the start of each fiscal year (April). The meeting welcomed Japan’s kind offer, but also recommended that other donors contribute to this financial assistance. Participating governments and organizations were encouraged to cover the expenses of travel to the workshops.
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9. **Other**
   - A draft summary report will be prepared within one month of the workshops, circulated to participants for comments, and adopted after a one-month period of discussion.
   - The adopted summary report, the Provisional Plans for 2009 and 2010, and the TOR for the 2009 and 2010 workshops will all be submitted at the next ICRI General Meeting (April 2009, Thailand).
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2-1. Regional and National Networks of Marine Protected Areas
Susan Wells

ABSTRACT
Most of the marine protected areas (MPAs) around the world, estimated to number about 5000, have been established on an ad hoc basis rather than through any systematic planning process. The Convention on Biological Diversity requires that Party states establish, by 2012, comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected areas, and that there should be effective conservation of at least 10% of each of the world's ecological regions by 2010. This obligation, combined with individual national targets, is providing an incentive for systematic conservation planning and there are now many initiatives to develop MPA networks. Social and learning networks of MPA practitioners are also being set up and are proving essential catalysts and facilitators for the development of ecological MPA networks.

A new report produced by UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre and the UNEP Regional Seas Programme on progress being made in establishing national and regional networks reviews some 60 case studies and concludes that few have yet been formally gazetted, and even fewer are fully managed. Those that are in place are primarily networks that cover small areas, or that are part of large management initiatives or multiple-use MPAs. Most national ecological MPA networks will comprise different types of MPAs including no-take areas and multiple use sites. Where MPA management is devolved to state or local-level governments, a hierarchical approach is generally being taken, with small networks nested within larger national networks. Comparison is difficult because of the wide range of methods and different spatial and geographical scales, but the many initiatives show how MPA networks can be established in practice, and adapted to different needs and priorities.

Issues of sovereignty mean that regional networks will be made up of their constituent national MPA networks, but there is added value in countries collaborating to ensure that an ecosystem-based approach taken. Regions with a strong co-ordinating framework and with a supportive treaty or agreement tend to have progressed furthest in terms of planning, for example in Europe. Several of the UNEP Regional Seas Programme regions have Protocols specifically aimed at promoting the establishment of MPAs and are starting to establish MPA networks. International NGOs such as WWF, TNC and CI are also supporting the approach of systematic conservation planning in the marine environment.

WCPA-Marine has produced guidelines for the application of scientific principles and criteria to MPA network design, including adequacy, representation, resilience, and connectivity, and some regions and countries have developed their own criteria. The methods being used to design MPA networks range from the simple to the more sophisticated, including decision-support tools such as Marxan. Representation is being addressed widely in network design; for adequacy, connectivity and resilience, ‘rules of thumb’ have to be used until we have a better understanding. Generally, several years are needed to develop a MPA network, if stakeholders are to be fully involved and scientific design principles applied.
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2-2. Review of ICRI SEA Policies
Richard Kenchington
Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security,
University of Wollongong

ABSTRACT
The paper reviewed the history of ICRI policies as they have developed through regional meetings in East Asia.

The first global meeting of the International Coral Reef Initiative was held in 1995 in Dumaguete City Philippines. It agreed on 4 priority strategic objectives:
- Integrated Coastal Management
- Capacity Building
- Research and Monitoring
- Review and Evaluation

These remain core strategic issues for management and conservation of coral reefs, associated ecosystems of East Asia. They are relevant to the broad range of management issues affecting renewable natural resources and ecosystem processes, some of which are being addressed through regional programs such as those of PEMSEA, COBSEA, ASEAN and APEC.

The key topical issues that have emerged through ICRI regional approaches include management of issues of climate change and extreme events such as tsunamis.

Ongoing strategic issues include continuing and growing needs for capacity building, enforcement, community engagement and regional networking.

Many of the identified ICRI activities have addressed the creation and management of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) but the relationship between MPAs and fisheries, catchment and nearshore and management is often unclear and often sectorally conflicted.

In summary MPAs have been a major element of South East Asian ICRI project work but:
- The rates of MPA creation are slower than global or regional targets;
- Building and maintaining capacity for planning, management and maintenance is a continuing a challenge;
- Enforcement is a common problem; and
- Integration of MPAs with broader marine management issues and policy priorities has proved difficult to achieve.

Ongoing management and protection of coral reefs and associated ecosystems will require:
- Informing and involving decision makers to initiate and coordinate action from regional to local levels;
- Expansion of existing network of local governments among countries, resource managers, scientists, regional programs (PEMSEA, COBSEA, ASEAN APEC etc)
- Building and maintaining capacity for planning, management and maintenance.

