

**Report of the Southeast Asia
Regional Session of the
Global Biodiversity Forum 2004**

20 - 23 June 2004 Manila, Philippines

Editors

Bhujangarao Dharmaji

Balakrishna Pisupati

Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

The designation of geographical entities in this book, and the presentation of the material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN or other participating organizations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN or other participating organizations.

Published by IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia, Sri Lanka.



Copyright	2005 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.
Citation	Bhujangarao Dharmaji, Balakrishna Pisupati (Editors) - 2005. <i>Report of the Southeast Asia Regional Session of Global Biodiversity Forum</i>
ISBN	955-8177-38-5
Copies from	IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia No. 53, Horton Place, Colombo 7, Sri Lanka. URL: www.biodiversityasia.org
Printed by	Karunaratne & Sons Ltd, 67, UDA Industrial Estate, Katuwana Road, Homagama, Sri Lanka



***Report of the Southeast Asia Regional Session of the
Global Biodiversity Forum***

20 - 23 June 2004

Venue

*Hotel Astoria Plaza
15 J, Escrivá Drive, Ortigas Business District
Pasig City, Manila, Philippines*

Hosts

Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines

Convenors and Sponsors

*IUCN - The World Conservation Union
ASEAN Secretarial
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Global Environment Facility (GEF)
United Nations Development Programmes (UNDP)
World Resources Institute (WRI)
ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation (ARCBC)
The Ramsar Convention Bureau
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)
KAMICYDI, Philippines
Flora and Fauna International
KEHATI, Indonesia*

Table of Contents

Foreword	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
1. Background	1
2. Objectives and Issues	8
3. Workshop Sessions	9
3.1 Workshop 1 - Divided, yet United – Development Planning at Regional and National Levels	9
3.1.1 Highlights of Abstracts/Presentations	9
3.1.2 Group work and Recommendations	14
3.2 Workshop 2 - The Precautionary Principle in Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation	20
3.2.1 Highlights of Abstracts/Presentations	20
3.2.2 Group work and Recommendations	24
3.3 Workshop 3 - Developing work programme for synergies among Multilateral Environmental Agreements	28
3.3.1 Highlights of Abstracts/Presentations	28
3.3.2 Group work and Recommendations	33
4. Annexe 1 : Agenda for Workshops	36
5. Annexe 2 : List of Participants	45

Foreword

The Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) is increasingly being seen not only as a useful platform for dialogue and discussions of issues of conservation of biological diversity, but also as a forum to discuss issues like development, poverty, trade and environment. This is possible since the GBF acts as a neutral forum that does not call for consensus on issues. GBFs have evolved into more mature, influential meetings not only feeding into the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), but also to other environmental and development processes. This regional session and its themes are a testimony to this maturity.

Recognizing the diverse needs of South Asia and Southeast Asia on issues of environment and development, IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP) Asia organized separate sessions of GBFs on the regions. This Southeast Asia regional session through three parallel workshops addressed the following themes: Divided, yet United – development planning at regional and national levels; The Precautionary Principle in natural resource management and biodiversity conservation; Developing work programmes on synergies among Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

This session brought together 66 participants from 13 countries and had representations from Governments, NGOs, CBOs, Women's organizations, Academic institutions, Donors and Development agencies.

Reviewing the outcomes, we feel that the recommendations are relevant, succinct and many are implementable. We hope that the GBF continues to provide a useful platform to openly discuss national, regional and global issues and hope that the support it receives – financial as well as technical – will continue in the future too.

Balakrishna Pisupati

IUCN – Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia
GBF Coordinator

Acknowledgments

The authors thankfully acknowledge the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines in particular Ms. Teresa Mundita Lim, Ms. Meriden Maranan and her team for being such a wonderful hosts as they are. Sincere thanks are due to Ms. Elisa Gozun, Secretary, Department of Environment and Natural Resources and all under Secretaries of the Department for their cooperation and support.

Thanks are due to colleagues at IUCN for all support and encouragement. A special word of thanks are due to Dr. Barney Smith and Dr. Rosie Cooney of the Precautionary Principle Project for being a strategic partner for this GBF session.

Financial support for this publication has been made possible through the generous support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and consortium of donors and sponsors as listed previously. The authors thankfully acknowledge technical contributions made by all participant during the plenary and group sessions.

Colombo
May, 2005

Bhujangarao Dharmaji
Balakrishna Pisupati

1. BACKGROUND

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was adopted on 22 May 1992 in Nairobi, Kenya. On 5 June 1992, during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED - the "Earth Summit") in Rio de Janeiro, more than 150 States signed the Convention, and on 29 December 1993, it entered into force. By May 1998, a total of 174 States had ratified the Convention, making it one of the most widely adopted environmental treaties in history. However, the process prior to and following the development of the CBD has not always allowed for the full participation of all those interested in and affected by the Convention.

The 1992 WRI-IUCN-UNEP Global Biodiversity Strategy identified a wide range of actions needed to save, study and sustainably use the world's biological diversity. In response to the need for a broad and open discussion of biodiversity-related topics, the Strategy called for the establishment of a forum that would allow governments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), scientists, natural resource managers, communities dependent on biological resources, and others, to meet together and guide international discussions as well as decisions concerning biodiversity.

The Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) was therefore conceived as a continuing and strategic process to provide information and generate debate on critical issues. In particular, the Forum was established to provide information to international biodiversity-related meetings, such as the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD, its Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), and other environmental bodies such as the COPs to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Ramsar Convention, the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora (CITES).

GBF seeks to complement government-level processes by:

- | providing a broad spectrum of perspectives, proposals and experiences from all stakeholders;
- | looking for innovative approaches to enrich national policies and inter-sectoral positions;
- | building diverse partnerships among stakeholders (for example, governments, indigenous groups, local communities, NGOs and the private sector); and
- | identifying areas of agreements and points of conflict on different biodiversity related issues.

The GBF is not a representative body of any of the groups or sectors that participate in Forum events, and should not be considered by the CBD, United Nations organisations, or other institutions to serve on behalf of Forum convenors and participants, or to offer a full consensus.

The first formal test of the Forum concept was the 1993 International Conference on the Convention on Biological Diversity: National Interests and Global Imperatives, hosted by the African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) and the Stockholm Environmental Institute, in Nairobi. This meeting recommended that the Forum concept be implemented and employed in other regions of the world, in forms appropriate to the particular region or to problems being addressed.

The first session of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF1-Gland) was hosted by IUCN and held in Gland, Switzerland, on 7-9 October 1993, immediately prior to the first meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity (ICCBD), held in October 1993 in Geneva. The event focused on three themes: broadening participation in implementing the CBD; conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources; and incorporating biodiversity in public law. A resolution passed at the 1994 IUCN General Assembly in Buenos Aires called on IUCN to institutionalise the GBF

The second meeting of the GBF (GBF2-Nassau) was hosted by the Bahamas National Trust and held in Nassau, Bahamas on 26-27 November 1994, immediately prior to the first meeting of the COP to

the CBD. The two themes were setting priorities for biodiversity conservation in the context of the Convention; and the importance of coastal and marine biodiversity.

The third meeting of the GBF (GBF3-Jakarta) was hosted by the Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation and WWF-Indonesia, and held on 4-5 November 1995, immediately preceding the second meeting of the COP to the CBD. Four topics were discussed in the Forum: marine biodiversity; regulating access to genetic resources; forests and biodiversity; and decentralisation of governance and biodiversity.

The fourth meeting of the GBF (GBF4-Montreal) was hosted by the Canadian Coalition for Biodiversity and the Canadian Global Change Programme, and took place on 31 August-1 September 1996 in Montreal, Canada, immediately prior to the second meeting of the SBSTTA of the CBD. It focused on: marine and coastal biodiversity; forest biodiversity; new methods for linking people and protected areas; and economic incentives for biodiversity.

The fifth meeting of the GBF (GBF5-Buenos Aires) was hosted by the Fundacion Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (FARN) and held on 1-3 November 1996 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, immediately preceding the third meeting of the COP to the CBD. Four topics were discussed: investing in biodiversity; integrating biodiversity into land-use planning and management; agricultural biodiversity; and biodiversity and indigenous peoples.

The sixth meeting of the GBF (GBF6-New York) was hosted by the Biodiversity Action Network (BIONET) and held on 3-4 April 1997 in New York, USA, immediately prior to the fifth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development. It explored options for incorporating biodiversity indicators and targets into national implementation reports required under the CBD.

The seventh meeting of the GBF (GBF7-Harare) was hosted by the Zimbabwe Trust and held in Harare, Zimbabwe, on 6-8 June 1997, just before the tenth COP to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Its purpose was to explore synergies between the CBD and CITES, and it focused on: community-based resource management: myth or reality?; non-detrimental export and sustainable use; and access to plant resources.

The eighth meeting of the GBF (GBF8-SBSTTA3) was hosted by IUCN Canada and held in Montreal, Canada, on 28-31 August 1997, immediately prior to the third meeting of the CBD's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA3, Montreal, 1-5 September 1997). It explored five critical biodiversity themes: communication and education for biodiversity; policy reform to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity: meeting the challenge with policy research; forests and biological diversity; inland water systems and biodiversity; and incentives, private sector partnerships and the marine and coastal environment.

The ninth meeting of the GBF (GBF9-Kyoto) was held on 6 December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, during the third COP to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC COP3). Four topics were discussed: Climate change and biodiversity; the impacts of climate change on biodiversity; synergy between climate change mitigation and biodiversity conservation; and the road ahead: opportunities to link climate change and biodiversity.

The tenth meeting of the GBF (GBF10- Bratislava) was held on 1-3 May 1998 in Bratislava, Slovakia, preceding the fourth meeting of the COP to the CBD. Eight topics were focused on: sharing the benefits arising from the utilisation of genetic resources; traditional knowledge and Article 8j; the CBD's clearing-house mechanism: building a network of networks; tenure and sustainability of natural renewable resource uses; financial innovations for biodiversity; an ecosystem approach to the management of inland water systems and their biodiversity; public education and awareness: how to put it into practice; and trade and biodiversity.

