



Mangroves for the Future
INVESTING IN COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS

MFF Regional Review Forum

21-24 April, 2008, Ahungalla, Sri Lanka

DRAFT SUMMARY REPORT



Credit: Madu Ganga Villa, Ahungalla, Sri Lanka



MFF Regional Forum 21-24 April

Heritage Hotel, Ahungalla, Sri Lanka

DRAFT SUMMARY REPORT

MONDAY, 21 April, 2008

INAUGURATION

The MFF Regional Review Forum was inaugurated on 21st of April 2008, at the Heritage Hotel, Ahungalla, Sri Lanka. This Forum was a four day event hosted by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MOENR), Sri Lanka. This meeting brought together 60 participants (see Annex 4 for list of participants), including MFF partners, focal points, donors, country representatives and MFF international and regional consultants, to review the progress with the MFF programmes of work (PoW) and to begin integrating key results from the PoWs into the MFF national strategies and action plans (NSAPs).

The inauguration session was opened by lighting the traditional oil lamp followed by brief welcome remarks from Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala, Country Representative, IUCN Sri Lanka. The Chief Guest was Mr. A. Sumanadasa (Additional Secretary), representing the Secretary of the MOENR. Remarks were also made by Mr. W.R.M.S Wickramasinghe, Additional Secretary, MOENR, the two MFF Regional Steering Committee co-chairs, Ms Marcia Kran, Head of Policy and Programmes and Officer in Charge, UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok, Ms Aban Marker Kabraji, Regional Director, IUCN Asia, and Dr. Don Macintosh, the MFF Coordinator

This Review Forum marked the end of the inception phase of the MFF and the beginning of the initiative's implementation phase. Both MFF Steering Committee co-chairs emphasized the importance of the Inception Phase as a period paving the way for the main implementation phase. In her speech, Ms Kran noted that *MFF is a direct response to the call by the Special Tsunami Envoy to "build back better", and that it is not only physical infrastructure that requires re-building but natural ecosystems must be re-conceived as development infrastructure. Equally, the institutions and mind-sets that govern how our societies treat and, ultimately, depend on our coastal resources require fundamental re-thinking. The tagline of Mangroves for the Future is "investing in coastal ecosystems" and reflects an innovative and powerful approach.*

Ms Kabraji reminded participants that the Forum is not only an opportunity to review what has been done, but also for the MFF focal countries to agree on priorities to implement the Small Grants Facility (SGF) and large projects, which are central to the MFF strategy, and which are intended to bring tangible and lasting benefits to the coastal stakeholders in the greater Indian Ocean. She said, *"...MFF is not a project or programme with a fixed implementation plan and budget, but an open partnership based initiative, which is intended to grow and adapt to changing needs and challenges..."*. Ms. Kabraji further explained the history and cultural heritage of the Ahungalla area which was heavily affected by the tsunami, and the rationale for choosing Sri Lanka as the host country for this event.

Don Macintosh explained that the main purpose of the forum was to review all the preparatory activities under the MFF programmes of work (PoW) and decide priorities regarding "next steps", including whether to continue with, or start activities under each individual PoW. The Forum would also discuss integrating climate change into MFF interventions, a task which is led by UNDP and UNEP, as well as reviewing progress towards an MFF communications strategy. The PoW findings would be presented for consideration by country working groups, for integration into each country's National Strategy and Action Plan (NSAP).

The Chief Guest, Mr. Sumanadasa, Additional Secretary, Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, emphasized that the MFF is timely for Sri Lanka and he assured the participants that MFF has the full support of his Ministry and the Government of Sri Lanka.

SESSION I: Capacity and Information Needs

Date:	21 April 2008
Chair:	Ms. Aban Kabraji, IUCN
Facilitator:	Dr Sergio Feld, UNDP RCB
Lead rapporteur:	Dr John Poulsen, IUCN/MFF
Supporting rapporteurs:	India and the Maldives

This session focused on capacity development and information management, based on country-specific analyses of capacity development and training needs; gap analysis of information needs; and consideration of a communications strategy for the MFF. Because MFF works at various levels, appropriate audiences and information flows need to be identified. Capacity Development must also target different levels and needs, the three main levels being policy and planning (national level), management (State/Provincial to District levels), and Community (local level).

It was agreed that the analysis of capacity and information needs should be guided by an understanding of the ICM process. There was a consensus that MFF has to agree on a definition of both Capacity Development and ICM. The Secretariat and consultants will look further into these and other definitions, and advise the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) accordingly.

ICM is a continuous and dynamic process, through which decisions are taken for the protection of marine and coastal habitats and the sustainable use of coastal resources. The actual ICM process will vary between countries, due to specific national and local planning procedures, hence the definition of “coastal managers” is one which is also country specific.

PoW 7.1: Capacity Development and Training Needs

Presented by Dr. Amaratne Yakupitiyage, AIT

Capacity development and training needs in the context of MFF fall into the categories of institutional reform, organizational strengthening, and technical capacity building. Building capacity to develop and implement ICM education and research programmes was identified as a priority by all MFF countries, along with good governance to strengthen coastal ecosystem/habitat management plans. Climate change and sea level rise are serious threats, especially for the MFF small island states of the Maldives and the Seychelles. Both these countries stressed their urgent need for training on climate change mitigation and adaptation.

- The priority capacity development needs within the three main levels and groups identified were:
- Policy-makers and planners (national level agencies)
- Enhancing their capacity to engage with regulatory activities, integrate sectoral plans
- Developing and managing coastal information systems, and,
- Developing greater inter-agency collaboration
- Planners and implementers (provincial/state-district levels)
- Strengthening their capacity of local government agencies to engage with partners in project development
- Coastal communities (local level)
- Strengthening their capacity to participate in local planning processes, project development, implementation and monitoring

There is a clear lack of **agreed definitions for some terms and concepts** which is clouding the discussion. These include: gap analysis, coastal communities, community participation, coastal managers, ICM, ecosystem, habitat, and others.

The need for a **paradigm shift in terms of coastal planning** was noted. Coastal areas are governed and managed by multiple and overlapping agencies, communication among which is often absent, or weak. In addition, good governance is lacking in all countries, in part due to insufficient regulatory frameworks. Shifts in planning and management from a sectoral approach to a spatial approach (as in the case of Indonesia), or through the preparation of joint management plans (involving government agencies, NGOs, etc.).

Specific planning needs include: development of community-based monitoring systems; strengthening coastal ecosystem/habitat management plans; strengthening protected areas (national parks, marine parks); improving capacity to control coastal pollution, threats and hazards, cope with climate change - especially sea level rise, and ICM education.

It was also noted that NCSAs (National Capacity Self Assessment) exist for many of the countries and that it would be crucial to review these in relation to the MFF. The boundaries set up for the PoW are very broad and the countries are therefore encouraged to stress clear priorities regarding their needs during the revision of the National Strategies (i.e. during the country working group session). A lack of reference to capacity building for potential private sector investors was also noted. This should be incorporated in the studies, in order to facilitate the right kind of investment and business approach.

PoW 1.1: Gap Analysis of Information Needs

Presented by Keith Forbes, FAO consultant

There are hundreds of data sources available to coastal managers but, in many cases, these are difficult to access. Even where data/information exists and is accessible, a further difficulty is to feed the information into the policy and planning process. It was also noted that socio-economic data appear to be one of the critical requirements for coastal zone managers.

A further constraint is that poor **data quality** hampers accurate analyses upon which effective coastal management and planning, including monitoring and evaluation, rely. Often only basic data and information exist, which may have been collected by the managers themselves. **Access to data and information** differs substantially among stakeholders, with the more remote stakeholders generally having the least access. Acknowledging that data and information may represent power, improved access to and sharing of information are crucial in order to increase empowerment, particularly the ability of local communities and coastal managers to engage with decision-makers.

Integrated planning at the government level is often hampered by compartmentalized government structures and the lack of institutional incentives to share information among different sectors and departments. Other constraints and barriers to effective information-sharing include **language barriers** and the high costs that may be involved in acquiring data and information. Further, we cannot rely entirely on electronic media for information-sharing, as some key audiences (specifically, many coastal managers) still have no (or limited) access to electronic media. Therefore, there is a need for other improved platforms for information-sharing and better use of data and information to support decision-making.

It was further suggested that **environmental concerns need to be mainstreamed** into the coastal planning process. A lack, or poor availability, of information on genetic resources ("bio-prospecting"), diseases and pests, and siltation/coastal dynamic processes were noted for India. It was suggested that the knowledge already existing in some MFF countries should be shared with the other countries. It was further noted that although in some cases (e.g. Maldives) data exist, there is a lack of standardized methodology or systematic measurement.

It is crucial that the MFF learns how to work with the reality of each governmental setting regarding the sharing and storing of information. The MFF Initiative does not have the mandate – or the possibility – of changing governmental policies and practices on information-sharing. MFF could, however, play a valuable role in pulling out information from different ministries and, with the approval of the concerned agencies, share this information through MFF websites and through physical documentation.