The objectives of ICRI are still critically important for effective management of coral reefs and other marine and coastal resources of East Asia. The regional ICTI partnership and professional networks have continuing and widespread potential to support and improve national and regional policies and programs for the management of coral reefs and other marine and coastal resources of East Asia.
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2-3. Status and challenges of coral reef conservation and MPA networks in East Asia

Chou Loke Ming
National University of Singapore

ABSTRACT
The seas of East Asia covering seven million square km is are lined by a combined coastline length of 234,000 km belonging to twelve countries. They hold one third of the world’s coral reefs. More than 70% of the region’s human population live in the coastal area and together with rapid economic development, add immense pressure to the marine environment. The establishment of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) remains a common management response to coral reef degradation with 88% of East Asia’s reefs under threat. However, management effectiveness is inadequate with an estimated 10% of the region’s MPAs considered as effectively managed. MPAs do not appear to be targeting coral reefs as only 8% of Southeast Asia’s reefs lie within MPAs. There are numerous regional activities on coral reef conservation and MPA enhancement but gaps are still evident. These gaps relate to management effectiveness, ecological representation, identification of reefs in need of protection, and coordination. Mechanisms to improve information sharing and capacity transfer will result in more effective policies that will improve the efficiency of regional approaches.
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4-1-1. The Locally Managed Marine Area Network (LMMA)

Wendy Tan
Locally Managed Marine Area Network

ABSTRACT
The LMMA Network is a network of over 300 sites in 8 countries across the Pacific. Our vision is that communities in the Indo-Pacific are effectively managing their resources, resulting in healthy ecosystems and sustainable communities. Our mission is to provide a forum for communities and supporting agencies to share practical lessons learned and to work collaboratively to promote adaptive local management approaches. Our goals are to protect biodiversity; encourage supportive policies; promote local and global learning on local management approaches; and, tools and to disseminate our lessons learned widely.

The LMMA Network seeks to increase capacity in community and local stakeholder-based marine resources management through training, coaching and mentoring, facilitating community and partner exchanges, and systematic (structured) learning across the Network with our members.

The LMMA Network experience shows the local management approach can effectively improve conservation efforts and provide livelihood benefits. Lessons learned from active sites/communities directly shared with other communities, i.e. peer-to-peer learning can be a useful and very motivational incentive for energizing, organizing and improving management efforts. The Network also demonstrates that a support-oriented, membership-based Network can successfully contribute to building institutional and cross sector (government, NGO, private) collaborative capacity within countries and regionally. This is critical for the sustainability of local or country networks.

The LMMA Network’s 8 years also offer lessons for network development and management – we share some suggestions to the ICRI East Asia MPA Networks Workshop towards any future development of regional MPA networks.

More information can be found at www.lmmanetwork.org
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4-1-2. Scaling-up to MPA networks in the Coral Triangle: Lessons from the MPA Learning Network

Alan White¹ in association with: Stuart Green¹, Anna Meneses¹, Stacey Kilariski¹, Patrick Christie², Barbara Best³ Giselle Samonte-Tan⁴, Kate Newman⁵ Caleb McClenen⁶, Helen Fox⁵, Stuart Campbell⁵, Leah Bunce⁴

ABSTRACT

Marine protected areas (MPAs) and networks of MPAs are accepted tools for protecting coral reef habitats and managing near-shore fisheries. MPA networks are also being established to maintain ecosystem functions and connectivity and to enhance resilience by spreading risk in the case of climate change or localized disasters. Since 2004 the United States Agency for International Development has supported a joint initiative of The Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and Wildlife Conservation Society to build upon and draw key lessons from MPA Networks under the “MPA Learning Partnership.” As part of the final stage of the project (2007 – 2008) a team examined six MPA networks in the Coral Triangle region. The study objectives were: (1) to understand the challenges related to the design, adaptive management, monitoring and financing of ecological networks of functioning MPAs; (2) to address specific learning questions affecting marine conservation efforts, learn from each other’s experience, and collaborate with partners at the scale of MPA networks; and (3) to provide guidance and resources to help direct recommendations for future applied research and improvements in MPA network planning, design and management. Findings reveal that substantial gaps between the theory and practice of creating functional MPA networks exist, across the MPAs and within the aspects of science and ecology, social management, institutional arrangements/governance and sustainable financing. To support the efforts of scaling up individual MPAs to networks, this project identifies a framework of best practices and guidelines that provide a basis for each MPA network that can be tested and amended to the local situation and the needs of local stakeholders.

¹ The Nature Conservancy
² University of Washington
³ United States Agency for International Development
⁴ Conservation International
⁵ World Wildlife Fund
⁶ Wildlife Conservation Society
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**4-2-1. Marine Protected Area Support Network in the Philippines**

Antonio C. Manila and Lynette T. Laroya  
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau,  
Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines

**ABSTRACT**

The Philippines is located in one of the most productive areas in the Asian region. The country’s coastal and marine waters are endowed with wide array of coastal and marine resources including ecologically important ecosystems such as coral reefs, mangroves and sea grass beds. It lies totally within the Coral Triangle which is recognized as having the highest coral diversity in the world. It has been identified by scientists as the “Center of the Center of Marine Shorefish Diversity in the world”.

However, a large portion of the coral reefs has unfortunately been subjected to serious degradation due to sedimentation and siltation from coastal development activities, unsustainable resource use practices such as; overexploitation, population pressure, poverty, destructive fishing methods, over fishing (Gomez et al. 1994) and other detrimental factors. Thus, the Philippines is also known as one the “hottest” of the marine biodiversity hotspots in the world (Roberts et al. 2002)”.

To abate the rapid destruction of the coastal and marine resources, the country adopted the marine protected area (MPA) strategy. The first MPA established in the Philippines is the Hundred Islands National Park declared in 1940 which was later followed by MPA designations both at the local and national government levels. Approximately, there are more than 500 existing MPAs of varying sizes in the country (UPMSI database, 2007) however, only about 10-15% are effectively managed.