The eleventh meeting of the GBF (GBF11 - Buenos Aires) was held on 6-8 November 1998 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the fourth COP to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Four topics were discussed: forests in the climate change agenda; co-ordinating national strategies and action plans under the UNFCCC, the CBD, and the Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); climate change, biodiversity and finance; and sustainable use and climate change.

The twelfth GBF (GBF12-Dakar) was held in Dakar, Senegal, on 4-6 December 1998, during the second COP to the Convention to Combat

Desertification. The four themes were: financial innovations to combat desertification; linking biodiversity and desertification: a strategic perspective; indigenous knowledge and desertification; and desertification and climate change.

The thirteenth GBF (GBF13 - San Jose) was held in San Jose, Costa Rica, on 7-9 May 1999 prior to the seventh COP to the Ramsar Convention. Six topics were discussed: wetlands and the private sector; mitigating the impact of alien/invasive species; an ecosystem approach to rehabilitation; the global carbon issue: peatlands wise use and management; indigenous peoples and local communities' participation in wetland management; water resources management and global change.

The fourteenth GBF (GBF14-Montreal) was held in Montreal, Canada, on 18-20 June 1999 prior to SBSTTA4 to the CBD. It focused on: building biodiversity into sectoral strategies and action plans; ecosystem approaches to the management of biodiversity in drylands; and resolving the conundrum of scale in adaptive management - households to large landscapes.

The fifteenth GBF (GBF15-Nairobi) was held in Nairobi, Kenya, 12-14 May immediately prior to the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP5). This session focused on the theme: "Sharing the Benefits from Biodiversity" and had workshops addressing the following three topics: Biodiversity for Poverty Alleviation; Instruments for Access and Benefit-Sharing from Genetic Resources; and Agricultural Biodiversity and Sustainable Livelihoods: the Case of Dryland Ecosystems.

The sixteenth GBF (GBF16-The Hague) was held in The Hague, The Netherlands, 5-7 April, 2002 immediately prior to the 6th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP6). GBF16 addressed the following key issues: Managing Forest Ecosystems for Sustainable Livelihoods; Biodiversity Plans for Business; and Mainstreaming Biodiversity - The Role of Communication, Education and Public Awareness

The seventeenth GBF (GBF17-Valencia) was held Valencia, Spain, 15-17 November 2002. immediately prior to the 8th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Ramsar Convention. GBF17

addressed the following key issues: Wetlands Restoration and Mitigation; Environmental Governance and Sustainable Development: the Contribution of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands; Agriculture, Wetlands and Water Resources; Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) and a roundtable on Wetlands, People and Climate: Preparing for Change.

The first inter-regional session of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF-Cuba) was convened from 30 - 31 August 2003 in La Havana, Cuba, during the Sixth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) (25 August - 5 September 2003, La Havana, Cuba). GBF-Cuba addressed the theme of the Ecosystem Approach to Dryland Management: Integrating Biodiversity Conservation and Livelihood Security through discussions on the following three key issues: Managing Water Resources and Wetland Habitats in Drylands; Environmental Management in Drylands from a Community Perspective: Issues of Gender and Traditional Knowledge; and Mobilising Financial Resources to Combat Desertification.

The 18th Session of the Global Biodiversity Forum was convened from 5-7 September 2003 in Cancun, Mexico, immediately prior to the 5th WTO Ministerial Conference, on 10-14 September 2003, also in Cancun. It addressed the following three key issues: The relationship between the TRIPs Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Risk, Precaution and Biosecurity; and Trade and Sustainable Livelihoods.

The 19th Session of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF19-Kuala Lumpur/COP7) was convened from 6-8 February 2004 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, immediately prior to the 7th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (9- 20 February 2004). GBF19 addressed the following three key issues: Livelihoods, Poverty, and Biodiversity; Technology Transfer and Capacity Building with Equity; and the Value of Biodiversity for Securing the Future.

In addition to these global events, several meetings have been held at the regional level. There have now been 3 Regional Sessions of the GBF for Asia:

The first regional session of the GBF for Asia (GBF- Asia, China) was held in Haikou, China between 23-25 March 1998, preceding the Asian meeting for preparation for the fourth meeting of the COP to the CBD. Three topics were addressed in this session; national biodiversity strategies and action plans; international co-operation in biodiversity: key issues and experience in implementing Article 8 of the CBD.

The Second Asia regional session of the GBF for Asia (GBF- South and Southeast Asia, Sri Lanka) was held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, between 24-26 October 1999 preceding the 5th meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) to the CBD. Five themes were discussed: during this session An Ecosystem Approach to Conservation with special reference to Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems (including arid mountains) and Coastal & Marine Ecosystems; Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; Alien Invasive Species; Biodiversity Friendly Practices and Technologies; and Developing and Implementing National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans: Lessons from Southeast Asia.

The third regional session of the GBF for Asia (GBF - South Asia, Bangladesh) was held in Dhaka, Bangladesh between 16-18 June 2003. This forum addressed the following priority themes: People and Protected Areas; Sustainable development and livelihoods; Access and benefit Sharing – Relevance of issues to trade and IPRs; Building a regional approach to taxonomic capacity building.

The following report is a summary of the **fourth regional session of the GBF for Asia** (GBF - South East Asia, Manila) held in Manila, Philippines between 20-23 June 2004. The views and recommendations contained in this report, while envisaged to stimulate a regional perspective on the themes covered, do not necessarily represent a consensus among all participants at the meeting; rather they aim to capture the diverse range of viewpoints and issues that need to be addressed in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity in southeast Asia.

2. OBJECTIVES AND ISSUES

The Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) provides a neutral platform to foster dialogue and discussion not only on issues of conservation of biodiversity, but also address some of the contemporary challenges such as poverty alleviation, development and synergies among Multilateral Environmental Conventions (MEAs). In Asia, three regional sessions of GBF were organized in the past. This 4th regional session was convened by a range of national, regional and global partners along with IUCN-Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia and was hosted by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) from 21-23 June 2004 in Manila, Philippines.

This session brought together 66 participants from 13 countries and had representation from governments, NGOs, Community leaders, Academia and Civil society (Annex 2). The forum addressed the following priority themes, through three parallel workshops over 2 days

- | Divided, yet United – Development Planning at Regional and National Levels;
- | The Precautionary Principle in Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation
- | Developing Work Programmes on Synergies between Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

The GBF was structured into an inaugural session, an opening plenary, three parallel workshop sessions and a closing plenary. Each workshop began with an introduction to the objectives of the workshop followed by series of relevant presentations in the respective workshop streams (Annex 1). A concerted effort was made to accommodate sufficient time for discussion and development of recommendations. This overview report provides the major outcomes that came out of the individual workshop streams in the same order as above.

3. WORKSHOP SESSIONS

3.1 Workshop 1 - Divided, yet United – Development Planning at Regional and National Levels

Development planning and conservation planning are currently being undertaken by a range of institutions and governments all over the world with the assistance of several agencies including UNDP, World Bank and UNEP. All these plans are aimed to reduce the levels of poverty and the dependence of communities on natural resources and achieving sustainable development at national level. The target audience to all these plans are the local communities and rural poor. However, they hardly are a part of the process since they do not understand the relevance of these plans to securing their livelihoods. This session of the GBF focused its attention on addressing the following:

- Is there a need to link development and conservation plans?
If 'yes' how?
- Are the communities aware of their roles and responsibilities in achieving the national plans?
- How to spread the ownership of achieving the elements of frameworks like Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Poverty reduction Strategies at the national and local levels?

3.1.1 Highlights of Abstracts/Presentations

1. Multilateral cooperation for the conservation and sustainable development of the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion

Evangeline Miclat
WWF - Philippines

The Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion (SSME) is globally outstanding in terms of biodiversity and productivity. Three countries – Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines – which share jurisdiction over it, are cooperating to conserve and promote sustainable development in this ecoregion under the framework of the SSME Conservation Program initiated by WWF in 1999.

For the planning component of the program, national and tri-national mechanisms, characterized by strong governments-WWF partnership and with involvement of major stakeholders at all levels, were established. The multi-lateral cooperation, though informal, successfully delivered a stakeholders' Ecoregion Conservation Plan (ECP) for SSME among others. In February 2004, the governments formally adopted the ECP through a signing of a tri-national Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) during the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP7). To govern the implementation of the ECP, a more formal mechanism, in the form of a Tri-National Committee will have to be put in place.

Multi-lateral cooperation proves effective in SSME for various reasons but generally because of the recognition of the need and the determination of governments to transcend man-made boundaries where maintenance of biological resources and ecological processes that nourish and sustain human populations are involved.

2. Regional Cooperation - the Central Asia and Mongolia Bioresources and Biosecurity Network

*Kirsten Neumann
United Nations University, Japan*

The countries of Central Asia and Mongolia are an extremely rich and important repository of biodiversity, including many endemic species adapted to harsh, fragile, and frequently extreme environments. Central Asia and Mongolia are rich in both genetic resources and traditional knowledge. They share a history as centres of origin for many domesticated plant and animal species and are an important source of genetic material, especially for agrobiodiversity. While exhibiting a diversity of national conditions, they share in varying proportions a common geography, which consists largely of mountains, arid and semi-arid regions. The challenge to maintain their biodiversity is further exacerbated by growing economic pressures, such as mining, hydro-electric power projects, agriculture and the absence of a legal framework to regulate ABS, protect traditional knowledge and govern the production, transport, use and handling of genetically modified organisms.

The workshops organized by UNU-IAS in the past has led to the establishment of a Central Asia /Mongolia Bioresources and Biosecurity Network with the principal aim of assisting Central Asian countries and Mongolia to conserve and sustainably use their biological diversity. The network will establish working groups of legal experts and professionals to analyse existing legislation on ABS, traditional knowledge, biosafety and intellectual property, to study international experiences, and to make recommendations to strengthen the legislative basis. UNU-IAS continues to provide technical support to the network secretariat and to organise capacity-building activities in the region.