The development and testing of the website www.coastalasia.org, and associated country-level websites, was also presented as a possible tool to improve information sharing within and between the MFF countries.

Towards an MFF Communications Strategy – progress and issues for discussion

Presented by Mr. Michael Dougherty, IUCN Asia Regional Communications Coordinator

The participants were given a brief update on MFF communication activities to date, including the production of promotional materials (brochure, hats, t-shirts), the launch of the website (www.mangrovesforthefuture.org) and a bi-monthly e-Newsletter. An announcement was made regarding planned MFF's activities at the next IUCN **World Conservation Congress** to be held in Barcelona 5-14 October. This important conservation event offers a great opportunity for promoting MFF to a global audience, key stakeholders and potential partners and donors. The MFF Secretariat is preparing for the congress and will coordinate with NCBs and partners over the coming months. Along with many other events taking place during the congress, MFF will host a 90 minutes workshop which will involve MFF partners, country representatives, and academia. Partners are encouraged to attend and to contribute. For more information please visit: www.iucn.org

A basic strategic communications framework was presented. Particular attention was given to identifying communication flows between global, regional, national and project levels. This paralleled the discussion of information flows in the two previous presentations. It is regarded as important that the countries consider their own communications capacity and needs and provide feedback to the MFF Secretariat. This will provide valuable input to inform an MFF communications strategy, which will be presented as a draft at the third RSC meeting, scheduled for 9-10 June, 2008 in Hua Hin, Thailand.

The following points of discussion were raised:

- The website should contain documents open to the external public, as well as “protected” sections for the partners to share internal documents and working drafts.
- Integration of the UNDP SNAP portal with MFF's communications is being considered.
- The need to translate documents into local national languages was highlighted. The budget for this should be included in each project, to cover local level needs, but the MFF needs to take a more strategic approach to translation and dissemination needs overall.
- Linking with media (newspapers, radio, etc.) was encouraged, especially for countries such as Sri Lanka where some media groups already have dedicated weekly air time and to environmental issues.
- Providing a structure to communicate programme impacts was stressed as important to include in the ‘communication matrix’.

Recommendations from session I:

- Findings should be harmonized with NSAPs.
- Each country NCB should develop country specific priorities related to the PoW 7.1 and PoW 1.1.
- Each country NCB should develop a communication strategy for their national MFF information needs, building on agreed country-specific MFF objectives.
- Each country NCB should consider ways in which data can be shared among stakeholders.
- A process for harmonizing definitions of key terms and concept should be initialized.
- The branding of MFF should be further elaborated in consultation with the MFF partners.

In conclusion, it was agreed that there is a need to:

- Engage and educate the business community about MFF;
- Enhance the promotional means to affect coastal planning processes;
- Capitalize on, and collaborate with, capacity building efforts in other sectors;
- Improve capacity for more inter-agency cooperation;

- Build capacity to strengthen legal and regulatory systems;
- Ensure that the MFF priorities selected will benefit coastal communities; and
- There is a need for the countries to make clear what information support services they require from the MFF Secretariat.

SESSION II: Valuing, Financing and Managing Coastal Conservation Efforts

Date:	Tuesday, 22 April 2008
Chair:	Mr. W.R.M.S.Wickremasinghe (NCB/SL)
Facilitator:	Dr. Ali Raza Rizvi (IUCN ELG-2)
Lead rapporteur:	Dr. J. Samarakoon
Supporting rapporteurs:	Indonesia and Sri Lanka

This session reviewed three programmes of work dealing with environmental valuation, sustainable finance mechanisms and marine and coastal protected area coverage.

PoW 4.1 Environmental Valuation

Presented by Saima Baig, IUCN ELG-2 Consultant

There is a need for sound environmental valuation to enable policy/decision-makers to understand the implications of under-valuing ecosystem goods and services; and to minimize harmful effects of development on the marginalized and the poor. This PoW is addressing the need to promote awareness of credible valuation methodologies. Although there are many environmental valuation tools, they are often difficult for decision-makers to understand. The MFF valuation tools will serve as guidelines to help with decision-making.

This PoW aims to:

- Develop a conceptual framework for addressing ecosystem values in coastal conservation and development processes.
- Provide summary papers on experiences of economic valuation of coastal ecosystems.
- Provide a “toolbox” for valuating coastal ecosystems as development infrastructure.
- Prepare case studies on the application of valuation methods in representative ecosystems.
- Establish a coordinating body to respond to capacity building needs in environmental valuation.

In the process, focus will be on marginal changes and their value; on valuation of mangroves and coral reefs; on involving local communities in environmental valuation; and on considering property rights as a key issue in the region. Some NCB members expressed scepticism over the issue of whether economic valuation would lead to policy changes, unless tangible results could be demonstrated. The small island States, however, were positive that policy-makers would listen and consider changing their policies.

Key challenges identified by the Forum participants:

- To translate economic valuation data into policies and decisions that can provide benefits to local communities.

- The need to get the message through in order to influence policy and decision-making was reiterated throughout the session.
- No one-fits-all valuation tools exist and regional diversity must be recognized regarding the most appropriate tools and methods to apply.
- Limited coastal land availability is a major constraint on rational land-use decision-making.

Recommendations and Considerations:

- MFF should bring all the valuation tools together and, if possible, present them as a “toolbox” at the Indonesia Training Course in October, 2008; MFF should also develop methodologies to go with the toolbox.
- Studies must be quick, accurate, scientifically reliable and robust; only credible values can be integrated into policy/decisions.
- Economists need to be as dynamic as the ecosystems themselves; i.e. there is a need to regularly monitor changes in ecosystems and their values.
- The value of planting mangroves for functions such as protection from coastal erosion (= ‘soft-engineering’) are very high relative to ‘hard engineering solutions’.
- Decisions are made on ‘margins’ not total economic value (at a national level); therefore local values are significant and should be incorporated for specific sites.
- Objective and meaningful criteria are required since Asian economies are often distorted.
- Base valuations on cost of recovery and on damage are much needed.
- Valuation must include comprehensive range of services provided by coastal ecosystems.
- Valuations need to harmonize with on-the-ground implementation measures, especially where local authorities are being given greater management responsibility.
- Strategic Environmental Assessments should be undertaken to guide local level decisions on land and resources allocations.
- Valuations must be useful for convincing politicians that Need to generate more capacity, and simple calculations to attract the interest of potential ‘trainee professionals’;
- Valuations should have a greater focus on economic development; however, it is also important to convince politicians of the value of conservation land use for local ‘livelihood’ support.
- It is important to distinguish between economic values and actual money flow. Local authorities will consider best options for investment and returns on a financial, rather than on an economic basis.

PoW 10.1 Sustainable Financing Mechanisms

Presented by Laura Meadors, Consultant

The objectives of this PoW are to conduct a review of innovative and sustainable funding mechanisms that are relevant to coastal and marine conservation in the MFF focal countries. The outputs under this PoW to date were presented. They included a literature review (*Sustainable Financing Mechanisms and Strategies for Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Indian Ocean Countries*); four issue papers, and a draft strategy.

The issues papers are as follows:

1. Sustainable Financing Mechanisms and Strategies for Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Indian Ocean Countries. Key outcomes:
 - Regulatory approaches depend on enforcement capacity, local resource conditions and incentives for success.
 - Regulatory approaches also depend on the level of decentralization of government.

- Non-regulatory approaches can be combined and can be viable in decentralized government scenarios.
2. The appropriateness of Voluntary and Involuntary Actions in supporting the development of regulatory and non-regulatory Sustainable Finance Mechanisms. Key Outcomes:
 - Property rights vary in their importance depending on the choice of financing mechanism.
 - Often, western-style property rights are not necessary and may be inappropriate.
 - Still, population and resource pressures point to a need for reform of open-access management.
 3. The Implications of Approaches to Sustainable Finance for the Poor. Key outcomes:
 - The extent of poverty matters at a project site level and should be factored into financing approaches. However, attempting to address poverty problems through sustainable financing mechanisms may cause a lack of focus that can put primary program goals at risk.
 4. The Role of Partnerships in Sustainable Ecosystem Management and Finance. Key outcomes:
 - There is huge variation in the scope and substance of partnerships - drawing general conclusions is not possible.
 - Partnerships are an implementation tool and not an end in themselves - they should be involved in all projects.

The final output from this PoW will be a regional 'Financing Guide'.

It was further highlighted that:

- A contextual approach to sustainable financing is appropriate for MFF.
- Fiscal instruments are widely seen as impractical in the region, though there are some recent initiatives (Sri Lanka) that suggest it is a more appropriate long-term measure.
- Lack of valuation information is a challenge to sustainable finance.
- Timing of sustainable finance need should be considered.
- Consensus at the Sri Lanka Forum suggests that partnership-building and poverty reduction are central goals of the MFF and should therefore be actively considered in choosing projects for MFF support.

There are many existing public-private sustainable financing mechanisms, but their success or failure tends to be quite context-specific, making it difficult to generalise. There is not necessarily any reason to impose western style property rights where there are functional common property management schemes that can support sustainable financing mechanisms. Open access resources continue to be a problem. Financing mechanisms for poverty reduction need to be worked out at local level in order to determine whether poverty ought to be considered as a primary or secondary factor? A wide range of partnerships currently exists, but accountability decreases as the scope of partnership broadens.