The need for collaborative efforts among various MPA practitioners and supporters nationwide to help improve MPA effectiveness led to the establishment of the MPA Support Network (MSN). It is a multi-sectoral alliance of government and non-government organizations that aims to support MPA initiatives through complementary collaborative efforts at the local, regional and national level.

MSN aims to build on the Philippine Marine Sanctuary Strategy (PhilMarSaSt) and Philippine Coral Reef Information Network (PhilReefs) to contribute for the improvement of MPA-management effectiveness and to achieving at least 10% full protection of coastal areas by the year 2020.

The country’s future directions on coastal and marine resources management are embodied on the 5-point agenda of the MSN: 1) Strengthening coastal law enforcement and compliance mechanisms within the Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) approach; 2) Sustain MPA management through enhanced coordination of MPA network synergies and highlight working MPA network models; 3) Institutionalize MPA incentives for good performance and increase adaptive management; 4) Improve cost effectiveness and equitable allocation of costs and benefits including governance, performance and impact evaluation; and 5) Develop public-private partnerships (PPP) and linkages of actions at various management scales.
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4-2-2. The process of proposal development of 15 MPA sites in Vietnam
Nguyen Giang Thu
Department of Science, Technology and Environment
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Vietnam

ABSTRACT
This presentation reviewed the process of proposal development of 15 marine protected area sites in Vietnam for the last twenty years. The background and status of coral reef in Vietnam was debriefed and the trend of degradation of coral reefs both in quality and in coverage in Vietnam was reported. The process of protected area designation for the last 40 years was also mentioned noticing that marine protected areas have been lately introduced to Vietnam compared to terrestrial protected areas. Several legal documents regarding to marine protected areas were listed with comment that the legal frame work for marine conservation in Vietnam has not yet been completed. In parallel with the establishment of the national marine protected area network, MPA social network has also been set up few years later creating a open forum for MPA practitioners, managers, researchers, governmental officers and other concerned people to share their information, lessons and knowledge on marine issues.

The lessons learnt from the development of the MPA network in terms of institutional framework, capacity building and livelihood development showed that even several successes have been made, there are still many challenges to the existing network. The institutional framed work needs to be completed and structured in such a way to avoid overlaps and gaps among different institutions at both central and provincial levels and the local people and communities should be involved more intensively in the process. Regarding the capacity development, an MPA training manual has been made for diversifying needs together with the training team development consisting of competent trainers. Communities based organization has been enhanced at all levels with different approaches developed for different target groups. The sustainable livelihood strategy for MPA has been recently developed bringing a systematic approach to support local peoples in income generation to compensate for the negative impacts of MPA designation to the people. The diversification of livelihood for people affected by MPA establishment has not been very successful due to the difficulties in identification of suitable livelihood for local communities, poor access to financial resources and markets. The integration of MPA management with integrated coastal zone was also recognised with the emphasis on political will and ICM plan.

Finally, the perspectives and suggestion to further development of the network were given. National long term financial support to establish and maintain MPAs, sustainable financing for MPAs, linking MPA concepts to ICM plans and sustainable livelihood were suggested.
4-2-3. Marine Protected Area networks in Indonesia
Cherryta Yunia
Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia

ABSTRACT
Indonesia has a conservation of biodiversity and its marine ecosystems, mean the management of the biological natural resources under a wise use utilization manner to guarantee a continuous supply of the resources for preserving the biological natural resources and their ecosystems for the sake improved quality of human life. The conservation program will be success if the program be supported society. Indonesia has already declared 7 Marine National Parks and 27 Marine Reserve (± 5.42 Million Ha), ± 4 Million Ha for District Marine reserve.

To support all forms of policies and implementation we have been created networking by cooperation with COREMAP program (Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program sponsored by World Bank, in more than 14 unit management). The goal is to improve capability, capacity of human resources, science, technology expert, people improvement, and conservation education.

First network was designed in 1984 with WWF organization. The target overall objective 10 Million Ha by 2010 and 20 Million Ha by 2020. Ministry of Forestry and Marine Affair are responsible in handling MPAS. Another networks is with CTI (Coral Triangle Initiative with Six Countries) and also with Sulu Sulawesi Seas Marine Ecoregion (Malaysia, Philippine, and Indonesia).
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4-2-4. Coral Reef MPA and Conservation Program in Japan
Tsuna Watanabe
Ministry of the Environment, Japan

ABSTRACT
In Japan, its coral reef area is approximately 96,000 ha and coral community has an area of about 35,600 ha. Japan has established several measures for marine conservation, but it is not specified which one of these adapts to an international framework of marine protected area. Coral reef area and coral community, where are under restrictive conservation, encompass about 4,100 ha in sum total. This figure reveals that only a small area is protected in Japan. It is therefore an important task to increase the number of domestic marine protected area. Restoration activities are carried out in ocean areas, including the Sekisei Lagoon and the Ashizuri. Long-term monitoring surveys are also started at 24 sites in Japan for the purpose of understanding of current status of coral reef and coral community. It is expected future outcomes of those efforts. In addition, the review work, which deals mainly with creation of ecosystem-conscious community, integrated coastal management and Marine Protected Area Networks, is currently conducted toward the formulation of the action plan for coral reef conservation.
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4-3-1. CaMPAM: a network of people to serve a network of MPAs in the Wider Caribbean
Georgina Bustamante (Caribbean MPA Management Network and Forum),
Alessandra Vanzella-Khoury and Heidi Savelli Soderberg (UNEP-Caribbean Environment Programme)