3. Making Support to CBNRM and Biodiversity Conservation Accessible to Community: Small Grants for Direct Larger Impacts

*Avi Mahaningtyas
GEF-SGP, Indonesia*

Communities are the direct beneficiaries and managers of natural resource management in many ecosystems, even in the protected ones. The implementation of precautionary principle in NRM and CB is best when local communities are recognised as part of the problem and solution. GEF-SGP has been learning from a decade of experience in supporting communities in implementing biodiversity conservation in forest and marine ecosystems through various approach that address both poverty reduction through sustainable livelihood and policy dialogue. However, main problems include widening access to community groups, especially indigenous peoples' groups in Indonesia. The GEF-SGP Indonesia recently developed initiatives to help illiterate communities to access small grants. There are challenges and shared learning that need to be discussed with other stakeholders as part of policy dialogue and global synergy in biodiversity conservation movement.

4. Achieving the Unity: Options and Opportunities

*Balakrishna Pisupati
IUCN-RBP, Asia*

Sustainable development can be defined broadly as “a development path along which the maximisation of human well-being for today’s

generations does not lead to declines in future well-being” (OECD, 2001). The concept also incorporates the need to balance the goals of economic efficiency, social development and environmental protection. and the importance of global cooperation among countries in their path towards sustainability is often emphasised.

Currently, economic development in many parts of the world is occurring in ways that are inconsistent with the concept of sustainable development. For example, increased economic activity coupled with inappropriate policies can create unsustainable pressures on the local poor and environment. This leads to increasing inequity as well as degradation and loss of natural resources and ecosystem services that are vital to many of the world’s poor for food security, livelihoods, health and economic opportunities. In addition, recent economic growth has been disproportionately shared among people and countries, with those most in need often receiving the least benefits. The last two decades have seen the emergence of a number of initiatives to address this scenario and help countries work towards sustainable development. These initiatives advocate strategies, plans and goals that aim to comprehensively address issues of poverty reduction and sustainable development. Differences and similarities between these strategies need to be understood better. Linking economic and development planning with conservation planning is critical to achieving sustainable development.

5. Development Planning : Role and relevance of conservation and livelihoods

Clarissa Aride
UNDP-Philippines

Much of the poor people living in absolute poverty in rural areas depend on the consumption and sale of natural products for most of their livelihoods. Conservation initiatives, particularly protected area establishment, oftentimes cordoned-off people in utilizing natural resources for their consumption. Despite numerous interventions and support to conservation activities, poverty persists in rural areas where natural resources still abound.

Well-managed protected areas can generate significant revenues through tourism and income derive from ecosystems services, such as water. People whose livelihoods depend on protected areas must benefit from them and must have continued stake in the overall management regime. Conserving fisheries and protecting livelihoods, integrating conservation and development beyond protected areas; increasing productivity and expanding agricultural areas while managing cropland loss are some of the key challenges facing the human dimension of conservation.

6. Building Synergies into National Policies: using lessons from the field

Sandra McKenzie
IUCN-RBP, Asia

Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction are overarching goals for all developing countries. However, while these issues affect all levels of government and community, messages are lost in translation as they filter from MDGs, PRSPs and MEAs to regional and national policy making forums. As sustainable development is most commonly defined and formally implemented through national policy making dialogues, failure to realise the opportunities and options presented by MEAs can seriously undermine conservation and poverty reduction outcomes.

When discussing the need for integrated planning at the national level, we need to address issues of governance and capacity. The synergies between these present an effective framework for building the capacity of national policy frameworks such as PRSPs, NSSDs, NBSAPs and National Communications.

7. Experiences from KAMYCIDI on linking conservation and Development

Bumacas Donato
KAMYCIDI, Philippines

The Sustainable Indigenous Peoples Agricultural Technology (SIPAT) is the major focus program of Kalinga Mission for Indigenous Children and Youth Development, Inc. (KAMICYDI) which was promoted, enhanced and implemented since 1984. This is the an

innovative initiative that promotes biodiversity and alleviates poverty. In general the goal of the project is to uplift the living condition of the Kalinga indigenous people and at the same time conserve, protect and maintain biodiversity. This innovative program or initiative interfaced five (5) major components which are FITU Technology, PINAGWA System, ARA or Indigenous Communal Irrigation System (ICIS), Rice Terraces-vegetables-fish integration and advocacy & multi-stakeholders partnership.

FITU Technology is an indigenous forest management technology where they built a wild animal traps called FITU then protect conserve the forest around it. PINAGWA System on the other hand is an indigenous way of watershed management where families own, maintain, manage, protect and preserve their agro-forest within the watershed. This system ensures continuous water supply for the ARA. ARA or Indigenous Communal Irrigation System (ICIS) is an indigenous constructed irrigation system that connects the water from the watershed to the rice terraces. Rice Terraces-vegetables-fish integration is an indigenous way of constructing rice fields to grow rice for food, and then integrate fish and vegetables. This system made the rice terraces a complete source of food for indigenous peoples. Advocacy & multi-stakeholders partnership was used to replicate the SIPAT technology. Multi-stakeholders networking and policy advocacy were undertaken which resulted to the sharing of benefits. Besides, we believe that biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation can only be achieved if tri-stakeholders: civil society, government and business sectors can work together.

3.1.2 Group work and Recommendations

The discussions in the working groups revolved around the need for countries to enhance their governance structures and ensure the understanding of who are the stakeholders in development processes. The group deliberated how international agencies like World Bank, UNEP and UNDP are working at country level to steer the nations towards reducing poverty and enhancing livelihoods through implementing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSD) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Several case studies, experiences and analytical frameworks on how the conservation and

development plans are developed and implemented were presented. Based on these the following issues were identified as those in need of priority attention:

- Governance
- Making the links between conservation and development plans
- Information and communication needs
- Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders
- Processes to be put in place to achieving the linkages between development and conservation plans
- Monitoring and evaluation issues

While discussing on modalities to link conservation and development agendas, the group emerged with the following set of ideas

- Implementation actions under the Rio Conventions at national level should address livelihood and poverty reduction issues. MDGs and elements of PRSP can guide this process.
- The Conference of Parties of the three Rio Conventions, *viz.*, CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD, should specifically focus on issues of national poverty reduction and development. This can be done through setting specific agenda(s) as well as calling for joint actions.
- Implementation of options under development plans should identify and address conservation issues. Thus national reporting on PRSPs, MDGs should consider the impacts of implementation of NBSAPs, National Communications and related processes.
- Community perspectives on PRSPs, MDGs and Conservation Plans should receive attention and be understood by policy makers and politicians.
- Conservation action at local and national level should be responsive to the development needs and project / programme design should consider these needs.
- The financial mechanism to the Conventions (GEF) should encourage supporting actions that relate to reducing poverty

and improving livelihoods. This focus should be consistent with national priorities identified under National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), National Communications (Nat. Coms), National Adaptation Programmes of Actions (NAPAs) and development plans.

- Locally relevant indicators to assess the impacts of biodiversity on livelihoods; gender, health, sanitation, education and other related issues should be developed.
- Social and economic impact assessments should be integrated into EIA and the outcomes of sustainability assessments need to be mainstreamed.
- Adaptive management approach to link development and conservation planning should be used.
- Common monitoring and evaluation tools and indicators – linking CBD, MDG and PRSP should be developed.

The group further identified that the responsibility to make communities aware of the global processes lies with the national, local governments, NGOs, CBOs as well as the implementing agencies. The group felt that this can be achieved through:

- Inclusion of local community representatives in delegations to global forums and meetings (including SBSTTA, COP, Others..)
- Supporting local consultation actions and development of local language material
- Organization of awareness raising programmes, exchange programmes and training sessions on the global processes
- Recognising communities for local actions leading to achieving the global/national targets (eg. Equator Initiative and others)
- Provision of information on status of implementation to the communities (reports in local language etc.)
- Provision of opportunities to support achieving the national targets by making the communities own the responsibilities of achieving national goals of conservation and development

The group further emphasized the need for actions to realize the principles and elements of NBSAPs, NAPAs besides responding to livelihood needs. Similarly actions to achieve MDGs and PRSPs as well as development programmes should contribute to environmental management and biodiversity conservation. These can be achieved through:

- Involving communities and other stakeholders in the design and implementation of actions/projects
- Designing joint projects/actions by agencies responsible for conservation and development
- Allocation of preferential resources for such actions/projects that contribute to the linkages/approaches
- Provision of incentives for such actions

With much of focus on mainstreaming environment, biodiversity and livelihoods, the outcomes of the workshop will feed into the discussions on development planning, conservation and resource use as well as better governance structures that are needed for an effective delivery of resources to achieve sustainable human development.

In addition, the participants also came up with the following recommendations to ensure that conservation and development will be mutually supportive to each other at national and regional levels besides contributing to national development:

- Invest in human resource capital to achieve long term impacts.
- Use adaptive management strategies to address issues of governance will provide the needed.
- Set national agendas, targets on a realistic basis with options for changes and adaptations while considering development plans.
- Review existing structures and policies so that they respond to the needs and targets at local level
- Recognise that governance is about informed decision making process at all levels - global, national and local and that empowering local communities contributes to realizing goals and targets effectively and in time.

- Agree that governance is also about enforcement. Enforcement mechanisms must be used effectively and be transparent.
- Allocate specific resources for programmes on improving governance.
- Increase transparency and accountability on issues of policy making, implementation and impacts.
- Recognise that natural resources contribute to poverty reduction.
- Develop suitable communication tools since the arguments to convince economists and policy makers to provide priority focus on conservation are still weak.
- Appreciate that unless the 'voices' of people and communities are heard at global and national levels, many of the plans are bound to be ineffective in their implementation. National actions must facilitate these processes.
- Recognise that while global initiatives such as Equator Initiative, Ecoregion Conservation Initiative and others are encouraging the links between conservation and development, the ownership to 'scale-up' such actions should be those of national governments and agencies.
- Understand that poverty reduction is a national business and global frameworks should only guide options and not dictate terms.
- Promote that the role of communities in making the poverty, development and environment linkage.
- Support discussions under the CBD on issues of access to resources and benefit sharing and ensure that they must address issues on all dimensions of poverty and income generation.
- Suggest that the international regime of ABS should consider responding to the poverty reduction targets under MDGs and national goals. The benefit sharing elements, apart from focusing on revenues, should also include non-monetary benefits.