Challenges

- To integrate poverty reduction and partnerships into a sustainable financing strategy where appropriate, MFF needs to determine what it wants to achieve, at what level, e.g. project level, national or regional levels, and at what speed?;
- Is a sustainable financing strategy required, or only tools and methods?

Recommendations

- It is important in some contexts to consider development as part of a sustainable financing strategy (i.e. roads, sewers, latrines, etc) to relieve pressure on the resource and make a conservation strategy more palatable. We must move from economics to finance when discussing how coastal ecosystem resource protection and conservation should be financed.
- Ecosystems must provide a 'monetized return on investment' in order to make financing sustainable.

- The scope of a sustainable financing strategy should operate at both national and project levels.
- Investment 'in alternative employment' is required where alternative livelihoods are a primary factor in order to make financing for conservation sustainable.
- MFF must integrate and harmonize poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods in its strategy and goal.

PoWs 13.1 Marine and Protected Area Gap Analysis

Presented by Emily Corcoran, UNEP-WCMC consultant, and Peter Shadie, IUCN ELG1

The aim of the Marine and Coastal Protected Area (MCPA) gap analysis was to review existing MCPA coverage, identify gaps in cover and to identify a process for the establishment of regionally and nationally representative MCPA system (in line with agreed CBD targets for 2012). The work tried to answer the question 'How well is the marine and coastal environment of the six MFF countries protected and where are the priorities for further investment in coastal conservation and development'? The outputs of the work included an inventory of MCPAs in the six focal countries (Access Database), an illustrated report detailing the gap analysis, recommendations for future steps, and a transboundary opportunity analysis. The results demonstrated that marine and coastal process are dynamic and require cooperative action between countries.

This preparatory activity was supplemented by A0 maps displayed at the meeting for review and comment by the participants. The main feedback received confirmed a high level of interest among the NCBs in the use of spatial analysis techniques to assist in management and decision making in the coastal zone. The mapping efforts were greatly appreciated and the need for more integrated maps was acknowledged. It was also suggested that maps and other visual aids could be applied to other PoWs.

The presentation on PoW 13.1 concluded with an emphasis on the following points:

- the broad biophysical definition of the coastal zone was appropriate to understand the scope and scale of coastal interventions needed but it needed to be overlaid by the legal and jurisdictional 'landscape' which varies country by country;
- MCPAs need to be planned and managed within a larger landscape and sectoral environment and that countries should agree to a common strategy of developing national MCPA systems plans which at a regional level will contribute to more coherent protection of the coastline;
- planning effective MCPAs should be done through the development of land use zoning maps;
- the analysis is skewed by the available data – of the 21 coastal ecosystems only three have adequate datasets to enable analysis (other coastal systems may therefore have high priority);
- the measure of protection needs also to examine how effective existing MCPAs are in meeting their objectives not just whether they have been established on paper; and
- this work represents only a baseline measure of protection that should be monitored over time to understand trends.

The final report supplemented by an MCPA database and A3 maps are available at a password protected website: www.unep-wcmc.org/oneocean/mff.aspx **password: mff.**

Feedback

The Forum participants were very positive about the work undertaken, noting that it has started to portray a cohesive picture of the status of protection within the 6 MFF countries. The discussion following the presentation revealed that better information is required for coastal conservation decisions to be taken. There was significant debate regarding the utility of a 'biophysical definition of the coastal zone' as a tool for measuring progress of MCPA cover. There are clearly different legal and jurisdictional different definitions of the coastal zone both within and between countries. A proposed definition derived from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was put forward as a working model. It

was generally agreed that this broad definition was helpful in responding to the needs of coastal systems, but this is something that will require further discussion at the national level.

There was a consensus amongst the participants that maps are an effective visual tool and a strong case to use such images more widely. The gap analysis was limited by the availability of appropriate datasets. It was agreed that a greater level of data accuracy is needed to progress the application of spatial analysis to assist decision makers. The results of spatial data analysis are only as strong as the input data. Regional and global datasets are dependent on the information provided by national authorities, and there was some discussion of the role of MFF as a model mechanism for helping to coordinate data that could contribute as indicators of progress towards internationally agreed targets.

The Forum participants argued that a protected area (PA) does not necessarily equal protected. On the contrary, there are areas which are not officially recognized as a protected area, but which are well protected, e.g. Aceh. The discussion called for a broader view of the definition of protected areas (PA). There are a considerable number of house reefs in the Maldives, which are owned by resorts. Whilst these are not nationally designated sites, they are still afforded a high level of protection. Likewise, there are officially recognized PA's which are not adequately protected. Understanding the area designated as protected will not tell us how well the area is protected. It is therefore important to build on the spatial analysis of 13.1 to look not only at geographical coverage, but also the management effectiveness of MCPAs. It was stressed that the definitions used for the coastal zone and the types of areas that are considered protected will significantly affect the conclusions on levels of protection which may lead to a false sense of security. There are several emerging governance models for PAs, such as Co-managed PAs (CMPA), Community Conserved Areas (CCAs) and areas under Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), and it would be excellent if MFF could agree on a standard definition to ensure accurate assessment of protection levels.

Recommendations:

- The term “coastal zone” needs to be defined, but this is a country specific task.
- In considering protected area coverage, and MCPA network planning, it is essential to consider (i) the effectiveness of the protected areas, (ii) the dynamic nature of the coast (dynamics in populations, and physical structure, which may occur in different time scales) and; (iii) the potential impact of climate related impacts.
- Need to incorporate socio-economic parameters as well as biophysical data into MCPA planning (for example community asset mapping will be an essential input to systems planning and the categories of PAs which may be created).
- Investment in ecosystems, both conservation and development, is based upon actual money flows, and particularly land-use value under local authorities. Rational behaviour drives decisions, where regulatory safeguards do not exist, environmental damage can be high.
- MFF must use national priorities as the starting point, which can be anchored to ecosystems that are most relevant. e.g. coral reefs are highly relevant to the Maldives, but mangroves much less so, therefore flexible systems that are tailored to national priorities are required.
- MFF and this PoW can support countries proposing to move from a sectoral to a spatial planning approach in finding balanced conservation and development strategies.
- Further strengthening of georeferenced data (socio-economic and biophysical) and continued country consultation is required to validate the data are needed.
- Use MFF to showcase state of the art methods to produce credible indicators of global biodiversity targets (e.g. the CBD target for a representative network of effectively managed MPAs by 2012).
- MFF to lay out path ways, through standardized methodologies. How do we balance the implementation of MCPAs and development needs? How do MCPAs fit within the broader picture of spatial planning in the marine and coastal environment?
- Maps are a valuable communication tool, presenting complex information in a visual format, accessible to a wide range of stakeholders, and not relying on a common language. It was

suggested that spatial analysis and maps might be a beneficial tool for other programmes of work to present information.

- This programme of work suggests an approach that could be used to monitor change, particularly to monitor the changes taking place over time in the context of the MFF, and to assess its impact.
- Maps should be shown to the respective NCBs as a learning opportunity

In conclusion, it was reiterated that:

- As a next step, the NCBs should decide on an agreed spatially-relevant definition of the coastal zone;
- This session on economic valuation, sustainable financing mechanisms and MCPAs had revealed the need to give serious consideration to integrating poverty and livelihood issues into all such studies and any subsequent MFF interventions.

SESSION III Governance and Climate Change

Date:	Tuesday, 22 April 2008
Chair:	Ms. Marcia Kran, UNDP RCB
Facilitator:	Dr Gernot Brodnig, UNDP RCB
Lead rapporteur:	Mr. Bhujang Dharmaji, UNEP/MFF consultant

PoW 11.1: MFF and Governance Mechanisms

Presented by Ms Patricia Moore, Head, Asia Regional Law Programme, IUCN, and Dr. Kobkun Rayanakorn, Consultant

An overview of governance issues was presented, based on National Assessments and a rapid Assessment of Regional Governance. This PoW was initiated by asking each country to address/comment on the following five governance issues; **Accountability, Transparency, Participation, Rule of Law, and Access to Justice**. Based on the responses, National Governance policy briefs had then been prepared and were available at the Forum.

Common issues that had emerged from this study included:

- No agreed definition of the “coastal zone”.
- No harmonized or standardized mandates for ICM.
- Inadequate budgets and support for public participation in decision-making affecting coastal zones.
- Some NGO’s not well equipped to facilitate public consultation.
- Too many users, general public, fishers, hoteliers, etc.
- Fishers are being marginalized, coastal communities are heavily affected and their voices are not being heard.
- How should governance principles be translated into action?
- What is the regional future and added value of MFF? (In this respect, it is pertinent to raise questions regarding the life span of regional initiatives/bodies).