ABSTRACT
In 1997, 50 MPA managers from 22 countries created the Caribbean Marine Protected Area Management Network (CaMPAM) for enhancing collaboration among MPA managers, most of them aiming at protecting coral reefs. During the last 11 years the Network has developed communication and capacity building tools such as an electronic list (campam@yahoogroups.com); information dissemination, discussion fora (mostly at the Annual Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (www.gcfi.org); a regional MPA database (http://cep.unep.org/caribbeanmpa); a Training the trainer program for MPA managers with a training manual for both Spanish and English speaking managers (http://www.cep.unep.org/publications/spaw/TOT-manual-en.pdf and http://www.cep.unep.org/publications/spaw/TOT-manual-es.pdf), a regional database (https://cep.uenp.org/caribbeanmpa), a Small Grant Fund (http://www.gcfi.org/SGF/SGFeng.php); and Steering Committee (http://www.gcfi.org/campam/CaMPAM.htm).

The Training of Trainer Program is CaMPAM’s flag capacity building and includes an annual regional 2-week course for MPA managers (6 have been implemented from 1999 to 2007) each one in a different MPA, as well as follow-up local trainings that have benefited ca. 300 MPA practitioners in the Caribbean. Several international (GCFI, TNC, Environmental Defense, etc.) and local/national academic, conservation NGOs and resources management agencies have partnered with CaMPAM by providing funding and in-kind resources to develop its program. We expect to enhance the scope of our activities through by better engaging stakeholders, diversifying the training tools and information services, and building synergy with similar initiatives to better address the changing needs of the MPA community in the region.
4-3-2. The Micronesia Challenge
Fabian Iyar
Palau International Coral Reef Center

ABSTRACT
The Micronesia Challenge is a commitment by the Chief Executives of the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the U.S. Territory of Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to: “effectively conserve at least 30% of the near-shore marine and 20% of the terrestrial resources across Micronesia by 2020.”

Covering 6.7 million square kilometers of ocean, the Micronesia Challenge represents more than 20% of the Pacific Island region – and 5% of the largest ocean in the world.

The Micronesia Challenge will help protect at least 66 currently identified threatened species, 10% of the global total reef area and 462 coral species – that is 59% of all known corals.

The Micronesia Challenge was signed by each of the five Chief Executives in early 2006 and was officially presented to the international community at a high level event at the Conference of the Parties under the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity in March of 2006 in Curitiba, Brazil.

The Micronesia Challenge is a collective effort of the five regional jurisdictions to strengthen the decades of work by the Micronesian people and organizations to raise awareness and enhance capacity across the region to conserve biodiversity. The first two years of implementation proved to be very challenging, to say the least. There is now a regional coordinator to manage activities. On its third year of implementation, the Micronesia Challenge is moving forward with a regional structure in place, clear conservation targets, lessons learned, and prioritized indicators for regional measurements.
4-3-3. Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF)
Eny Budi Sri Haryani
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia

ABSTRACT
The Coral Triangle (CT) Region represents the center of marine biological diversity on the planet, and one of humanity’s greatest common heritage treasures – with 76% of all known coral species, 37% of all known coral reef fish species, 33% of the world’s coral reefs, the greatest extent of mangrove forests in the world, and spawning and juvenile growth areas for the world’s largest tuna fishery, moreover the bio-geographical conditions within the CT enable the region to main its exceptional productivity in the face of future impacts of climate change.

However, in contrast with nowadays fact and of course considering that the coastal and marine resources of the Coral Triangle Region are already experiencing significant degradation, and are facing increasing threats due primarily to rapidly growing populations, pollution, unsustainable coastal development, over fishing and unsustainable fishing practices, and climate change, the six countries (CT6) – Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Solomon Islands and Timor Leste have initiated a bold, new response, the Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF) to address these threats.

The CTI puts the actions into plan – finalized 10-year Plan of Action representing the goals – Priority seascape designated and effectively managed; Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources fully applied; Marine Protected Areas; Climate change adaptation measures achieved; Threatened species status improving; targets and actions, calling attention to the urgent need to address the threats through multilateral collaboration designed to achieve a new trajectory in the future that ensures the conservation and sustainable use of our – six countries precious marine and coastal resources for present and future generations.

Key words: Coral Triangle Region; Coral Triangle Initiative; six countries; Plan of Action; represents the center of marine biological diversity; significant degradation and increasing threats; goals, target and action.
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4-3-4. The South China Sea: An exemplar for achieving coral reef governance
Porfirio Alino
Marine Science Institute, University of the Philippines

ABSTRACT
The South China Sea is found in the cradle of the coral triangle which is acknowledged as the most diverse marine ecosystems in the world. Over 400 scleractinian coral species and an estimated 3000 associated fish species are found in nearly 750,000 hectares of coral reefs. Most of the reefs in this area are in a poor state due to illegal and destructive fishing and poor land use. In the Philippines which contribute the greatest coral reef area in this region, it has been considered the hottest of the hotspots in the marine world. The United Nations Environment Programme – Global Environment Fund – South China Sea (UNEP-GEF-SCS) project seeks to reverse the degradation trends in the SCS. Its diversity of life support system to the coastal communities is of profound importance to the livelihood and political economy of its growing but impoverished people. The UNEP-GEF-SCS is an exemplar of how to undertake good environmental governance processes through the Coral Reef Regional Working Group (CR-RWG) provides sound scientific advice through the Regional Scientific Technical Committee (RSTC). Having inputs from the RSTC and engaging the science practitioners in an integrated manner helps to improve partnerships with other stakeholders. These partnerships have paved the way to towards sustainable management of these rich biodiversity resources especially with the formulation of the strategic action plan (SAP). Recently, some general consensus has been agreed to targets that, by 2015 at least 70% of the coral reef areas (153,000 ha) are placed under an appropriate form of sustainable management. In addition, it has set that a reduction of the regional decadal rate of degradation from its present decline of 16% to 5%. Based on the lessons learned from the demonstration sites and economic analyses by socio-economic task force it is surmised that coral reef actions if invested well and effectively would require around $3 million dollars and this is expected to have a benefit cost ratio of nearly 3:1. These actions will aim: i) to address good environmental governance systems, standards and processes; and ii) to build the capacity of the local stakeholders supported by sound technical basis in making informed decisions.
SUMMARY