Finally the participants felt that:

- While the conservation community has picked up the 'signals' on the ways they contribute to development, the development community is still not clear on how to make conservation work for the poor. This imbalance should change.
- Recognising that sustainable development is a national obligation and that all people have equal responsibility to make it happen, is critical.
- Enhancing participation of local communities and stakeholders in policy making, ensuring the local experiences play an important role in the design of 'options'
- Enhancing vertical and horizontal coordination among agencies, ministries and institutions, including between development and conservation agencies.

3.2 Workshop 2 - The Precautionary Principle in Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation

The precautionary principle is a central and important principle of sustainable development law and policy, and has been widely incorporated into law, policy and management at multilateral and, increasingly, national level. However, the group felt it remains highly controversial, and has sparked dispute within arenas such as the WTO, CBD, WSSD and CITES. However, currently there is little consensus on its acceptance, little shared understanding of its meaning, inconsistency in its implementation between different sectors, issues and regions, and little information on its practical impacts. This can lead to confusion and controversy, and can result in poor conservation outcomes and negative livelihood and development impacts. While substantial debate and dialogue has focused on the precautionary principle in recent years, comparatively little attention has been paid to its use in the context of “green”, biodiversity-related issues, and little analysis of the principle in the context of sustainable development, livelihoods, and poverty alleviation has been carried out. The abstracts submitted as part of this stream are presented as hereunder.

3.2.1 Highlights of Abstracts/Presentations

1. Meaning, Impact and the Implementation of the Precautionary Principle in biodiversity conservation: Perspectives from India

Nanki Kaur

The Energy and Resources Institute, India

The Precautionary Principle has been applied extensively in the context of natural resource management and biodiversity conservation. However its application to biodiversity conservation, through management approaches like ‘protectionism’, the ecosystem approach and adaptive management have led to varying degrees of socio-economic impacts on local livelihoods. Such livelihoods, based on traditional practices and institutions, are believed to have in place mechanisms for sustainable resource use, which effectively address conservation and livelihood priorities relating to income

generation, security (based on ownership and access to natural resource use) and equitable benefit sharing of resources.

In this context, the aim of this paper is to facilitate dialogue that will either validate India's biodiversity conservation strategies, based on state initiated protected area management plans, and/or assess the potential and the means of adopting traditional precautionary natural resource management practices within current state initiated approaches.

Such a dialogue is expected to provide an insight into the meaning and the impact of the precautionary principle on conservation and local livelihoods; within protected and community conserved areas so that the three priorities of sustainable development – conservation, sustainable resource use and equitable sharing of benefits – may be addressed in implementation.

2. Uncertainty, Complexity and the Precautionary Principle

*Brenden Moyle
Massey University, New Zealand*

The problem of strategic planning under uncertainty is not unique to wildlife management. The problem is ubiquitous whenever managers have to deal with complex systems. Most ecological, economic and social systems have the characteristics of complexity. Complex systems have special characteristics which are outlined. These characteristics prevent managers using models to describe the behaviour of the system. This in turn generates uncertainty about the optimal management decision.

There are several decision rules that can be used to cope with this uncertainty. These range from expected payoff rules through to the precautionary principle. All of these rules have advantages and disadvantages which are elaborated. The disadvantages of the precautionary principle are outlined. These stem from its extreme timidity in the face of uncertainty as well as discounting potential benefits from the management decision.

The precautionary principle can be usefully employed alongside other decision rules. The workshop concludes by explaining- with reference to extant conservation projects- how the precautionary

principle can be made operational. This is based around complementary decision rules that preserve the risk-aversion of the precautionary principle, but avoiding its excessive timidity. These rules stress the need for robust and adaptable approaches rather than depend entirely on precaution as the basis for decision making.

3. The Precautionary Principle in Natural Resource Management and Bio-diversity Conservation(with special reference to Nepal)

Madhu Prasad Regmi
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, Nepal

Nepal is very rich in terms of natural resources and biodiversity. A broad range of ecosystems flourishes on relatively less area of land in Nepal. Its biodiversity is a reflection of its unique geographic position and altitudinal and climatic variations. A great deal of efforts has been made over the years in Nepal to protect and manage the biological resources and their diversity. It has been recognized that huge natural endowments are the mainstay of Nepal's economy and the well being of its people. If such resources are properly managed and utilized, the growth rate of economic development could be accelerated. Hence, Nepal's current development policies are geared towards poverty alleviation through wise and sustainable utilization of its natural resources.

The PP has now-a-days received widespread recognition from the international community. Although the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) does not clearly spell about the principle, its preamble clearly notes that where there is a threat of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to avoid or minimize such threat. The principle requires activities and substances which may be harmful to the environment to be regulated, and possibly prohibited, even if no conclusive or overwhelming evidence is available as to the harm or likely harm they may cause to the environment. It also calls for a shift on the burden of proof. This means that where there is an identifiable risk of environmental harm or loss of biodiversity, it may be appropriate to place the burden of proof on the proponent, who wishes to carry out such activity to prove that it is not detrimental to the environment will not cause harm to the environment.

The legal status of PP is still evolving. However, there is sufficient evidence of State practice to justify that the principle has now received sufficiently broad support to allow a good argument to be made that it reflects the principle of customary international law.

Experiences in the past decades with environmental problems have tempted policy makers to re-evaluate how we address potential environmental harms. At the centre of this re-evaluation is the PP, which reflects the recognition that scientific certainty often comes too late to design effective legal and policy responses for preventing many potential environmental threats. It addresses how environmental decisions are made in the face of scientific uncertainty.

4. The Precautionary Approach (PA) in Living Aquatic Resource Management

*Paul Teng
World Fish Centre, Malaysia*

Living aquatic resource systems have inherent buffering capacity but are also subject to disruptions which result in both reversible and irreversible changes in species composition and type. The PA is a response to uncertainty and inadequate knowledge in order to avoid or prevent changes which may impact ultimately on poor people who derive livelihoods from living aquatic resources. Areas in which it applies include fisheries management, alien invasive spp., spread of pathogens, utilization and trade of wild species, and protected area management. Aquatic resource systems to be considered include most of those which are considered priority by the WorldFish Center – Coral reefs and Coastal waters; Floodplains, streams and rivers; small water bodies, reservoirs and lakes; and ponds. It is necessary to ask what intervention instruments (guidelines, regulations, policies, international treaties/agreements) have potential applicability to each aquatic resource system.

Risk assessment techniques, such as those developed for crops modified using biotechnology, and Risk Management under imperfect scientific conditions, will both have to be modified for use on alien species and improved stock (and their pathogens). It is important that epidemiologic and population dynamic principles be

taken into consideration in any risk assessment, together with the biological properties of individual species such as their diets, dispersal patterns, fecundity, and generation times. Lessons for LARs may also be taken from the introduction into Asia of many alien plant species for commercial purposes, and from the plantings of millions of hectares of improved crop species, with little to no measurable impact on indigenous related species. A common approach to applying the PA to LARM is feasible, which accepts that imperfect knowledge is the norm and not the exception in developing countries.

3.2.2 Group work and Recommendations

The second workshop reviewed and discussed case studies and analyses of the precautionary principle in practice across a range of biodiversity and resource management areas, including fisheries management, alien invasive species, utilisation and trade of wild species, protected area management, and sustainable forest management. Discussion focussed on the need for anticipatory and preventive action in many biodiversity and resource management areas, the ways in which the principle had been applied and examination of the consequences, the conservation, livelihood and poverty alleviation implications and impacts of application, how serious and irreversible harm should be determined, the relationship between the principle and adaptive management, and how the precautionary principle should be implemented to further conservation and poverty alleviation goals.

Based on extensive discussion, the following points and recommendations for implementation of the precautionary principle in NRM and biodiversity conservation emerged:

Uncertainty

Uncertainty is characteristic of complex systems, including ecosystems. In NRM/biodiversity conservation in general, and particularly in developing countries, decisions must typically be made on the basis of great uncertainties, and in the face of multiple risks. Requiring all information to be in place before making conservation/NRM decisions, and knowing exactly the outcomes of those decisions before undertaking them, is not practical or feasible,

especially where resources/capacity are limited. In these circumstances it is helpful to adopt an adaptive management approach, which includes monitoring and periodic review to provide feedback, and amendment of decisions in the light of new information. The involvement and consultation of stakeholders is an important element of this process. The precautionary principle should be implemented and understood in a manner consistent with this approach.

Explicit and implicit uses of the precautionary principle

Some instances of application of the precautionary principle are explicit and unambiguous, while others are implicit. However, examining the use of the precautionary principle where it is not explicit requires examining the context and motivations for decisions and management interventions. It is not always easy to determine whether decisions or management interventions have been implicitly precautionary, especially as many decisions in biodiversity conservation/NRM, take place in the face of some uncertainty.

What is serious or irreversible harm?

The question of what constitutes serious or irreversible harm may be dependent on context and circumstances. For instance, this will vary widely according to sector, and on the objective(s) of management. Irreversibility alone may be an inadequate criterion, as many changes, including the deaths of individual organisms, are clearly irreversible. Determination of serious or irreversible harm is likely to vary according to the scale at which precautionary action is being applied/considered. For instance, it may vary from the international, to the national, to the local level. At each level, the background of other laws, policies, objectives etc. need to be considered.

Determining serious or irreversible harm will always be a question involving judgement and values. However, judgements should be informed, rather than arbitrary. All available information should be taken into account, including indigenous and traditional knowledge as well as science.

Perceptions of risk and harm will vary, including according to the urgency of other priorities, such as poverty alleviation.

How should ‘serious or irreversible harm’ be determined?

Because this determination necessarily involves judgement, perception and values, the question of “who decides” is extremely important. In many cases it will be appropriate for decisions to be made by those responsible for management, including, in particular, national and local levels of management.

Decisions on what constitutes serious/irreversible harm should be consultative and involve relevant stakeholders. These include in particular those who bear the costs of environmental harm, and poor or marginal groups who may bear costs of precautionary action. Where decisions involve shared or transboundary resources, such as fisheries in transboundary river basins, all relevant management units should be involved.