A second presentation on regional governance highlighted the work of several intergovernmental bodies operating in the South Asia and Southeast Asia sub-regions that have interests and expertise in ICM. They include four intergovernmental bodies, namely the Coordinating Body on the Seas of East

Asia (COBSEA), Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), and South Asia Seas Programme (SASP). The first three function in the East Asian Seas, and the fourth in the South Asian Sea. The regional governance study had also included some other important regional fishery bodies, in addition to SEAFDEC, namely FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO RAP), the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC), and Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (NACA). The regional governance report from PoW 11.1 reviews the work and interest of each of these intergovernmental organizations, or bodies, and examines the extent to which they have collaborated with one another and with civil society, especially local communities. It also assesses the extent to which these bodies are currently collaborating with one another, and how their collaboration can be enhanced in the future.

It was explained that, because of the importance of coastal governance and the MFF, a separate workshop on the findings from PoW 11.1 would be held at a later date.

Feedback:

It was pointed out that MFF is breaking new ground in this governance study, as exemplified by the lack of published governance type information from several countries. MFF should play a key role in helping the countries and NCBs to reach the next step by **enhancing synergies and reducing overlaps between the POWs**. The need to look at the national assessments in more detail was also acknowledged (particularly by India) and this is a task for the focal countries, while the **MFF Secretariat should focus on building on the regional governance assessment**. It was also noted that although a review of basic governance principles at a general level (such as accountability and transparency) is useful, but more **informal types of governance should also be considered**. Another remark was that we should also look at user rights in addition to property rights which are the only rights acknowledged by authorities. It was further noted that it would be valuable for each of the countries to see where similarities/synergies exist, and where the regional bodies could support the process of achieving good governance. In addition to identifying “good” governance and institutional mechanisms that support ICM, it would be particularly useful to identify the gaps left by many ICM projects that have been carried out in the MFF countries and why some of these initiatives have not produced more sustainable outcomes?

Integrating Climate Change and Climate Variability in MFF interventions

Presented by Dr. Tim Boyle, MFF consultant, UNEP and Glenn Dolcemascolo, MFF Consultant UNEP-DRR

The session introduced climate change adaptation and provided an overview of the first draft of the climate proofing method to mainstream climate change adaptation into MFF activities. Climate change is now on the top of every agenda. In the context of global environmental change, sustainability must incorporate measures to address the likely impacts of short-term climate variability and long-term climate change. A priority must be to **build adaptation capacity of coastal communities** and ensure adaptation measures are both dynamic and flexible recognizing national and local contexts. Currently, adaptive capacity is distributed extremely unevenly across all scales.

While “climate-proofing” is a widely used term, it is still not well understood by practitioners of what it actually means. The process of “climate-proofing” the MFF should not be seen as an “add-on” requirement. Rather, it must be integrated into the mainstream processes of MFF project design and implementation, and linked to the project cycle.

The climate change preparatory action is a partnership between MFF, UNDP, UNEP and IUCN. There are several different components and the participants were referred to the policy paper ‘*Integrating Climate Change considerations into the Mangroves for Future (MFF) initiative*’ by Dr. Ainun Nishat, IUCN Bangladesh, which is currently under final review and will be distributed shortly. Two climate proofing pilot projects underway in Indonesia were also mentioned as part of this preparatory action.

An example of the link between climate change adaptation and PoW 9 for reducing vulnerabilities to natural hazards was then provided. It was proposed that training be provided to NCBs to build capacity on disaster risk reduction for coastal ecosystem management, emphasizing the role

ecosystems play in reducing vulnerability. One option would be to include such training in association with the Regional Training Course proposed in Indonesia during October 2008.

The topic of “climate proofing MFF” generated a fruitful discussion. Some of the points raised during the discussions were:

- Mainstreaming climate change adaptation into the initiative is not an ‘add on’ but an integral part of the project cycle.
- The draft climate proofing method will be distributed to all NCBs after the Forum for stakeholders to provide feedback and comments on its applicability and use.
- Building the capacity of coastal communities to adapt to climate change is seen as a key issue.
- The likely impact of climate change should be identified prior to project planning. – National communications with UNFCCC, NAPA, Nairobi Work Programme (UNFCCC) and SuBSTA, should be taken into account in the national strategies.
- Climate proofing will take guidance from the NAPAs, national communications, etc.
- The IUCN Global Marine Programme has an established working group on climate change and coral reefs that include a monitoring programme that measures the resilience of marine and coastal ecosystems to climate change impacts – this initiative could add value to MFF work.
- Sea level rise was considered the most important impact from climate change to many of the focal countries and will likely continue over the next century regardless of reductions in CO₂ emissions.
- The Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) should also be considered as an important tool to address climate change in the context of MFF – despite being considered as a mitigation measure, REDD also plays an important role in climate change adaptation and poverty alleviation.

Feedback:

- What modifications would be necessary to ensure that the tools are useful?
- A Toolkit is more directed towards building resilience.
- FAO informed the participants of the FAO website on climate change adaptation. The possibility of linking up with other projects/initiatives to share lessons learned, etc., was also mentioned, for example DFID’s work in India.
- The entire process can take advantage of all the work since Montreal, i.e. CRISTAL (IISD, IUCN, and SEI) and should take guidance from other initiatives and the Nairobi programme.
- A commented that the original 15 PoWs should not be modified just because of the current emphasis on climate change was also noted.
- MFF can add more value by emphasizing capacity building and sharing experiences (through developing “communities of practice”), than by supporting extensive research on climate change adaptation.

SESSION IV MFF Country Working Groups

Date: Thursday, 24 April, 2008

This session was dedicated to country working groups (WG), which were given the task of integrating the PoW results and recommendations from Sessions I-III into their respective MFF National Strategy and Action Plans

(NSAP). A chairperson, facilitator and a rapporteur was appointed for each working group. Based on a Guidance Note provided, the WGs were asked to consider questions raised in the previous PoW

presentation sessions, and other key issues (see annex I for WG Guidance Note and annex II for questions).

Each country working group consisted of NCB representatives, UNDP and IUCN Focal Points, MFF Consultants and/or Secretariat Representatives (See annex III). Some of the consultants and agency representatives assisted with more than one WG, as required. A period of 3.5 hours was allocated so that each WG could discuss the questions and issues in detail.

SESSION V

Date: Thursday, 24 April, 2008
Co-Chairs: Mr Anders Granlund, SENSEA
Mr. Knut Laksa, NORAD
Facilitator: Dr. Don Macintosh, MFF Coordinator
Lead rapporteur: Mr Tim Greenhow, consultant

Presentation of revised National Strategies and Action Plans, and other recommendations, by country (in Plenary)

Each country WG was given 30 minutes to present their NSAP.

MALDIVES

Presented by: Mr. Saleem Ahmed

The Maldives used the MFF Review Forum to agree components for the national strategy, which is under preparation. The Maldives WG deemed the capacity assessment undertaken under PoW 7.1 too general, and requires more specific identification of capacity needs. The decentralized centres in the north and south of the Maldives need capacity building if these are to function effectively. The approach would be to consider the level and type of training required; at the policy level this would require consideration of Ministries as well as the linkages between the President's Office, Ministries, and the Atoll Chief Office. At the decentralized centres, basic staffing requirements would be the Environmental Officers. These staff members would require broad-based training covering such areas as fisheries, coastal erosion, waste management, harbour development and attendant areas, and should be able to identify the priority needs of the atolls in terms of integrated coastal management.

In the context of the Maldives, short-term training is not considered effective and is no longer supported. A more appropriate strategy would be to have a regional training leading to a diploma, and this opportunity should be available to both governmental and other stakeholders.

The Maldives College of Higher Education is expected to start a course in 2010 leading to a diploma, with training focused on coastal zone management. Training of environmental officers within this course would be a possibility. However, Maldives would need support to develop a suitable curriculum for this course, which should include distance learning considering the geographic situation in the Maldives. Distance learning activities could be considered for funding under the MFF Small Grants Programme.

In addition, there is a need to build institutional capacity, and some of the key areas to be covered are as follows:

- Need for more hands-on and field-oriented staff training in data collection and compilation, analysis and interpretation, and report writing. There is also a need to develop protocols for data collection and standardisation of data, as well as for exploring the establishment of data repositories.
- Capacity building on GIS; the Maldives WG suggested a consultant to provide initial training and capacity building, and to provide proposals for hardware, etc.

- Capacity development in fields like coastal erosion – mitigation and soft and hard engineering solutions.
- Capacity to tackle large scale environmental disturbances such as fish kills.
- Capacity building in awareness and outreach.
- Training in project cycle management; this is particularly important at the Ministry level, but community project management (and participatory monitoring and evaluation) are also needed.

It was noted further that the existing NCB should be used to coordinate capacity building, rather than creating a new unit.

Other needs and gaps under the various PoWs identified by the WG

Governance - there is a need for **agreed definitions** on ICM. The WG suggested convening an expert group, consisting of lawyers, government officials, NGOs, and Private Sector, to reach this consensus. The strategy for developing a National Framework for ICM will entail the following key areas:

- Conducting extensive consultations through regional workshops.
- Circulating MFF document for comments by the government.
- Posting documents on a website for public comment; Reaching out to the public with information that is easy to digest. (Radio has proven to be the most effective tool in this regard, particularly for atoll inhabitants); it was noted that documents should be available in local languages;
- Capturing relevant experiences, since feedback is otherwise very limited;
- Exploring the possibility of enacting a special act for Coastal Zone Management.