Group 1 : Ecological MPA networks

10. Facilitators

Thamasak Yeemin and Shinichiro Kakuma

11. Participants


12. Background Presentations

i) Dr. Shinichiro Kakuma gave case study presentation entitled “The diversity of Marine Protected Areas in Okinawa and Asia-Pacific”. Dr. Kakuma pointed out that there is a huge diversity of MPAs in Asia-Pacific region, and it is necessary to increase effectiveness of individual MPAs before networking them. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

ii) Dr. Hiroya Yamano gave case study presentation entitled “Satellite-based mapping of coral reefs in the East Asia region”. An effective mapping method for coral reefs using satellite images has been developed. It is planned to expand target area to East-Asia region in the future. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

iii) Dr. Coralie Taquet gave case study presentation entitled “Introduction of a new project: Conservation Strategy based on Regional Reef Connectivity and Environmental Load Assessment in SEA-WP Region”. A research plan on connectivity in SEA-WP region through genetic and current system studies was introduced. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

13. Summary of Discussion

Common target goals:

In discussion:

i) The group tried to clarify what the "common target goal" stands for. It was suggested that developing an additional target goals aside from existing ones (i.e., WSSD/CBD) is not realistic but an additional regional target which is particularly focused on coral reefs might be useful.

ii) The majority of participating countries considered CBD target (i.e., 10% of marine coastal area effectively conserved) as their official target goal. However, each country was at different stage of achieving this goal. Therefore, current objectives varied among participating countries (see the table).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/state</th>
<th>Existing/planned target goal</th>
<th>Current objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>Establish first MPA</td>
<td>Field survey and training to establish first MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>10% of EEZ by 2015</td>
<td>Establish first MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>10 million ha by 2010, 20 million ha by 2020</td>
<td>Collect information on existing MPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>MPA is not defined in Japanese law</td>
<td>Definition of MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Short-, medium-, long-term goals stated in national action plan</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity building and Existing MPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>10-15% of marine area effectively managed by 2012</td>
<td>Strengthen existing MPA network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>CBD target</td>
<td>Conserve and enhance existing marine habitats through its planning framework process and marine initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>5% of territorial sea by 2005, 10% by 2010, 20% by2012</td>
<td>Increase MPA area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>CBD target</td>
<td>Gap analysis on existing MPAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the group:

i) reconfirmed that common target goal is the CBD 2012 MPA target;

ii) agreed to carry over the detailed discussion about the common target goals in 2009 workshop.

### Identification of priority areas:

In discussion:

i) This session was intended to be a brainstorming session and participants shared their thoughts on potential priority areas for conservation.

ii) It was pointed out that ecologically important areas should be protected. The examples include resilient reefs, high marine biodiversity area and key stone species hot spots. Also, it is important to protect areas for different lifecycle stages for species such as spawning area, aggregation, and nursery area.

iii) Areas outside MPAs should be set aside as buffer zone to maintain ecological/social connectivity of coral reefs and related ecosystems. Network aspects (source, sink, connectivity, etc..) should be also considered. Using fishery refugia approach might be useful and the guidelines are available on the internet.

In conclusion, the group agreed to carry over the detailed discussion about identification of priority areas in 2009 workshop.

### Criteria for MPA/MPA networks:

In discussion:

It was pointed out that there were already existing sets of criteria based on science made available by a number of organizations.
ANNEX 5

In conclusion, the group:

i) agreed that review and modification of existing criteria of CBD will be done by a working group consisting of volunteers from participants.

ii) agreed to carry over the detailed discussion about criteria in 2009 workshop.

**Recommendation on sub-regional level ecological MPA networks:**

In discussion:

In addition to existing subregional networks such as CTI and SCS, the following gap areas were identified; East China Sea, network along Kuroshio Current (which connects Micronesia, South-east Asia and Japan), and Andaman Sea. These subregional networks would fill in the present gap area and cover the entire region.

Also the group discussed the importance of building a “network of subregional networks” including CTI and SCS.

In conclusion, the group agreed to carry over the detailed discussion about subregional level networks in 2009 workshop.

**Ecosystem based management:**

The participants recognized importance of ecosystem based management as well as integrated coastal zone management. However, there was a common perception among participants that currently there is a lack of available scientific information required for ecosystem-based management, such as species richness, ecological connectivity, and population genetics. To fill in this gap, it was suggested to build a network for collaboration for science based actions.

In conclusion, the group agreed to carry over the detailed discussion about ecosystem based management in 2009 workshop.