Application of the precautionary principle: assessing costs and benefits

The precautionary principle is often understood and applied in ways that emphasise averting potential conservation threats. The potential conservation benefits that may result from a particular intervention may be ignored. This can lead to “missing out” on conservation benefits that can be gained by actions that pose some level of conservation risk. In making judgements and decisions based on the precautionary principle, the costs and the benefits of both action and inaction should all be taken into account. These costs and benefits should not be limited to conservation, but should include livelihood, socio-economic, food security and relevant “intangible” costs and benefits.

Indigenous and traditional knowledge and management practices

Indigenous and traditional knowledge and management practices are very important in the context of NRM and biodiversity conservation. These are frequently ignored in “precautionary” decision making based only on the science available to policy/decision-makers. Applications of the precautionary principle should be based on understanding of indigenous and traditional knowledge as well as scientific information.

The precautionary principle has often been used as a rationale to support conservation interventions which are detrimental to indigenous people's aspirations to use wildlife and biological resources to support livelihoods. Precautionary conservation interventions are likely to be more effective when indigenous and local people are involved in the decision-making process and in management. Many traditional and local people reliant on biological resources are likely to be supportive of a precautionary approach to resource management, when their needs and viewpoints are included in the process, particularly where communities have been negatively affected by resource degradation.

Information gathering

Decisions using the precautionary principle should be accompanied by efforts to seek further information, and reduce uncertainties. The precautionary principle should be applied as part of a dynamic management process including monitoring the impact of the precautionary decision, and "revisiting" the decision regularly. However, constraints of resources and capacity need to be taken into account.

Tools for implementing the precautionary approach

There is a strong need to establish tools to operationalise the precautionary approach in NRM/conservation. These could include information resources based on research findings and outputs, and experiential and indigenous/traditional knowledge, to assist decision-making and management.

The outcomes will contribute to the development of "best-practice" guidance for application of the precautionary principle and feed into ongoing project activities including development of case studies, further regional consultations and workshops and inputs into relevant policy arenas, including the IUCN World Conservation Congress in November 2004.

3.3 Workshop 3 - Developing work programme for Synergies among Multilateral Environmental Agreements

Beginning 1992 Rio Summit, there has been an increase in the number of environmental agreements with specific and sectoral focus such as biodiversity (CBD), climate change (UNFCCC), desertification (UNCCD) and others. This has resulted in overlap in negotiation processes for individual instruments and in few cases resulting in conflicts and issues of 'territoriality'. In a few instances, the implementation of one MEA overstep the guiding principles upon which another instrument is based. This causes additional burden for the contracting parties at the national level to meet their obligations mandated by several MEAs.

With these issues in mind, the workshop attempted to develop a concerted work programme for demonstrating 'synergies in action' at the ground level by addressing the following broad issues.

3.3.1 Highlights of Abstracts/Presentations

1. The Irony of the Wildlife Conservation Act on the Turtle Islands, Philippines

*Ria Apostol Adoracion
WWF-Philippines*

The Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act or RA 9147 was enacted in 2001 to regulate the collection and trade of wildlife in the Philippines. This law provides a legal framework to implement the country's commitments under the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES) of which the Philippines is a signatory. While the intention of the Wildlife Act is to conserve species and biodiversity, it is producing the opposite effect in the Turtle Islands. For years, the harvesting of turtle eggs has been a traditional source of livelihood by various ethnic groups in Southern Philippines. A permitting scheme introduced by wildlife authorities twenty years ago harmonizes people's needs and conservation. The system allows for 60% of eggs to be harvested through a system of revolving permits and 40% set aside for conservation through a hatchery

program. Under the Wildlife Act, turtle egg collection is now banned and sustainable use outlawed.

The application of the law effectively undermined an egg collection and permitting system that became a working system acceptable to local communities and wildlife authorities. Upon enactment of the Wildlife Act, the local government of the Turtle Islands and the community vehemently reacted citing lack of consultations, alternatives and social preparation. This eventually led to non-compliance to the new law and eventual collapse of the permitting and turtle egg allocation systems. This paper presents the social dynamics in the Turtle Islands and the processes that led to a breakdown in conservation management. It highlights the importance of negotiated resource agreements, monitoring their impacts and the need for re-negotiation to address present conflicts.

2. Harmonization for implementation: Multilateral environmental agreements in Lao PDR

Kelsey Jack
IUCN-Lao PDR

In 1995, Lao PDR accepted its first set of obligations under a multilateral environmental agreement by ratifying the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. In subsequent years, those obligations multiplied, with accession to several other MEAs, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Ozone Agreements and the World Heritage Convention. For a least developed country, with a relatively recent set of environmental laws and policies to guide implementation, the task of coordinating MEA implementation, handling reporting requirements and attending the associated meetings and negotiations is severely constrained by available human and financial resources. Thus, creating synergies for more efficient and effective implementation is essential for Lao PDR.

Coordination committees and national focal points have been established for every MEA to which Lao PDR is a party. In addition, coordination committees exist for a number of activities and projects aimed at implementation. Several ongoing and upcoming projects are either wholly or partially focused on developing synergies among MEAs. A National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan has been

finalized, a National Adaptation Programme of Action is underway, and a National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment will begin in the next few months. The scope and variety of institutions and activities for addressing MEAs demand harmonization themselves, which is what a recently approved IUCN/UNDP project proposes to do.

Some basic principles to guide Lao PDR's efforts to create synergies among MEAs can be drawn from the outcomes of regional and global meetings on the topic. These include the need for: a coordinating mechanism for both horizontal and vertical harmonization; a focus on linking MEA implementation to substantive national development priorities; and an initially specific approach that expands as capacity increases. Examining the linkages among the different MEA implementation activities in light of these principles provides some direction for implementation, as well as highlighting potential pitfalls and priorities. Opportunities to raise awareness, boost participation and increase efficiency are tied to finding synergies among different implementation mechanisms.

3. Streamlined National Reporting under Biodiversity-related convention, Pilot study in Indonesia

*Ina Binari Pranato
Indonesia*

UNEP workshop in Cambridge, October 2000 reviewed several options for how national reporting of the biodiversity-related treaties could be harmonized and streamlined in all levels, including the so-called "modular approach." Under this approach the information required for reporting on the implementation of these conventions would be defined into a series of discrete information package or themes.

Following the Cambridge workshop, Indonesia volunteered to undertake a pilot study on harmonizing national report using modular approach to field test information management and harmonization concepts in the context of the national reporting under biodiversity related conventions. Pilot study showed that it is possible to develop overarching thematic framework for modular national reporting which can accommodate the requirements of CBD, CITES, Ramsar and WHC.

The exercise was implemented by Ministry of Environment in collaboration with UNEP and WCMC. Experience from this activity will be shared and discussed.

4. Native landraces and their wild relatives: a case study on *in-situ* conservation plan in Vietnam

Hoa Thi Tran
Vietnam

The tropical plant genetic resources including native landrace and their wild relatives (NLWR) face multiple threats from habitat loss, climate change, and invasive species. Conservation of NLWR is compounded by the fact that the number of species require protection, “conservation in use” and have complex of biological features. These factors render *ex situ* conservation difficult and inappropriate, and *in situ* conservation as the only viable strategy for communication and use the majority of NLWR.

The ecological conditions vary within NLWR distribution in Vietnam. At the same time, possible threats to these units could be mapped. Genetic variation between orchards (e.g. Citrus, Litchi and Longan) within and between gene management zones (GMZs) is therefore suggested as a management option. It is therefore recommended to conserve a network of conservation orchards rather than a orchard. Eight GMZs/genecological zones are outlines, and potential gene conservation orchards identified in a way that all GMZs can be represented in the network. Mitigation strategies/conservation plan for NLWR to counter the threats should be an integral component of programs designed to conserve and manage NLWR. In Vietnam, millions of people use NLWR to sustain their livelihoods. Thus any program aimed at conservation should include a strategy for participatory management of NLWR. Participatory management can be enhanced through incentives and improved institutional mechanisms. Legal, political and cultural settings within which participatory management is practiced vary considerably and accordingly.

A conservation plan for NLWR in gene management zones (GMZs) is presented in this paper and an implementation plan is outlined. Lessons learnt and policy implication from the case study will also be discussed.

5. Translating synergies between MEAs into Local Action for Biodiversity Conservation and Livelihoods

Sandra Mckenzie
IUCN-RBP, Asia

Ignoring the linkages between climate changes, loss of biodiversity, and the needs of an expanding population is one of the most severe threats to the global environment. IUCN's Asian Regional Biodiversity Program has illustrated how synergies between MEAs such as the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) can be achieved at the macro scale. Addressing these linkages not only has the benefit of delivering more strategic and targeted projects but also economising on the use of scarce fiscal and technical resources.

Feedback from donors, project planners and designers has indicated significant challenges in translating synergies between MEAs into multiple outcomes at the local level. Work is now underway to illustrate how linkages can be best achieved at the local level to deliver outcomes for biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation and food security and poverty reduction.

The specific outcomes of these projects as they relate to MEAs will be discussed along with challenges in achieving these linkages at the field level. Using these case studies as themes, feedback will be sought from workshop participants on specific regional strengths and challenges for achieving linkages. This information will be used to identify opportunities and recommendations for future project leaders, NGOs, governments, stakeholders and donor agencies planning biodiversity and development projects in and around the Asia region.

6. Synergies among global conventions for sustainable development: Options and Opportunities

Bhujangarao Dharmaji
IUCN-RBP, Asia

Multiple stressors, including, burgeoning population, habitat loss and fragmentation and spread of invasive alien species will limit the

resilience of ecosystems to climate change. In addition, climate change may further accelerate current high rates of biodiversity loss, precisely at the time when diversity and the range of ecosystem adaptation options are most required. Climate change and biodiversity loss also threaten to reverse progress in the field of sustainable development. As biodiversity, climate change and livelihoods are intrinsically linked, efforts to conserve biodiversity, adapt to and mitigate climate change and eradicate poverty are also interlinked. Policy and government-level initiatives to tie these multiple objectives have begun. However, in most cases, on-the-ground work remains focussed on addressing single issue or convention.