The WG flagged the necessity of **mainstreaming ICM into existing policies and programmes**, as well as tackling overlapping institutional mandates and regulations. The latter could be addressed by:

- Raising the issue of overlapping mandates with the Presidents Office;
- Developing an ICZM Act;
- Applying a top down approach;
- Dialogues within the NCB;
- Increasing transparency (by providing access to information produced by the various agencies; currently information sharing is limited).

Incorporation of **Gender and Youth awareness** into the MFF was another issue brought up by the Maldives. The WG proposed that gender impact assessments should be carried out for MFF projects to ensure that these projects are gender neutral. IUCN ELG 2 in Sri Lanka is able to provide assistance with mainstreaming gender, and this could be helpful during preparation of the Maldives NSAP and MFF projects.

Gaps in information for coastal management include information on mangroves (species and standing biomass), sea grasses (baseline), functioning of ecosystems and meeting both conservation and development needs. Regarding Gap analysis and MCPAs, the current PoW suffered from lack of data. The NSAP should include the following issues/needs:

- Deficiencies in data and information and lack of ground-truthing.
- The need for categorization of existing MPAs and for building management effectiveness into PA management.
- The need to overlay socio-economic data on bio-physical data.

Sustainable Financing: Suggested actions for Sustainable Financing Mechanisms are as follows:

- Include sustainable financing in business plans – institutionalise aspects such as employment and training of local people, and showcasing the current activities.
- Support a review on alternative livelihoods and livelihood diversification opportunities on a regional/international coastal area basis.
- Strengthen engagement of the private sector in coastal investment and sustainable financing; it was noted that engagement of the private sector needs a different approach and a different communications strategy.
- Develop mechanisms for introducing user fees in PAs.

For valuation of the coastal zone, the Maldives WG proposed the following actions:

- The AEC project will carry out valuation of biodiversity at a national level; this project can be used as a case study to “kick-start” the valuation process for MFF; it was also noted that there is a training component in the same project, and capacity building can be undertaken in collaboration with SANDEE.
- Develop local capacity to carry out environmental valuation.
- Conduct a review of existing environmental valuation studies, including species valuation.

Suggestions provided for integrating climate change issues into MFF activities are:

- Consider the possibility of using funding for the larger projects from MFF for implementing NAPA activities
- Incorporate climate change considerations as one of the criteria for MFF small grant and large project proposals
- Engage relevant institutions on climate change issues and linking MFF with Disaster Management and Adaptation.
- Compile Lessons Learned from UNDP projects in the Maldives, which could be shared as a piloting tool.

The next steps for the Maldives NCB will be to:

- Formalise the NCB – it was noted that currently the NCB functions are covered by the Climate Change Technical team (CCTT); this needs to be formalized by renaming it as the NCB, enlarging it with other relevant agencies, and seeking approval of the President’s Office.
- Develop a national framework for ICM.
- Procure a regional consultant to work with a national consultant on the NSAP and produce a first draft of the NSAP by 21st of May 2008.
- Meet with the NCB on 28th May to finalise the draft NSAP.
- Have the NSAP endorsed by the MEEW and President’s Office.

Participants’ Feedback:

It was pointed out by another Maldives representative that unless Maldives received technical assistance and financial resources, it will not be able to deliver much under the MFF integration of climate change adaptation agenda.

The co-chair asked how NAPA and MFF can be combined? It was noted that Napa identifies very critical protection needs which could be integrated into the MFF approach, especially regarding e.g. resilience building and climate change adaptation.

Another comment, which applies to all country groups, was that of using both national and international languages. One of MFF goals is to share information, but there will be significant budget constraints for all SGF projects and even large projects in this regard. Thus, there is a need to have a strategy and a budget allocation in the MFF to support document translation into national languages. Nonetheless, at

local level, MFF projects should still be resourced to provide effective information dissemination via local language materials. This requirement should be incorporated into the SGF criteria.

SEYCHELLES

Presented by Mr. Denis Matatiken

The Seychelles NSAP presentation gave an overview of the current situation in the Seychelles, and its many similarities with the Maldives. Both countries are heavily dependent on the tourism and fisheries sectors, which need to be considered for any development. It was also explained that poverty in the Seychelles is not as widespread as in many other countries, although there are low-income families and some developments do lead to increasing social segregation (e.g. beachfront development). The national development aim is to double the GDP in the coming ten years, mainly through increasing tourism and tourism revenue – this poses a lot of challenges and threats, but is also an opportunity for financing sound management mechanisms. The government is under going a shift from being an implementer to being primarily a facilitator. For the MFF NSAP to be successful there is a very strong case for ensuring participation and stakeholder involvement in every process, as well as ensuring that relevant information is produced and made available. However, the NCB representative emphasized that the capacity to deal with this situation is insufficient at almost every level.

Specific recommendations for the completion of the MFF Seychelles NSAP

Addressing capacity gaps

There is a need for coastal managers who are generalists, so that they can contribute in a meaningful way on a broad range of issues related to development, management and conservation (such as construction and development, biodiversity, fisheries, habitat restoration, waste management, erosion control, climate change impacts and monitoring). Presently there are too many individuals with **limited skills**, or with skills that are too narrow. The national University being established is a key development to address this issue (both within Seychelles and regionally). A diploma course or similar is envisaged – which will mainstream environmental subjects on a national/regional scale for the first time. It was emphasized that there is recognition that with projected developments in Seychelles, there will be an **increasing demand for environmental management skills** among staff in government, as well as in the private sector and among NGOs, etc. This will ensure that a pool of trained people becomes available and will ultimately strengthen institutional capacity across the board.

Community capacity and empowerment

“Communities” are currently not as well represented (and therefore not able to participate proactively) in development, management and conservation processes, compared to government institutions and NGOs. However communities need to be seen as **key partners**, which will require empowerment and capacity building (among e.g. CBOs, stakeholder groups, interest groups). These needs will be addressed through the MFF SGF projects.

Local benefits

Many of the major coastal developments in Seychelles are foreign-owned. Employment opportunities and other benefits in the industry, including construction, do not necessarily benefit local people (or the country) as much as they could. In particular, there is a need to review how the specific needs of local communities are addressed in tourism development and how benefits from e.g. hotels are distributed. For example, what are the cash flows? Can guidance management regulating foreign operations be developed somehow? The review and analysis of relevant past work will provide indicators for further research needs and recommendations on how to increase local benefits. It was also proposed that pilots could be carried out through SGF projects.

Information and data gaps

Currently, the right to information by the general public is very limited, although much information related to management and development tends to be in the public domain. Decision/policy making needs should be based on access to sound and complete information. However, information flow is

not sufficient and information does not get to where it is needed. In view of this, organizing and providing access to information is now a national priority.

There was a request for **MFF to facilitate information collation and synthesis**, specifically for policy applications, including networking, information flow, coordination, and meta databases. It was also envisaged that the governance issues can also be addressed; e.g. by working towards a national strategy to ensure access to information, decision-making processes, etc., which can then be reviewed, and developed eventually to become a national law or act.

MCPAs as a coastal management tool, and sustainable financing

Seychelles is home to some of the best functioning MPAs in the MFF region, including examples of creative financing mechanisms. In several cases, NGOs are seen as significant partners in implementing national priorities, which serve as good examples. They also provide interesting models for conservation financing, although there is a need to look particularly at the role of private sector partnerships as a basis for sustainable financing. Umbrella organizations commonly exist, which can facilitate working relationships, but which also constitute an extra layer between government and companies, and may actually be an obstacle to resourcing conservation and management support through the private sector.

The NSAP will focus on further **developing the role of the private sector in establishing and maintaining MPAs**, as well as on sharing lessons learned more broadly within the MFF and in the Western Indian Ocean as a whole.

Facilitation

In the light of the situation in the Seychelles and the probable MFF expansion into East Africa, there is a need to have a dedicated **full time person coordinating activities under MFF**. Tasks for this position would include: networking; lobbying for and facilitating issues of particular importance to the MFF action plan; leading consultations for future priority setting, and expansion of the national MFF strategy.

Gender Mainstreaming

The need for an activity to specifically address gender issues was also raised, while gender mainstreaming is important across the board. This needs to be considered especially in the MFF capacity building component, by ensuring **gender balance** and **equal opportunity** and access for men and women to training, etc. Similarly, balance among stakeholders in all activities needs to be ensured. This will be included as specific criteria in MFF activities.

Timeline:

It was explained that a draft NSAP for the Seychelles will be developed by 15 May, 2008. Meetings to incorporate comments and other feedback will then be held and, after amendments, the final draft will be available by the end of May in preparation for the RSC-3 in June 2008.

Participants' comments

The Seychelles WG was reminded to consider a communications strategy, and how to **tackle communication needs** in general. The Seychelles responded that they would need to have a dedicated communications project officer. Further, it was noted that they would like AIT to contribute to the process of bridging the identified gaps in knowledge.