**14. Actions to be taken**

Japan proposed to carry out regional gap analysis, coral reef mapping and upgrading of regional MPA database, and asked for intergovernmental collaboration with other participating countries. It was confirmed that the follow-up discussion after this meeting will be continued by E-mail communications among volunteered participants.
SUMMARY
Group 2: Social/Management MPA networks

1. Facilitators
Porfirio Alino and Makoto Tsuchiya

2. Participants
Richard Kenchington, Susan Wells, Alan White, Fabian Iyar, Lorenzo Tan, Eny Budi Sri Haryani, Fazrullah Rizally bin Abdul Razak, Nguyen Ginang Thu, Marisa Aramaki, Yasuaki Kishino, Georgina Bustamante, Wendy Tan

3. Summary of Discussion

Discussion on the regional strategy
At the beginning of the group discussion, the Group 2 discussed about the concept and purpose of the regional strategy as requested by the Co-chairs in the plenary discussion. In discussion, the following comments were raised:

i) Effective actions were rarely conducted following past ICRI regional strategies and policies, thus the new regional strategy should look at how it can support the countries and members to take more effective actions for achieving 2012 goals.

ii) They explained purpose of the regional strategy was not clear and the purpose to achieve the 2012 goal seemed too weak. The alternate purpose could be: “To review and evaluate the progress of the achievement and propose necessary actions for 2012 goals and long-term strategic plan for post 2012 on MPA networking in the East Asian region”.

Mechanism for social/management networks:

In the discussion, the group recognized that:

i) The geographic area of East Asian region is too broad to maintain effective social networks for MPA management. Therefore, facilitation of sub-regional level activities is needed to maintain their social networks and it would be ideal to have facilitators and a leading country in each sub-regions.

ii) There are several existing social networks for regional coordination already in place (i.e., PEMSEA, COBSEA, UNEP Regional Seas-EAS, IUCN-WCPA-Marine-SEA and EA, ICRI/GCRMN-SEA and NEA, APEC, ASEAN), but communication and understanding among these networks are not active for enhancing MPAs. Thus, it is necessary to enhance mutual communication among these networks.

iii) There are also some existing initiatives and programs ongoing in sub-regional target areas (i.e., Coral Triangle, Sulu-Sulawesi, and South China Sea).

iv) Some potential opportunities for sharing the information and ideas with existing networks to develop the mechanism of collaboration were identified as below:
In conclusion, the group recommends to the workshop to:

i) Identify appropriate sub-region(s) to develop the regional strategy for effective MPA management and enhancement; and

ii) Support joint activities to develop collaboration mechanism to build on existing networks for sharing information to achieve the WSSD and CBD target goals.

Management effectiveness standard and protocol:

In discussion, the group recognized that:

i) Effective MPA management needs to be approached at different levels, such as regional, national and site.

ii) There are some existing guidelines and protocols to assess the management effectiveness (i.e., Score Card by World Bank, IUCN, etc).

iii) Improving the capacities of managers and practitioners on operation and management of effective MPAs are needed.

In conclusion, the group recommends to the workshop to:

i) Review existing standards and identify appropriate protocols for assessment on the effectiveness of MPA management at regional, national and site levels;

ii) Develop a proposal of regional workshop for assessment of MPA management effectiveness to provide appropriate protocol at regional/national/site level to each country in the region;

iii) Develop long-term strategic plan for training and capacity building programs for managers and practitioners on effective MPA management.

4. Actions to be taken

The group agreed to form a working group on the Social/Management MPA networks to continue the discussion and conduct following tasks:

i) Review existing social networks and contacts for sharing the idea of built-in mechanism or is it internal capacity building for regional collaboration;
ii) Review existing sub-regional initiatives and programs for identifying appropriate sub-regions which need involvement on enhancing effective MPAs and establishing MPA networks;

iii) Review existing standards and protocols for appropriate assessment of MPA management effectiveness at regional/national/site level;

iv) Develop long-term strategic plan for training and capacity building on effective MPA management for managers and practitioners.
SUMMARY

Group 3: Information MPA networks

1. Facilitators

Chou Loke Ming and Kazuo Nadaoka

2. Participants

Jerker Tamelander, Moi Khim Tan, Shingo Takeda, and Toshio Torii

3. Background presentations

To facilitate understanding and discussion by the group, two presentations were given during the session:

iv) Ms. Moi Khim Tan gave a presentation entitled “Coral Reef MPAs of East Asia and Micronesia” to provide background information. The presentation explained about the previous MPA database development conducted in 2005-2007 including a summary of the outcomes and how the database works. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

v) Mr. Toshio Torii gave a short presentation about coral reef monitoring and information sharing in Japan as one of the examples at national level, i.e., about Monitoring Sites 1000, method of coral reef monitoring in Japan, and data gathering and information sharing by the Biodiversity Center of Japan. See presentation at Agenda and documents.

4. Summary of discussion

The group first suggested items to be incorporated to the regional strategy which are pertinent to information MPA networks, and then discussed the potential actions to be taken until 2010 that can help achieve the objectives of the workshop. After general consideration, the group discussed each identified action in detail. The following summarizes the group’s discussion.

1) Regional MPA database

Rationale (why):

The group agreed that upgrading the MPA database should be one of the priority actions to be undertaken by 2010. The rationale for upgrading the MPA database was clarified. In discussion, the following were identified:
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i) There are many existing databases but most of them are not effectively used (information not being updated);

ii) Currently available MPA databases are still at an “initial stage” of development in terms of coverage of MPA sites, and the status of MPAs in the region are not sufficiently understood;

iii) Most of the existing databases cover only basic information and not readily useful for MPA establishment and management.