Incorporating biodiversity conservation objectives into climate change adaptation and mitigation activities will help maintain the biological capital of adaptation options, and foster achievement of maximal mitigation benefits. Ensuring that development initiatives are environmentally sustainable and that they account for future climatic change is crucial.

3.3.2 Group work and Recommendations

The group discussed on possible options that could be tried and tested for achieving interlinkages among the MEAs. The group also noted that issues of 'overstepping', 'territoriality' and inter ministerial / inter departmental competitions as some of major bottle-necks in developing a common work programme for synergies among MEAs. However, the group felt that the following options could be considered to address issues and reduce constraints.

- Identification and participation of key stakeholders at all levels
- Institution building and inter-linkages among various policies and legislation at the national level
- Reducing dependency on external support for joint implementation of MEAs
- Partnership building and harmonisation of common goals
- Bridging gap between "shopping lists" and "strategic statements"
- Building on GEF initiatives to promote synergies among MEAs (e.g. NCSA)

An important element of interlinkages that can exist among MEAs lies in the harmonization of procedures, methodologies and formats for data collection analysis and reporting. The importance of information lies in the fact that it is usually the basis of most aspects of MEAs, from negotiations to compliance. The group felt that one of the significant problems faced by the national focal points in responding to the mandates of MEAs in a coordinated effort is the lack of information base and poor knowledge management (KM) options. It is felt that this area should receive high priority. Considering the lack of sufficient human resources which tends to limit the abilities of national governments; incomplete inventories and databases and; almost non-existing knowledge management options, the group has suggested the following options that could be prioritised by the national governments as a first step in the direction of synergies among global conventions.

- Competency-based training for implementing synergies, including on database use, harmonised reporting and others.
- Information dissemination to increase exchange among partners (e.g. MEAs) for application at regional and national levels
- Development of resource kits and training standards for national application
- Translation of MEA materials into relevant and accessible formats and local languages
- Exploring opportunities for CBD implementation in conjunction with other MEAs such as UNFCCC, e.g. linking CBD and LULUCF (Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry)
- Developing policies and programmes to achieve complementarity, save resources and avoid redundancy (e.g. common reporting formats)
- Involving collaborators early enough in planning processes so that they have a buy in
- Supporting projects and activities that identifies and implements actions on synergies at local level.

Significant challenges exist for the contracting parties in having an informed participation in the global events such as CoPs and the negotiations for each instrument. The group realized the fact that using synergies approach, the elements of one convention can be implemented in conjunction with other cross-cutting MEA. However, the group felt that it is essential to evolve a set of strategies that would help joint implementation of cross-cutting and related MEAs at no additional cost to the national exchequer.

Most of the MEAs deal with complex technical issues, often having cross-sectoral impact. The group felt that action in one field may lead to unintentional consequences in the other. In addition, lack of technical expertise, timely information and resources compounds the problem. The group recognised that effective management of information and development are the key elements for successful implementation of MEAs. The group also stressed the need for harnessing the power of information technology and scientific assessments to achieve synergies among MEAs which ultimately could lead to sustainable development. The following broad project concepts were recommended as examples by the group for ground level demonstration of synergies among MEAs.

- Developing and implementing the Environmental Impact Assessments that are responsive to the elements of the MEAs.
- Integrated land use planning at landscape/watershed scale.
- Economic valuations of natural ecosystem services that could provide the linkages between environmental management and economic development.
- Bio-regional planning and trans-boundary cooperation (e.g. Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion (SSME), Greater Mekong region, Himalayan ecosystem) that can demonstrate the needs and options for inter-sectoral cooperation.



4th Asian Regional Session of the Global Biodiversity Forum: Southeast Asia

**21-23 June 2004
Manila, Philippines**

Annexe - 1 : Agenda for Workshops

Programme for the Inaugural Session

21st June, 2004

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 08:30 - 09:00 | Registration |
| 09:00 - 09:10 | Welcome Remarks
Theresa Munditha Lim, DENR, Philippines |
| 09:10 - 09:20 | About the GBF Southeast Asia
Balakrishna Pisupati,
IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia |
| 09:20 - 09:35 | Address by the Chief Guest
Hon. Elisea G. Gozun,
Cabinet Secretary, DENR, Philippines |
| 09:35 - 09:45 | Remarks
Deborah Landey, UNDP – Philippines |
| 09:45 - 09:55 | Remarks
Gregario Texon, ARCBC |
| 09:55 - 10:00 | Remarks
Barney Dickson, The Precautionary Principle
project |

- 10:00 - 10:10 Inaugural Address
Hon. Renato de Rueda,
Undersecretary, DENR, Philippines
- 10:10 - 10:15 Vote of Thanks
Bhujang Dharmaji,
IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia
- 10:15 - 11:00 Refreshments (*Sponsored by ARCBC*)
- 11:00 - 11:30 Introduction to the Themes
1. Divided Yet United: Development Planning at National and Regional Levels Balakrishna Pisupati, IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia
 2. The Precautionary Principles in Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation, Barney Dickson, The Precautionary Principle Project
 3. Synergies among MEAs, Bhujang Dharmaji, IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia
- 11:30 Parallel Workshops Start

Workshop 1

Divided, Yet United – Development Planning at Regional and National Levels

21st June 2004, Monday

- 11:00 - 11:20 Development Planning: Role and relevance of Conservation and livelihoods. **Clarissa Arida**, UNDP
- 11:20 - 11:30 Discussion
- 11:30 - 11:50 Conservation agenda : Making it work for People's Livelihoods. **Gonzalo Oviedo**, IUCN
- 11:50 - 12:00 Discussion

12:00 - 12:20	CBD and MDGs. Mundita Lim , DENR
12:20 - 12:30	Discussion
12:30 - 14:30	Lunch (<i>Sponsored by ARCBC</i>)
14:30 - 14:50	Regional Cooperation - the Central Asia and Mongolia Bio-resources and Bio-security Network Kirsten Neumann , UNU
14:50 - 15:00	Discussion
15:00 - 15:20	Multilateral cooperation for the conservation and sustainable development of the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Evangeline Miclat , WWF
15:20 - 15:30	Discussion
15:30 - 15:50	Making conservation efforts meaningful for communities: Relevance of SGP. Angie Cunanan , UNDP
15:50 - 16:00	Discussion
16:00 - 16:30	Coffee/Tea
16:30 - 16:50	Building synergies into national policies using lessons from field. Sandra McKenzie , IUCN
16:50 - 17:00	Discussion
1730	Dinner (<i>Department of Tourism, Philippines</i>) Dinner Venue " Intramuros " the Wall City.
2130	Return to the hotel

22nd June 2004, Tuesday

09:00 - 09:20	Achieving the Unity: Options and Opportunities. Balakrishna Pisupati , IUCN
09:20 - 09:30	Discussion
09:30 - 09:50	Experiences from KAMYCIDI on linking conservation and development Donato Bumacas , KAMYCIDI

- 09:50 - 10:00 Discussion
- 10:00 - 10:15 Challenges in implementing CBD : A case of Wildlife Conservation Act in Turtle islands, Philippines – *Ria Apostol*, WWF – Philippines
- 10:00 - 12:30 *Panel Discussion on Making Development Planning work for Environment and people*
Balakrishna Pisupati, Mundita Lim, Donato Bumacas, Gonzalo Oviedo
- 12:30 - 14:00 Lunch (*Sponsored by CI, Philippines*)
- 14:00 - 17:00 Group Discussions

GROUP 1 Making Development Agenda work for the Poor

Here the participants will discuss how to mainstream issues under CBD, PRSP and MDGs so that the target groups are better benefited. They will also identify ways to use the local experiences in deciding policies and actions

GROUP 2 Key questions for achieving the synergies between poverty reduction and environmental management

Here the participants will brainstorm on the examples and case studies and will suggest the knowledge and information gaps on issues of links between poverty and environment besides suggesting ways of designing actions to address the link. Also, the participants will discuss the possibilities to develop a common set of indicators to monitor achieving development and conservation goals and targets

- 18:30 Dinner (Hosted by WWF at Hotel Astoria Plaza)

23rd June 2004, Wednesday

- 09:00 - 11:00 Finalization of recommendations
Breakout groups
- 11:00 - 11:30 Refreshments

11:30 - 12:30 Closing Plenary chaired by
Hon. Elisea G. Gozun,
Cabinet Secretary, DENR, Philippines.

12:30 Lunch

Workshop 2

The Precautionary Principles in Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation

21st June 2004, Monday

9:00 - 11:00 **OPENING PLENARY**

Introduction to the Workshop by Dr Barney Dickson

11:30 - 12:30 **Rosie Cooney**, *The Precautionary Principle Project*
The Precautionary Principle Principle in NRM and Biodiversity Conservation: Issues and Problems

02:30- 05:00 **Brendan Moyle**, *Department of Commerce, Massey University, New Zealand.* Uncertainty, Complexity and the Precautionary Principle
Lorenzo Agaloos, *PAWB* Precautionary Principle in the Wildlife Act.
Madhu Regmi, *Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, Nepal*
The Precautionary Principle in Natural Resource Management and Bio- diversity Conservation (with special reference to Nepal)

17:30 Dinner (*Department of Tourism, Philippines*)
Dinner Venue "**Intramuros**" the Wall City.