It was acknowledged that the SGF projects pose a particular challenge for the Seychelles and Maldives because they require a lot of NGO capacity and administration, as well as NCB support. It was further noted that the NCB can play a major role, but it cannot be a beneficiary alone, the SGF projects need to be partnership-based. It was also suggested that the **MFF Secretariat should do a round of adaptation to suit both the Maldives and the Seychelles**.

The issue of private sector engagement was also raised. Like climate change, this is something that is often added to project proposals, or mentioned as a target, but with minimal meaning. It was

suggested, therefore, that the SGF could be dedicated to exploring ways to integrate private sector support effectively with more conventional project assistance.

INDIA

Presented by K. Kathiresan

The India WG commenced by highlighting India's rich biodiversity and its links to human well-being, but it was also emphasized that India is facing vast human pressures due to population growth, which is increasing the demand for environmental goods and services. India's strong policy front and legal support for the conservation of biological resources was also mentioned and reference was made to several acts already implemented. The presenter then moved on to management of coastal ecosystems in India and the various components of the NSAP for India. The need to involve people in local conservation and management of coastal resources has been recognized as a key issue. The priorities under this issue were identified as:

- Capacity development for management (PoW 2).
- Awareness creation (e.g. community based monitoring, risk hazard management, capacity building on the economic value of coastal ecosystems) (PoW 6).
- Alternative livelihoods (PoW 4).
- Creation of green belts for coastal protection (PoW 3 and 9).

The knowledge and knowledge gap priorities for India include:

- Biodiversity (PoW 1.2);
- Bio-prospecting (PoWs 1.5 & 15.1);
- Genetic and tree breeding (PoW 1.5);
- Pests and diseases (PoW 2).

And the interrelationship between:

- coastal ecosystems (PoWs 1.5 & 2.4);
- Coastal processes (PoWs 2.3, 3.3);
- Pollution abatement (PoW 1.5).

The approach to address the above priorities will be through conservation, habitat restoration, and sustainable livelihoods.

The MFF India projects will comprise of three major components; i) a national project (conservation of 3621 km² of mangroves in five states, and mangrove restoration of 200 km²), ii) a Small Grant Facility to supporting projects for coastal community empowerment and capacity building (mangrove and coastal biodiversity assessment, coastal greenbelts, livelihoods, incomes, equality and gender concerns), iii) research projects to fill knowledge gaps for management of coastal ecosystems. These will involve participatory monitoring of coastal ecosystems.

The India WG representative emphasized the identified need of having local field surveys. The strategy for conservation will be through community participation by creating eco-development committees facilitated by NGOs and the Forest Department. The long-term strategy is to earmark 25 percent of the SGF for improvement of education facilities.

The action plan for conservation is to ensure the provision of basic amenities and infrastructure for better living and by creating community assets. The strategy or techniques for restoration will be through canal bank planting using the "fishbone" design for high tidal amplitude areas. The latter raised some questions from the other countries. However, this method has been applied with good results in

Tamil Nadu and guidelines are available on which species to plant. It has led to increased areas of fishery nursery habitats, which have a high livelihood value for local fishers. The action plan for restoration will be implemented using community participation along with governmental efforts.

The NCB India representative also added that the Government of India is establishing a fully fledged research centre, the **National Institute for Research in Mangroves and Coastal Bio-resources near the Sundarbans** in West Bengal. A Sida funded MFF consultant designed the ToR for the institute. The India NCB also expressed gratitude to IUCN which now has an India country programme. Guidelines for mangroves are under development and will be shared with the other MFF countries.

India was congratulated on the advanced status of its NSAP, but concerns were raised that there may not be enough funding to fully implement its action plan. It was queried whether some of the excellent suggestions and activities in the plan could be supported by another means, such as through government funding?

Participants also pointed out that there was a **predominant focus on mangroves**, and inquired whether the NCB has considered, or will include, other ecosystems? The NCB representative explained that mangroves are in focus because they are at the centre stage of all coastal ecosystems in India. However both mangroves and corals are sensitive systems and have the highest protection status.

THAILAND

Presented by Dr Sonjai Havanond

The Thailand presenter highlighted the fact that the PoW's presented detailed information and recommendations, most of which were already addressed within the Thailand NSAP, Climate change has been treated as a part of natural disasters rather than as a separate issue. The follow up actions for the PoWs, as well as modalities for operating the SGF and Large Projects, were then addressed.

The Thailand representative suggested incorporating the **preparatory activities as guidelines for priority investment** by using the gap analysis to highlight areas for action, as well as to identify target groups. The necessity to integrate components (government, communities, NGOs, etc.), and to use the tools that have been developed by the PoW's preparatory activities, were also highlighted.

Gender should not be a stand alone issue. It should be integrated in order to achieve **gender neutrality**. FAO, UNDP and IUCN have developed guidelines which could be used to help mainstream gender into decision-making. A regional activity could be proposed to **appraise the existing tools**, as well as compile and disseminate lessons learned.

The Thailand NSAP has an adaptive strategy that synthesizes the Thai working papers focusing on identifying criteria within the MFF geographic areas. Guidelines will be added for project selection with indicators for a score cards. The draft NSAP includes an annex for specific key coastal issues to be addressed. It was further explained to the participants that there will be a detailed follow up workshop and the outcome would feed into the project guidelines. The strategy has further identified needs for a **local secretariat to facilitate the integration of actions at national level**. This could also include a communications strategy for MFF Thailand as part of the NCB support to be requested from the MFF Secretariat.

PoW 4.1 should be a regional activity where key national technical experts are identified whose capacity can then be built on through the NCB. Capacity building (PoW 7.1) needs to build on existing programmes within the country and then expanded i.e. working with existing training programmes within the government, as well as other institutions. MFF should use existing training systems such as PEMSEA and the South China Sea Programme to promote local level capacity building. Training of trainers may also be a valuable approach.

With regards to climate change, the Thailand representative emphasized the importance of **private sector linkage with carbon sinks and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)**. It was also pointed out that resilience issues are already addressed in the draft NSAP. The urgent **need to initiate PoW 9.1 (community resilience-building)** was stressed, which should be linked to climate change, as well

as the need to have more specific information exchange between MFF and other regional projects. In addition, the need to address the information flow between researchers, practitioners and local level users, as part of an advocacy/communications strategy, was also highlighted.

Comments from the floor included concern over the **cost of document translation** and whether there could/would be a way of prioritizing materials in need of translation? It was also suggested that headings (of translated documents) should also be in English and the text in Thai (or other local language), in order to be able to identify their content.

INDONESIA

Presented by Ibu Nur Hygiawati Rahayu

The presenter gave an overview of the extensive marine ecosystems, plus coastal management (including legislation and institutional frameworks) and development features in Indonesia. The challenges and constraints were explained, such as heavy population density in coastal areas, a high dependence on fisheries, and the fact that 70 % of oil and gas exploitation is located in marine areas.

The principles for MFF activities in Indonesia should be as follows:

- Promote sustainable development.
- Address the key problems, constraints and conflicts in the coastal zone.
- Focus on community and local level.
- Facilitate emerging issues and new approaches.
- Explore previous experiences and use them on a Lessons Learned basis.
- Enhance coordination of NGO and public private partnerships.
- Strengthen regional and international co-operation.

There is a national focus on supporting coastal livelihoods initiatives (PoW 8); improving the resilience of coastal communities through coastal ecosystem management (PoW 9); and increasing awareness of the economic value of coastal ecosystems (PoW 4). However, there are other PoWs linked to the focus, i.e. PoW 6 (Strengthening the awareness and participation of civil society); PoW 10 (Developing and review sustainable financing mechanisms for coastal ecosystems and livelihood activities); and PoW 4 (Development of ecosystems valuation tools and methods).

The National Strategy outlines the national criteria for large projects. These should contribute to ecological processes or life-support systems, for example by supporting key fish breeding and migration areas, or have potential economic and social value for communities; and finally, be compatibility with social, political, education, tourism, recreation, local uses, and existing management regimes.

The SGF is an important activity to meet local needs, and therefore it should be based on participatory approaches and on strengthening local institutions. It was further emphasized that the SGF projects should support ICZM in the broader context and supplement other assistance in order to strengthen on-going activities and avoid duplication.

The information gap analysis (PoW 1.1) revealed the need to share local information and make better use of raw data. It was noted that the NCB needs to establish a communications strategy for decision-makers, but that additional financial help to build the communication strategy would be needed.

Indonesia has made rapid progress regarding climate change. In anticipating the impacts of climate change, the Government of Indonesia has launched a National Action Plan and integrated the issue of climate change in the development plan.

The Indonesian representative referred to pilot projects undertaken by COBSEA to strengthen the GOI NAP on climate change adaptation and other on-going climate change projects. The Indonesian WG members also expressed a request to see MFF playing a catalytic role in strengthening partnerships across horizontal and vertical government bodies and with other stakeholders.

With reference to PoW 13.1, MCPAs were not identified as a priority, but should be mainstreamed into the general ecological criteria for MFF project selection.