Goal

It was suggested that the goal for MPA database development could be divided into two phases depending on timescale:

i) Immediate (short term) goal: To upgrade/update the regional MPA database particularly to support regional review and gap analysis.

ii) Mid to longer term goal: To develop a mechanism to sustainably update the database; and to define and generate comprehensive and enhanced content of the database for future use.

Timeframe (when)

Proposed actions and timeframe for upgrading the database were discussed.

i) It was assumed that the outputs of the MPA database will be used in the regional review and gap analysis, and that the launch of the MPA database take place at the CBD COP-10 (October 2010);

ii) Thus, it was realized that available time for development of the database is very limited (i.e., about 1 year); and

iii) Suggested actions and timeframe (deadline) for the MPA database development to fulfill above needs were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>Finalize detailed plan and TOR of the MPA database development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>Finalize contract (JWRC – World Fish Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>Finalize the database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential user (target)

It was suggested that the potential target (user) of the MPA database could be different depending on timescale:

i) Initial target: Policy/decision makers and managers

ii) Longer term target: Public (for awareness raising)

Implementation structure (who)

The possible structure to conduct the MPA database development was considered. In discussion,
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i) Conditions precedent to the development were clarified and that Japan will provide funding for the FY2008 and FY2009, where the total amount is subject to determination of FY2009 budget of the Ministry of the Environment. It was assumed that Japan (Ministry of the Environment) will be responsible for overseeing the project, and a sub-contractor will be hired to implement the project.

ii) It was suggested that ReefBase (WorldFish Center) is the most appropriate sub-contractor to develop and maintain the database (website) for the next phase development. The reasons for nomination were that: (a) The main office is based in the region (Penang) and they have good contacts in the region; (b) It is the only existing regional MPA database that can potentially cover all the countries in the region (while others were restricted to sub-regions and/or the membership); (c) It is the world’s leading database on coral reefs and it has good GIS system and other information sources that can potentially be useful; and (d) It is already hosting the current MPA database.

iii) It was suggested that, current and future opportunities of the workshops in 2008-2010, where most of the East Asian governments who are in charge of MPAs are represented, should be used most effectively in verifying and gathering the data. Thus, it was proposed that the workshop should get agreement by these governments to contribute to MPA database development, including appointing their focal point for MPA data. It was also suggested that relevant organizations in the workshop could play important roles in assisting the governments in this efforts.

**Contents of the database development (what)**

Proposed actions and content for the next phase development were discussed. The following were raised as potential items:

i) Update the existing MPA database with new site and unrecorded site data:

- This would be the very basic action but most important information when conducting the regional review and gap analysis.

ii) MPA management effectiveness assessment:

- This would also be important information in the review and gap analysis.

- It was suggested that comprehensive management effectiveness assessment for most of the MPAs in the region would be a long term goal, and is not realistic to be achieved by the current project. Thus it was suggested that the current project should start with the minimum basic standard.

- It was suggested that such a standard should be proposed and agreed to by the participating governments, and should be completed as soon as possible to allow enough time for countries to collect information, and ReefBase to update/analyze the data.

- It was suggested that the working group shall consider the minimum standard together with other groups (Group 1 and 2) by taking into account the existing management effectiveness standards (e.g., “How is your MPA doing”, IUCN; MPA Scorecard, World Bank; Philippines’ national standard).

iii) Application of existing biophysical data layers on ReefGIS (e.g., coral reef mapping data, etc.)

- This is expected to assist consideration of MPA establishment and also to serve as information for the review and gap analysis.

- Potential data layers:
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- Coral reef mapping by satellite images, which the National Institute for Environment Studies (Dr. Yamano) is currently conducting (poster presentation available at: Agenda and documents). The entire East Asia region is due to be completed next year.

- ReefCheck data

- Fisheries data, mangrove data, etc.

- It was suggested that limiting factors could only be the technical matters and getting agreement for data sharing with the current data hosts.

iv) Locally managed/ community based MPAs (including other de facto MPAs):

- It was noted that WorldFish Center is managing the LMMA database and its format could be used.

- It was noted that these information would be useful in understanding the overall status of MPAs (as most of the current database only cover the legal/gazetted MPAs), while it was pointed out that collecting these information would take considerable amount of time and effort and could not realistically be achieved in the current project.

v) Analytical function of the website:

- The current MPA database just show basic information of each MPA sites and is not readily useful for understanding the status overview. To make the database be of greater value to users (e.g., MPA managers), it was suggested that adding analytical functions on the website would be useful.

vi) Linkage with relevant database:

- The group recognized that there are several existing databases on MPAs in the region (e.g., ACB’s MPA database, COBSEA’s knowledgebase, national database). To make best use of respective databases, and to avoid duplication of work, it was suggested to seek possible linkage with these databases.

vii) Development of demonstration MPA database website (for future development)

- It was suggested that exploring the “ideal form” of the MPA database would be useful for identifying the goal for future MPA database development. To do so, a demonstration website could be developed, and the data items and structure of the database could be explored by applying some actual test sites’ information.

In discussion, the group realized that just completing an update of the existing database will take considerable amount of time and efforts, and thus, it is not realistic to cover all the above possible contents within this project. It was therefore suggested that prioritization of the above contents is needed taking into account their needs and achievability.

