



4th Asia Regional Session of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF): Southeast Asia

Major outcomes

Introduction

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 1). 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 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 2). 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.

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?

The discussions in the working group 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 NBSAPs, Nat.Coms, 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 into EIA and consider the outcomes of sustainability assessments need to be mainstreamed.
- Processes such EIAs should integrate biodiversity impact assessments and the ecosystem approach.
- 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 deliberated on 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.
- Governance is also about enforcement. Enforcement mechanisms must be used effectively and be transparent.
- Governance is about ensuring long term impacts and not only on implementation of regulations and laws in the short term
- Programmes on improving governance should have corresponding resource allocation
- Increase transparency and accountability on issues of policy making, implementation and impacts.
- Even though there is a clear recognition of the fact that natural resources contribute to poverty reduction, poverty reduction is still seen as an economic issue.
- Biodiversity and natural resources contribute to local livelihoods. However, the arguments to convince economists and policy makers to provide priority focus on conservation are still weak. Tools and methods to communicate this should be developed.
- 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.
- 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.
- Poverty reduction is a national business and global frameworks should only guide options and not dictate terms.
- The role of communities in making the poverty, development and environment linkage is critical and should receive attention at all levels.
- Finally, guidance from local and inter-regional initiative and experiences should be considered for deciding and achieving national and global targets.
- Discussions under the CBD on issues of access to resources and benefit sharing must address issues on all dimensions of poverty and income generation.
- 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.
- Development of national ABS regimes should consider issues of natural resource management and conservation of biodiversity from the livelihoods and poverty perspective

- Fighting poverty is a multi-dimensional issue, where ownership is critical.
- 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

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 leading 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 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

Developing work programme for Synergies among Multilateral Environment 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 may 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 third workshop attempted to develop a concerted work programme for demonstrating ‘synergies in action’ at the ground level by addressing the following broad issues.

- ‘Space’ for synergies to happen in the existing systems of administration and management
- Networking and data-sharing as important elements to achieve synergies
- Options to achieve synergies at ground level including better collaboration and cooperation among key actors (governments, civil society, NGOs, etc.)
- Assessing existing capacities before seeking additional inputs through process such as NCSA

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 are 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
- Reduce dependency on external support for joint implementation of MEAs
- Partnership building and harmonisation of common goals
- Bridging gap between “shopping lists” and “strategic statements”
- Build 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 and analysis. 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 to respond 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, i.e. database use, harmonised reporting, etc.
- 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
- Explore 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)
- Develop policies and programmes to achieve complementarity, save resources and avoid redundancy (e.g. common reporting formats)
- Involve collaborators early enough in planning processes so that they have a buy in

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. However, the group felt that opportunities for enhanced synergy among MEAs could be achieved through some of the following project ideas that could demonstrate how synergies among MEAs. The group felt that effective management of information and development of a knowledge base are the key elements for successful implementation of MEAs. The group also felt 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.

Considering the constraints of developing and least developed countries in lacking effective strategies for implementing the conventions, the group came out with the following set of strategies for complementing the implementation of MEAs synergistically.

- 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.

Annex 1. List of Participants (Separate XL file attached)

Annexure 2: Agenda for Parallel workshops

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 in NRM and Biodiversity Conservation: Issues and Problems

02:30- 05:00 **Bharat Desai**, *School of International Studies Jawaharlal Nehru University*
The Precautionary Principle in Multilateral Environmental Agreements on Biodiversity

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 Biodiversity 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 - **Ina Binari Pranoto**, Ministry of Environment, Indonesia
- 15:50 16:00 Discussion
- 16:00 16:30 **Coffee/Tea**
- 16:30 16:50 Mainstreaming Climate Change and Biodiversity
Kelsey Jack, IUCN- Lao PDR
- 16:50 17:00 Discussion
- 17:30 Dinner (*Department of Tourism, Philippines*)
Dinner Venue “**Intramuros**” the Wall City.
- 21:30 Return to the hotel

22nd June 2004, Tuesday

- 09:00 09:20 Linking Agrobiodiversity and food security with CBD--
Tran Thi Hoa, 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 -- **Dano Elenita**, SEARICE, Philippines
- 09:50 10:00 Discussion
- 10:00 10:20 National Capacity Self Assessments **Bhujang Dharmaji**, IUCN
10:20 10:30 Discussion
- 10:30 11:00 Coffee / Tea
- 11:00 12:30 Panel discussion on designing work plan to achieve Synergies
among MEAs. **David Duthie**, **Amparo Ampil**, **John MacKinnon**,
Bhujang Dharmaji
- 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