Regarding PoW 10.1, the involvement of the Ministry of Finance to obtain buy-ins from critical sections of government at all levels should be sought. This subject needs thorough analysis in order to identify financing needs and assess possible revenue mechanisms. It was further hoped that MFF will facilitate private sector partnerships and investments.

MFF regional support was sought to link with International Laws, as well as for regional monitoring and evaluation methodology to support assessment of MFF projects and grant implementation. The issue of mainstreaming gender has already been incorporated in the project selection criteria.

Decision for the following replenishment of SGF will be based on project absorption capacity. SGF Operational Guidelines will be finalized and implemented in May 2008. Criteria include: availability of co-funding/co-financing, recognition from local government. The selection of MFF project sites is still under consideration.

Tentative workplan

- Finalize Indonesia NSAP – May 08.
- Finalize Small Grant Facility Operational Guidelines – May 08.
- Call for Proposals – June 08.
- Final preparation of National Projects – June 08.
- Regional Activities (Training Course, etc.) – Oct 08.
- Regular Activities (Meetings, progress monitoring and reporting).

Participant feedback/comments

Indonesia was complemented on having touched upon the issue of a communications plan which is essential for successful project outcomes. One question posed was whether the Government of Indonesia could engage in providing further funding to support MFF activities, or help make synergies between MFF and other initiatives? A small window of opportunity that would pave the way for larger project investment would be interesting pathway to investigate.

There are many initiatives on the coastal management in Indonesia. It is a need to synergize the MFF with those initiatives. It is explained in the criteria for the proposed MFF projects in Indonesia.

SRI LANKA

Presented by Mr Anil Premaratne

The Sri Lanka NSAP is aligned with the National Coastal Zone Plan. The MFF NSAP should aim at influencing the next revision of this plan through advocating an integrated ecosystem approach. Discussions with the Coastal Conservation Department (CCD) on supporting the next revision due in 2008 have already been initiated. It was acknowledged that a strategic approach would be to look at critical sites instead of diluting the funding over very wide geographical and programmatic areas. Political will to change practices and recognize the importance of an integrated approach is essential. A risk and vulnerability atlas is being developed incorporating GIS based data that are already available, involving the Central Environment Authority (CEA) and CCD, and the Urban Development Authority (UDA), with financial support from UNEP to determine climate change risks.

Key findings from the PoW 13.1 were that the regional gap analysis of MCPAs was too generalized, and there was a need for baseline data on coastal bio-physical processes (also related to PoW 4.1).

The Sri Lankan WG found that capacity and training needs assessment (PoW 7.1) was sufficiently addressed in the NSAP, both at the legal, institutional and local level. Other observations/findings included:

- Coastal managers are both professional and voluntary. Voluntary contribution is sometimes more important and community-based. Professionals should be able to guide the voluntary effort.
- Facilitation skills for stakeholders (government officials) are needed to support community participation, ownership and use of traditional knowledge.
- Community aspects of coastal management are important: how can managers mobilize the community towards sustainable resource management?
- A formal training school for ICM is recommended to provide short courses (professional in-service and volunteers/ media training),
- Capacity is needed to develop user friendly information for communications packages (related to PoW 1.1).
- Local and district level government officials and local authorities require training on the ecosystem approach (especially related to infrastructure development in coastal areas).
- Exchange programmes are recommended to share experience regionally between MFF countries and locally within country (e.g. Thailand ecosystem approach – reef to ridge/ share information from Forestry sector).
- Capacity is needed to develop assessment models on climatic events (e.g. floods/droughts), and to fine tune the risk/vulnerability mapping, in order to be able to use this information effectively for decision making in the coastal areas with particular regard to food security and livelihood.

Key issues/ideas to be addressed in relation to developing an MFF Communications Strategy include:

- CCD is an ideal national focal point, but unfortunately its capacity is minimal.
- CCD's education and awareness programmes should be built up through personnel, training, information development and dissemination; however support for this would be required.
- Support from the MFF Secretariat is needed to develop a national communications strategy.
- Increase outreach activities to media, launch a national information campaign through national media, and provide training for environmental reporting.
- Communication of 'best practices' based on sound science principles at all levels is important

Valuation:

- Baseline data are required. Baseline information on bio physical information (PoW 1.1) Ecosystems approach- identify critical coastal areas to develop baseline data.
- Develop standardized valuation tools and methods for Sri Lanka's context.
- Sri Lanka already has the capacity for valuation and training, but standardised and practical methodology is required to avoid the issue of incomparable values emerging from different studies.

Sustainable finance mechanisms:

- Government of Sri Lanka is considering introducing an environmental levy based on the polluter-pays principle and ecosystem services. It plans to generate SLRs 1 billion a year- disseminated through a Committee representing key national stakeholders; and part of this to be used for ICM practices.
- Government should provide seed funds to initiate activities that evolve in to sustainable business models. Experience from other countries in this regard would be very useful to design this process.
- Sustainable financing mechanisms based on private sector-community partnership need to take into consideration community 'rights' to open access resources. Community rights are important as much of the land is owned by the Government. Communities may then contribute resources based on 'rights' as equity. Generally, open-access resources are expropriated by the private sector.

MCPAs:

- The current definition of the coastal zone is based on the Millennium ecosystem study, and is not applicable in the local context.

- The important conservation areas are not just coral reefs and sea grass beds, but also bays, beaches, dunes, estuary, mud flats, lagoons and tidal flats which make up the ecosystems constituting the whole coastal zone.
- Whether conservation areas are adequate is too subjective and generalized. Nationally we should look at conservation not on a separate habitat basis, but via a larger ecosystem approach.

Institutional mechanisms:

- There is an issue with governance due to lack of clarity in policy and overlapping institutional mandates regarding the coastal zone.
- Policy direction should safeguard the structure and productivity of coastal ecosystems.
- Civil society and media groups should be nurtured as watch dogs, or guardians, to ensure accountability.

Climate change:

- Address climate-related changes in natural hazards at country level- lightning storms/increased urban flooding, etc.
- Develop assessment models for climatic events (flood/ drought).
- Fine tune the risk/vulnerability mapping and to be able to use this information for decision-making in coastal areas.
- Cooperate and collaborate with the Disaster Management Centre and other relevant departments- e.g. Meteorology. Downscaling regional models to improve flood and climate prediction. building capacity of the Departments of Meteorology and Ministry of Environment and Natural resources for climate change vulnerability assessments.
- Design a mechanism to disseminate key findings to local communities in an effective manner (information should be understandable and relevant to the communities concerned).

Modalities for implementing SGF and MFF large projects:

- Small grant projects should be developed based on the ecosystem approach – priority areas will be decided by a working group of the NSC (this is considered necessary to avoid cumulative adverse impact of ‘piecemeal’ solutions to systemic problems).
- The SGF will be administered by IUCN and projects will be approved by the NSC.
- Large projects will be developed and implemented by different agencies according to the NSAP.

Gender issues are already well covered in Sri Lanka’s policies and laws.

Next steps:

- Identify national priorities and refocus studies to cater to those priority areas and programmes. Regional Consultants should take the cue from these national priorities to explore ways of supporting the NSP.
- PoW 8 and 9 are very important and needs to begin immediately. (Note that in Sri Lanka both environment sustainable livelihoods and community resilience forms the basis for the current national strategy- so country has already placed high priority to these two PoWs).
- PoW 15 should also be implemented. The private sector in Sri Lanka is ready and willing to collaborate in ICM. The NSAP already addresses private partnerships but a private sector engagement strategy is needed in the framework of Corporate Social Responsibility.
- PoW 2 – Designing ecological and socio-economically sound coastal ecosystem rehabilitation should also commence based on adequate hydro-dynamic and causal models.
- Sri Lanka can play a regional role as one of the Champions in private partnership building for the MFF by showcasing some successful examples related to PoW 15.
- Area of focus - Small and medium enterprises (Sees) and their impact on coastal resources. Seriously polluting industries are not large exporters as they normally comply with ISO standards.

However, there are many small and medium enterprises in coastal areas, which are unregulated in comparison to large industries, but contributing significantly to pollution. Thus there is a need to engage the SME entrepreneurs.

- It will be highly advantageous to work with Apex bodies, such as the Chamber of Commerce.

The possibility of working in conflict areas was raised. The SL delegation reaffirmed the Government's commitment to continue working in the conflict affected areas. Irrespective of the conflict situation, the eastern and northern coastal areas are considered to be critical areas requiring attention through the MFF. All efforts will be made to work in these areas; however, it is likely to be much more difficult and implementation would inevitably be slower.

Final Summing Up and Way Forward

Presented by Mr Kent Jingfors (IUCN, ARO)

The summing up session reflected on what MFF has achieved so, its short falls, how to fill the gaps, and the directions MFF should go in the coming implementation phase.

The Capacity Development and Training Needs assessment revealed that the needs are vast, and emphasized the need to focus on where MFF can best add value; e.g. moving from sectoral to spatial coastal planning, build on National Capacity Self Assessments (NCSAs), as well as looking for practical applications of toolkits, which will be demonstrated initially at the MFF regional training workshop in Indonesia in October 2008.