2131 **Return to the hotel**

22nd June 2004, Tuesday

- 09:00 - 12:30 **Barney Dickson**, *The Precautionary Principle Project*
Applying the Precautionary Principle in
Biodiversity Conservation and NRM: Some Key
Issues
Paul Teng, *Worldfish Centre, Malaysia*
The Precautionary Approach (PA) in Living
Aquatic Resource management
Christine Casals, *FishBase*; Towards Building to
Assess Species Invasiveness in a Precautionary
Framework
Rezal Kusumaatmadja, *Marine Aquarium Council,*
Asia
Applying the Precautionary Principle for Coral
Reef Conservation and a Responsible Marine
Aquarium Trade through MAC Certification
- 02:30 - 05:30 **Nanki Kaur**, *Energy and Resources Institute, India*
Meaning, Impact and the Implementation of the
Precautionary Principle in biodiversity
conservation: Perspectives from India
Tonie Balangue and Anabeth Indab *Resources and*
Environmental Economics Foundation of the Philippines
(REAP) The Precautionary Principle in Biodiversity
Conservation: Experience in the Philippines
Implementing the Precautionary Principle in
Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource
Management

How should the precautionary principle be
implemented to support both biodiversity and
livelihoods?
Review and discussion of draft guidance for best-
practice
- 18:30 Dinner (Hosted by WWF at Hotel Astoria Plaza)

23rd June 2004, Wednesday

- 09:00 - 11:00 Finalisation of recommendations
Breakout groups
- 11:00 - 11:30 Refreshments
- 11:30 - 12:30 Closing Plenary chaired by **Hon. Elisea G. Gozun**,
Cabinet Secretary, DENR, Philippines.
- 12:30 Lunch

Workshop 3

Developing Work Programmes on Synergies among MEAs

21 June 2004 - Monday

- 11:30 - 11:50 Synergies among global conventions for sustainable development: Options and Opportunities -*Bhujang Dharmaji*, IUCN –RBP, Asia
- 11:50 - 12:00 Discussion
- 12:00 - 12:20 Harmonization of reporting to global biodiversity treaties through Biodiversity Information Sharing System – *Gregorio Texon*, ARCBC
- 12:20 - 12:30 Discussion
- 12:30 - 14:30 Lunch (*Sponsored by ARCBC*)
- 14:30 - 14:50 Accessing data without pain – *John McKinnon*, ARCBC, Philippines
- 14:50 - 15:00 Discussion
- 15:00 - 15:20 Implementation of CBD, and RAMSAR Conventions in Vietnam
Mr. Tran Ngoc Cuong Nature Conservation Division - Vietnam Environmental Protection Agency

15:20 - 15:30	Discussion
15:30 - 15:50	Streamlined national reporting under Biodiversity related convention: Pilot study in Indonesia - <i>Ina Binari Pranoto</i> , Ministry of Environment, Indonesia
15:50 - 16:00	Discussion
16:00 - 16:30	Coffee/Tea
16:30 - 16:50	Mainstreaming Climate Change and Biodiversity <i>Kelsey Jack</i> , IUCN- Lao PDR
16:50 - 17:00	Discussion
17:30	Dinner (<i>Department of Tourism, Philippines</i>) Dinner Venue " <i>Intramuros</i> " the Wall City.
21:30	Return to the hotel

22nd June 2004, Tuesday

09:00 - 09:20	Linking Agrobiodiversity and food security with CBD— <i>Tran Thi Hoa</i> , Center for Biodiversity and Biosafety, Vietnam
09:20 - 09:30	Discussion
09:30 - 09:50	Community experience among biodiversity related conventions in Plant Genetic Resources Conservation: A reflection on MEA synergies — <i>Dano Elenita</i> , SEARICE, Philippines
09:50 - 10:00	Discussion
10:00 - 10:20	National Capacity Self Assessments <i>Bhujung Dharmaji</i> , IUCN
10:20 - 10:30	Discussion
10:3 - 11:00	Coffee / Tea
11:00 - 12:30	Panel discussion on designing work plan to achieve Synergies among MEAs: <i>Bhujung Dharmaji, David Duthie, John MacKinnon, Greg Taxon, Amparo mpil</i>

- 12:30 - 14:30 Lunch
(Sponsored by CI, Philippines)
- 14:30 - 17:00 Group work
GROUP A - Making synergies work
This group will identify specific local actions that can demonstrate synergies and how to implement such actions.
GROUP B - Capacities for achieving synergies – Follow up to NCSAs
This group will discuss how countries develop their capacities based on the discussions held before
- 18:30 Dinner (Hosted by WWF at Hotel Astoria Plaza)

23rd June 2004, Wednesday

- 09:00 - 11:00 Finalization of recommendations
Breakout groups
- 11:00 - 11:30 Refreshments
- 11:30 - 12:30 Closing Plenary chaired by **Hon. Elisea G. Gozun**, Cabinet Secretary, DENR, Philippines.
- 12:30 Lunch

Annexe - 2 : List of Participants

Name	Address	Country
Adorable Arleigh (Mr)	DENR-PAWCZMS 10, Macabalan, Cagayan de Oro City, 9000 Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines Phone: +63 88 856 9591 Fax: +63 8822 726280 Email: pawd_denr10@yahoo.com	Philippines
Agaloos Lorenzo (Mr)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman, 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 9258945 Email: director@pawb.gov.ph	Philippines
Ampil Amparo (Ms)	Department of Agriculture, Elliptical Circle, 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9267439 Fax: +63 2 9280590 Email: amparo.ampil@eudoramail.com	Philippines
Apostol Ria Adoracion (Ms)	WWF Philippines, 57 Kalayaan Avenue, LBI Building, Diliman 1101 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9207923 Fax: +63 2 4263927 Email: rapostol@wwf.org.ph	Philippines
Arida Clarissa (Ms)	UNDP Philippines, 7/F NEDA sa Makati Bldg., 106 Amorsolo Street, Legaspi Village, 1229 Makati City, Philippines. Phone: +63 2 8920611 Fax: +63 2 8163011 Email: arida.clarissa@undp.org URL: www.undp.org.ph	Philippines

Balangue Tonie (Dr)	Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies, Inc. (REECS), Suite 405, The Tower at Emerald Square, JP Rizal cor. P. Tuazon Sts., Project 4, Quezon City, Philippines. Phone: +63 2 4396617 Fax: +63 2 9950556 Email: reecs@skyinet.net	Philippines
Balilia Winnievir S. (Ms)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman , 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 9204486 Email: planning@pawb.gov.ph/ winzbal@yahoo.com	Philippines
Barangan Florendo	DENR – Coastal & Marine Management Office, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City 1100, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9261004 Email: emmo24@yahoo.com	Philippines
Casal Christine Marie V. (Ms)	WORLD FISH CENTER, Khush Hall, IRRI Campus, 4031 Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines. Phone: +63 049 5360168 Fax: +63 049 5360202 Email: c.casal@cgiar.org URL: fishbase@org	Philippines
Castel Cynthia (Ms)	Development Academy of the Philippines, DAP Building, San Miguel Ave., Pasig City 1600, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9350091 Fax: +63 2 6312123 Email: academy@dap.edu.ph	Philippines

Cooney Rosie (Dr)	The Precautionary Principle Project, c/o Fauna & Flora International, Great Eastern House, Tenison Rd, CB1 2TT Cambridge, United Kingdom Phone: +44 1223 579020 Fax: +44 1223 461481 Email: rosie.cooney@fauna-flora.org URL: www.pprinciple.net	United Kingdom
Corpuz Nancy R. (Ms)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman, 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 9204486 Email: planning@pawb.gov.ph / winzbal@yahoo.com	Philippines
Cunanan Angie (Ms)	UNDP/GEF/RNE Small Grants Programme, 7/F NEDA sa Makati Bldg., 106 Amorsolo Street, Legaspi Village, 1229 Makati City, Philippines. Phone: +63 2 8920611-20 local 241 370 Fax: +63 2 8927771 Email: angie.cunanan@undp.org	Philippines
Cuong Tran Ngoc (Mr)	Nature Conservation Division, Vietnam Environmental Protection Agency, 67 Nguyen Du Str. Hanoi City, Vietnam Phone: +844 0424557 Fax: +844 8223189 Email: baoton@hn.vnn.vn, / tcuong@nea.gov.vn	Vietnam
Custodio Carlo (Mr.)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 9240109 Email: wildlife@pawb.gov.ph	Philippines

Dano Elenita (Ms)	SEARICE , Unit 331 Eagle Court Condominium, 26 Matalino St., Diliman, 1101 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 433-7182 Fax: +63 2 922-6710 Email: nethdano@searice.org URL: www.searice.org.ph	Philippines
David Myra (Ms)	ARCBC, 3rd Floor ERDB Bldg., College, Laguna 4031 Laguna, Philippines Phone: 63 49 5362865 Fax: 63 49 536 3173 Email: mydaryldavid@yahoo.com	Philippines
De Rueda Renato,	Undersecretary DENR, Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines Phone: 63 2 9296626 Fax: 63 2 9242540	Philippines
Dharmaji Bhujangarao (Mr)	IUCN – Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia , 53, Horton Place , Colombo 7, Sri Lanka Phone: +94 11 4710439 Fax: +94 11 2662941 Email: rao@iucnsl.org URL: www.biodiversityasia.org	Sri Lanka
Dickson Barney (Dr)	The Precautionary Principle Project, c/o Fauna & Flora International, Gt Eastern House, Tenison Road, CB1 2TT Cambridge, United Kingdom Phone: +44 1223 571000 Fax: +44 1223 461481 Email: barney.dickson@fauna-flora.org URL: www.pprinciple.net	United Kingdom
Donato Bumacas (Mr)	KAMICYDI, Payawal Subdivision, San Lorenzo, 3105, Gapan City, Philippines Phone: 63 9 27498770 Email: kamicydkalinga@yahoo.com	Philippines

Dumaup Jose Noel (Mr)	World Wildlife Fund , LBI Bldg. 57 Kalayaan Ave., Diliman 1101 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: 63 2 4330909 Fax: 63 2 4330911 Email: ndumaup@wwf.org.ph	Philippines
Duthie David (Dr)	UNEP/DGEF, P.O. Box 47074-00100, Nairobi, Kenya Phone: 254 20 623719 Fax: 254 20 624268 Email: david.duthie@unep.org	Kenya
Elauria Erla Rhysa	Mapua Institute of Technology, Muralla St., Intramuros Manila, Philippines Phone: 0920 9221535 Email: erlae@yahoo.com	Philippines
Gozun Elisea	Secretary, DENR, Visayas Avenue, Dilliman, Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9296626 Fax: +63 2 9242540	Philippines
Indab Anabeth (Ms)	Resource and Environmental Economics Foundation of the Philippines, Suite 712, The Tower at Emerald Square, J P Rizal Cor. P. Tuazon Sts., Project 4, Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9958483 Fax: +63 2 9958483 Email: reapph@yahoo.com	Philippines
Isip Emmanuel (Mr)	DENR , Lanang, Davao City, 8000 Davao City, Philippines Phone: +63 82 2341100 Fax: +63 82 23444011 Email: pawms@mozcom.com	Philippines
Jack Brooke Kelsey (Ms)	IUCN Lao PDR , PO Box 4340, 15 Fa Ngum Road, Vientiane, Lao PDR Phone: +856 21 212786 Fax: +856 21 216127 Email: kelsey@iucnlao.org	Lao PDR