Other considerations

In addition to the above discussion, the following issues were also identified as important factors when considering MPA database development:

i) Sustainable mechanism for updating the database and sharing the information is needed. Increasing incentives to data providers to contribute data was thought to be especially important.
ii) The database should be unique to differentiate it from existing databases.

2) Regional review and gap analysis

Information available for the gap analysis

The group realized that some existing gap analysis have already been undertaken in the region and there is a need to review them. In addition, it was also suggested that CBD’s proposed procedure for the regional gap analysis should be reviewed to clarify what are requested. The following were identified as information sources needing review:

i) ACB’s marine gap analysis
ii) Sulu-Sulawesi Ecoregion’s gap analysis
iii) CBD gap analysis criteria

Information needed/available for the gap analysis

The group identified the following information is needed, in general, to conduct the regional MPA gap analysis:

i) Ecological and bio physical
ii) Management (governance)
iii) Socio-economic

While the group also realized that existing information that could realistically be gained to conduct the analysis are not sufficient, and that such a “gap” should be filled as much as possible in the current database development.

Implementation structure (who)

The implementation structure to conduct the regional review and gap analysis was considered. In discussion,

i) It was suggested that it is necessary to hire a consultant to undertake the drafting task for the regional review and gap analysis. Japan offered to seek funding to hire consultant(s) and it was suggested that the working group shall identify candidate consultant(s), and draft the TOR for the consultant(s).

ii) It was pointed out that WorldFish Center (ReefBase) shall work closely with the consultant(s) in providing updates of the MPA database and requested analytical information;

iii) It was suggested that the working group and ICRI Ad Hoc Committee of ICRI East Asia Regional Workshop shall serve as the main reviewer of the draft, and that draft should also be circulated to all the participating East Asian governments for their internal review.

Possible timeframe and actions
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Proposed timeframe and actions for conducting the regional review and gap analysis were discussed, and the following schedule was identified as realistic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>Working group to draft TOR (attached with initial draft) and identify potential consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>TOR to be ready; Contract with the consultant finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-late 2009</td>
<td>Progress report and initial review in the 2009 workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>Draft for extensive review to be ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March (?) 2010</td>
<td>Finalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>Launch at CBD COP-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that March 2009 is the deadline for submission of the national report to CBD Secretariat, and is not likely to be in time for this deadline. It was suggested that Japan discuss with the CBD Secretariat about the regional gap analysis and clarify their requirements on the regional level (i.e., at the CBD workshop which takes place in December, Tsukuba, Japan).

3) Regional information sharing network

Rationale (why)

The group discussed and agreed that information sharing network, particularly to share MPA information, is needed at regional level. The following were identified as the rationale for the regional information sharing network:

i) There are no existing regional-level mechanisms that:
   - Maintain and update MPA and MPA network information;
   - Conduct regional level evaluation (e.g., for CBD commitments);
   - Share lessons learned on MPA/MPA networks; and
   - Conduct and provide MPA management effectiveness study.

ii) Some countries do not have their own MPA database and in most cases the national database is not up-to-date, and not linked to regional/global level database (i.e., WDPA), or shared among countries in the region.

iii) Most of the national level MPA database in East Asia are in their national language (thus the information is not easily shared)

iv) Most of the countries need to strengthen their national capacity to create and/or maintain the database.
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Potential network (who)

The potential mechanism of the information network was considered. In discussion,

i) The IUCN WCPA-Marine’s regional mechanism was raised as the potential coordinating mechanism. It has regional coordinators in both East Asian Seas region and North West Pacific region (these two regions cover all East Asian countries), and country coordinators in some countries.

ii) Linkage/collaboration with existing database or information sources (e.g., ACB, COBSEA, NOWPAP, national databases) is suggested to be important.

Role of the network (what)

The potential role of the regional level information sharing network is suggested as to:

i) Share relevant information that could potentially support MPA development, management and evaluation (e.g., monitoring data);

ii) Bridge between national database and global database (i.e., WDPA);

iii) Assist countries that do not have their own MPA database or willing to upgrade their database; and

iv) Facilitate and follow-up the MPA database and gap analysis.

Other considerations

The group suggested that:

i) The possible development of regional level information sharing network shall continue to be discussed in 2009 and 2010, taking into consideration the progress of the MPA database and gap analysis; and

ii) Sustainable funding mechanism to maintain the information sharing network is needed.

5. Conclusions and suggestion to the workshop

In conclusion, the group requests the workshop to:

i) Get commitments from all the participating East Asian governments to contribute to the development of the MPA database and gap analysis;

ii) Form a working group to implement the tasks below until the next workshop in 2009;
   ➢ Develop detailed working plan and follow up on the progress of the MPA database development.
   ➢ Identify candidate consultant(s) and develop TOR for the regional review and gap analysis, and to follow up the progress.

vi) Invite preliminary interests in joining the working group from the workshop participants;

vii) Consider inclusion of the following items in the regional strategy. These items were identified as pertinent to information MPA networks, and important by the group;
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- Regional MPA database
- Regional review and gap analysis
- Regional information sharing network

viii) Consider inclusion of following action items in the Provisional Plan 2009-2010.

- Upgrade the regional MPA database
- Conduct regional review and gap analysis
- Consider, and if appropriate, prepare for the regional information sharing network