Joshi Ravindra (Dr)	Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice), Maligaya, Muñoz Science City, Nueva Ecija 3119 Nueva Ecija, Philippines Phone: +63 44 4560112 Fax: +63 44 4560112 Email: rcjoshi@philrice.gov.ph URL: www.philrice.gov.ph	Philippines
Kaur Nanki (Ms)	The Energy and Resources Institute, TERI, Darbari Seth Block, Habitat Place, Lodhi Road 110003 New Delhi, India Phone: +91 11 24682111 Fax: +91 11 24682144 Email: nanki@teri.res.in URL: www.teriin.org	India
Kusumaatmadja Rezal (Mr)	Marine Aquarium Council, 923 Nuuanu Ave., Honolulu, HI 96817 Hawaii, USA Phone: +1 808 5508517 Fax: +1 808 5508217 Email: RKusuma@aquariumcouncil.org URL: www.aquariumcouncil.org	USA
Lapis Aida (Dr)	ARCBC, University of the Philippines Los Banos, P.O. Box 35015, Laguna, Philippines Phone: +63 49 5362865 Fax: +63 49 5363173 Email: acbl2002@yahoo.com	Philippines
Layugan Jovito (Mr)	Regional Technical Director, PAWCZMS, DENR-2, Tuguegarao City, Philippines Phone: 078 844 3037 Mobile: 09189176757	Philippines

Lecciones Amy (Ms)	Philippine Sustainable Development Network, Unit F, 9 th Flr. STRATA 100 Bldg. Emerald Avenue, Ortigas Center, Pasig City, Philippines Mobile: 0917 8301105 Email: amym1@psdn.org.ph / URL: amy_lecciones@yahoo.com	Philippines
Lim Theresa Mundita (Dr)	DENR - PAWB, Quezon Ave., Diliman, Quezon City, 1100 Quezon, Philippines Phone: +63 2 924-6031 to 350 Fax: +63 2 924-0109 Email: adirector@pawb.gov.ph / pawb.gov.ph	Philippines
Lintao Agnes (Ms)	SEARICE, Unit 331 Eagle Court Condo, 26 Matalino St, Central District, Diliman 1101 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 433-2067 Fax: +63 2 922-6710 Email: policy@searice.org.ph URL: www.searice.org.ph	Philippines
MacKinnon John (Dr)	ARCBC, Los Banos, UPLB, P.O. Box 35015 Laguna, Philippines Phone: +63 49 536 4042 Fax: +63 49 536 3173 Email: jrm@laguna.net URL: www.arcbc.org	Philippines
Mahaningtyas Avi (Ms)	GEF-SGP Indonesia, Jl. Hang Lekir VI/no:1, 12120 Jakarta, Indonesia Phone: +62 21 7206125 Fax: +62 21 7220905 Email: avi@indo.net.id URL: www.sgp.or.id	Indonesia
Maranan Meriden (Ms)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031-35 Fax: +63 2 9204486 Email: planning@pawb.gov.ph	Philippines

McKenzie Sandra (Ms)	IUCN – Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia, 53, Horton Place, Colombo 7, Sri Lanka Phone: +94 11 4710439 Fax: +94 11 2662941 Email: sam@iucnsl.org URL: www.biodiversityasia.org	Sri Lanka
Mendoza Marlynn (Ms)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 924 8950	Philippines
Meniado Angelita (Ms)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 924 0109 / 9258951 Email: recreation@pawb.gov.ph	Philippines
Metin Rolando	Undersecretary, DENR, Visayas Avenue, Dilliman, Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9296626 Fax: +63 2 9242540	Philippines
Miclat Evangeline (Ms)	World Wildlife Fund-Philippines, LBI Bldg., 57 Kalayaan Avenue, Diliman Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 4367311 Fax: +63 2 4330911 Email: emiclat@wwf.org.ph	Philippines
Molinyawe Norma (Ms)	PAWB-DENR, NAPWNC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman 1100 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 9246031 to 35 Fax: +63 2 924 0109 Email: biodiv@pawb.gov.ph	Philippines

Moyle Brendan (Dr)	Massey University, PB 102904, AL154 Auckland, New Zealand Phone: +64 9 4140800 Fax: +64 9 4418177 Email: b.j.moyle@massey.ac.nz	New Zealand
Neumann Kirsten (Ms)	United Nations University, Institute of Advanced Studies, 6F, International Organizations Center Pacifico-Yokohama, 1-1-1 Minato Mirai, Nishi-ku 220-0012 Yokohama, Japan Phone: +81 45 221-2330 Fax: +81 45 221-2302 Email: neumann@ias.unu.edu URL: www.ias.unu.edu	Japan
Oviedo Gonzalo (Mr)	IUCN-The World Conservation Union, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland Phone: +41 22 9990001 Fax: +41 22 9990002 Email: gonzalo.oviedo@iucn.org)	Switzerland
Palma Joel (Mr)	World Wildlife Fund-Philippines, LBI Bldg., 57 Kalayaan Avenue, Diliman Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 4367311 Fax: +63 2 4330911	Philippines
Pangga Imelda (Ms)	ARCBC, 3rd Floor ERDB Bldg., College, Los Banos 4031 Laguna, Philippines Phone: +63 49 5362865 Fax: +63 49 5363173 Email: melpangga@arcbc.org URL: www.arcbc.org	Philippines
Pisupati Balakrishna (Dr)	IUCN – Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia , 53, Horton Place, Colombo 7, Sri Lanka Phone: +94 11 4710439 Fax: +94 11 2662941 Email: pbk@iucnsl.org URL: www.biodiversityasia.org	Sri Lanka

Pranoto Ina Binari (Ms)	Ministry of Environment, Jl.DI. Panjaitan Kav, 24, Kebon Nanas 13410 Jakarta, Indonesia Phone: +62 21 8517163 Fax: +62 21 85905770 Email: ina.pranoto@menlk.go.id	Indonesia
Punzalan Lauro (Mr)	ARCBC, Los Banos, UPLB, P.O. Box 35015, Laguna, Philippines Phone: +63 49 5362865 Fax: +63 49 5363173	Philippines
Regmi Madhu Prasad (Mr)	Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, Singha Durbar, Kathmandu, Nepal. Phone: +977 01 4244703 Fax: +977 01 4223868 Email: regmimadhu@hotmail.com	Nepal
Rosales Rina (Ms)	REECS, Unit 405, Tower at Emerald Square, JP Rizal cr. P Tuazon Sts., Project 4 1109 Quezon City, Philippines Phone: +63 2 4396617 Fax: +63 2 4388858 Email: rina@mmla.nsclub.net	Philippines
Roxas Elizabeth (Ms)	Environmental Broadcast Circle, 81, C. Raymundo Avenue, Caniogan, Pasig City 1600, Philippines. Phone: +63 2 6414416 Fax: +63 2 6422128 Email: ebc@ebc.org.ph URL: www:ebc.org.ph	Philippines
Samarasooriya Shireen (Mrs)	SGP –UNDP, Baudhhaloka Mawatha, Colombo 7, Sri Lanka Phone: +94 11 2580691 - Ext: 314 Fax: +94 11 2581116 Email: shireen.samarasuriya@undp.org	Sri Lanka
Sampulna Jim (Mr)	DENR-XII, Koronadal city, Philippines Phone: +63 83 2286225 Email: denrxii-ored@yahoo.com	Philippines

Santisteban Celeste Joan (Ms)	Mapua Institute of Technology, Intramuros, Manila 1102 Manila Philippines Phone: +63 2 3750181 Email: doctorcele@yahoo.com	Philippines
Soemadiredja Zainal M. (Mr)	Unit B 191, Alexandra, 29 Meralco Ave, Ortigas, Pasig City, Metro Manila, Philippines Phone: +63 2 635 2248 Fax: +63 2 635 4572 Email: zsoemadiredja@hotmail.com	Philippines
Teng Paul (Dr)	WorldFish Center, P.O. Box 500 GPO, 10670 Penang, Malaysia Phone: +60 4 6261606 Fax: +60 4 6265690 Email: p.teng@cgiar.org	Malaysia
Texon Gregorio (Mr)	ARCBC, Los Banos, UPLB, P.O. Box 35015, Laguna, Philippines Phone: +63 49 5362865 Fax: +63 49 5363173 Email: contact.us@arcbc.org	Philippines
Tran Hoa Thi (Dr)	Institute of Agricultural Genetics, Section for Genetics and Plant Conservation, A1 Tap The Vien Khoa, Hoc Vietnam, Ngo 106, Hoang Quoc, Viet Str., Nghia Do-Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam Phone: +844 754-1298 Fax: +844 755-0879 Email: htran@bdvn.vnmail.vnd.net URL: www.undp.org.vn	Vietnam
Uriarte Monina T (Ms)	ARCBC, College Laguna, Philippines 4031, Philippines Phone: +63 49 536 7746 Fax: +63 49 536 2865/3173 Email: m.uriarte@arcbc.org	Philippines

<p>Viray Leo (Mr)</p>	<p>PAWMS, DENR-CAR Casa Vallejo Bldg., Upper Session Rd., Baguio City, 2600 Benguet Philippines Phone: +63 74 4442720 Fax: +63 74 4442720 Email: pawmsdenrcar@digitelone.com</p>	<p>Philippines</p>
<p>Vitharana Renuka (Ms)</p>	<p>IUCN – Regional Biodiversity Programme, Asia, 53, Horton Place, Colombo 7, Sri Lanka Phone: +94 11 4710439 Fax: +94 11 2662941 Email: rdv@iucnsl.org URL: www.biodiversityasia.org</p>	<p>Sri Lanka</p>