The issue of definitional clarity (e.g. for terms like Coastal Zone, Coastal Manager) and the overall Information and communications needs of the MFF still have to be addressed.

Valuation and Sustainable Financing Mechanisms- How do we communicate and convince the "non-converted" regarding the true values of coastal resources? We need to ensure credible valuations through standardized and good methodologies, and support and train a "community of practitioners". The need to develop and pilot sustainable financing in the overall context of poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods was echoed, as well as to look for "low hanging fruits" including public/private partnerships.

Management effectiveness of MCPAs may be as (or more) important than simply having a comprehensive MCPA system. This poses the question whether there should be a pilot study at a regional level. It is, however, important to validate global/regional databases and also to consider "protection" in relative terms. The potential for using MFF to showcase state of the art methods to produce credible indicators of global threats and arguments for regional and national priorities should be something to aspire/aim for.

MFF's governance structure (in itself) is breaking new ground, both in terms of its geographic and programmatic scope. A recommendation that emerged from the Forum was to use "informal governance" to promote inclusive and broad-based principles during implementation, including support for civil society participation and private sector buy-in. Follow up on both national and regional assessments to identify "good" institutional mechanisms for coastal management is necessary.

It was further noted that the issue of climate change should not be left to experts, but to consider using MFF as a "training ground" to better understand future climate change impacts on coastal areas and how communities (and governments) can adapt and stay resilient. MFF needs to ensure that as much as practically possible, future MFF activities are "climate proofed". Regional training opportunities are being planned which will incorporate training in use of climate proofing and related tools.

The presenter reflected on the country working group presentations, their characteristics, needs and strengths. These are summarised in the table below.

Country	Characteristics	Priorities/Focus
Maldives	Very ICM focused	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity building and development of a national framework for ICM ▪ Valuation and sustainable finance (using Ba'a Atoll as a first valuation model) ▪ Climate change adaptation ▪ Filling gaps in basic information (especially on MCPAs)
Seychelles	Small Island State, but energetic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity building across all levels and sectors, particularly of "generalists" ▪ Emphasize role of private sector in financing conservation and in creating/managing MCPAs ▪ Address information needs, possibly using spatial planning ▪ NB: Assistance is needed to finalise MFF NSAP
India	A big country with lots of national capacity, and an advanced MFF NSAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conservation Strategy (Community participation, and Forest department involvement) ▪ Restoration Strategy (Areas of high and low tidal action, and innovative ideas) ▪ GOI is also creating a new National Institute of Mangroves and Coastal Bio-resources (Sunderbans)
Thailand	Very experienced, and much work has already been carried out to support MFF objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National strategy builds on preparatory work (e.g. PoWs 4.1 and 7.1) and will use existing programmes to expand focus (e.g. SEAFDEC and COBSEA) ▪ Aligning national MFF Strategy with government budget priorities ▪ Promote information exchange and information flow between researchers and practitioners, but note the importance of the Thai language in this respect.
Indonesia	Very experienced, and with advanced legislation and an enabling environment for local community action, as well as the MFF NSAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strengthening civil society awareness/engagement ▪ Data sharing and communications to decision makers ▪ Using MFF as a catalyst for climate change action (where Indonesia will be a global/regional priority) ▪ Involving Ministry of Finance in SFMs ▪ Promoting practical private sector engagement ▪ Continued resource mobilizations (and communications) are a priority.

Sri Lanka	Also experienced, and with an MFF strategy which is consistent with national coastal conservation development plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training on social mobilization and applying the ecosystem approach and vulnerability mapping to coastal areas ▪ Communication, awareness and education ▪ Standard valuation tools that can be applied in the Sri Lankan context ▪ SFMs in context of proposed environmental levy ▪ MCPA system review ▪ Governance advances (role of media and civil society) ▪ Links with disaster management agencies and using local knowledge to improve community resilience ▪ Implementing POWs 8 and 9, which are national priorities, and 15 (private sector) which has great potential in Sri Lanka
-----------	---	--

Closing remark:

The presenter concluded by noting that beyond the great wealth of valuable information and advice generated at the Forum, and reported on above, we should all remember that MFF must be *“partnership based, people focused and policy relevant!”*

Vote of Thanks:

A vote of thanks to Sri Lanka and the Forum organizers was made by Dr Sonjai Havanond (NCB Thailand), on behalf of the other MFF countries and partners.

ANNEX I: MFF REGIONAL REVIEW FORUM DAY 4

QUESTIONS FROM THE PoWs – FOR DISCUSSION BY THE COUNTRY WORKING GROUPS

PoW	Preparatory Action	Questions
1.1	<i>Gap analysis of existing knowledge and data sources as compared to the needs of coastal managers for information</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there a need to share data and other information between coastal managers? (a) within your country; (b) between MFF countries? ▪ What are the key types of data/other information that are required? ▪ How should your data/information-sharing needs for coastal management be fitted into the National Strategy (NSAP)? ▪ What should the follow up to this preparatory action be?
7.1	<i>Capacity and Training Needs for Integrated Coastal Management in the MFF countries</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Define which groups of people you regard as “Coastal Managers” in your country. ▪ Prioritise what their main information and training needs are (use the AIT subject matrix for this purpose, but select only the most important 3-4 subjects). ▪ What are your suggestions for the mechanisms to undertake capacity building in the MFF countries? ▪ Should an MFF coordinating unit responsible for capacity building be established? If so, what links to the national level should it have? ▪ What should the follow up to this preparatory action be?
ADD.	<i>Towards an MFF Communications Strategy: progress and issues for discussion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you dedicate a national communications focal point for MFF? And do you have the capacity to support this function? ▪ Would you prefer to have the Secretariat support country level communications? ▪ Would you prefer Project-based communication? Who will support project communication activities - a national communication focal point, or project focal point? Is MFF Secretarial support needed?

4.1	<i>Development of simple, easy-to-apply ecosystem valuation tools and methods that can be used for planning and appraising coastal conservation and development activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What should the valuation toolbox comprise of? Given the already available toolboxes, is the suggested outline acceptable? ▪ What could be potential topics for environmental valuation case studies to be included in the toolbox? ▪ How should we link ecosystem valuation to sustainable financing? ▪ What are your suggestions for capacity building for valuation? ▪ What should the follow up to this preparatory action be?
10.1	<i>Review of innovative and sustainable funding mechanisms which have applicability to coastal areas and coastal management actions.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is a consistent approach to financing activities under the MFF important? ▪ Should the MFF sustainable financing be a regional strategy or a project-specific toolbox? Is it the goal of MFF to employ market-based mechanisms or sustainable livelihood measures? ▪ Are there well-positioned private sector partners who have goals compatible with the MFF and are located in MFF project areas? ▪ What is the likelihood of major governance, or legal framework shifts to help implement sustainable financing mechanisms? ▪ What should the follow up to this preparatory action be?
13.1	<i>Gap analysis to review existing marine and coastal protected area coverage and to identify a process for the establishment of regionally and nationally representative MCPA System</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the working definition for the coast valid for the MFF as a whole? ▪ 11% coral, 9% seagrass and 57% mangrove is protected – Does this constitute sufficient protection? E.g. are seagrasses and/or corals a priority for conservation in your country, and regionally? ▪ Should the MFF support a Management Effectiveness study to assess the proportion of existing MCPAs that are well managed? ▪ What should the follow up to this preparatory action be?

11.1	<p><i>Assessment of national institutional mechanisms and programmes for ICM in order to identify and operationalise appropriate, inclusive and sustainable governance mechanisms for MFF.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What would be the process for clarifying institutional mandates? ▪ What would be the process for developing comprehensive ICM policy? ▪ What would be the process for strengthening laws and regulations governing ICM? ▪ What are the key processes for making ICM decisions and how could they be streamlined? ▪ How can public participation in ICM decision-making be assured? ▪ How can access to information on coastal resources and decision-making processes be improved? ▪ How can accountability for ICM decisions be strengthened? ▪ How can access to justice be improved for individuals and communities in the coastal zone? ▪ How can the outputs of the governance assessment – literature review, national assessment, policy brief – be used most effectively in your country? ▪ How can your country participate in regional ICM bodies and processes? ▪ What should the follow up to this preparatory action be?
ADD.	<p><i>Integrating Climate Change and Climate Variability into MFF interventions.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What disaster risk issues/measures would you like MFF to address? ▪ How best to engage your national disaster reduction institutions? ▪ How best to approach the training needs (regarding Climate Change) of the MFF implementing partners in your country?

ANNEX 2: SESSION 4 - COUNTRY WORKING GROUPS - 09.00-12.30 HRS

GUIDANCE NOTE

Each NCB will conduct a Country Working Group session to integrate the results and recommendations from the seven PoWs presented at the Forum into the National Strategy and Action Plan (NSAP).

The NCBs will be assisted by their IUCN/UNDP country office colleagues and their consultants. A number of other partners, focal points and experts will be on hand to assist in one or more of the country working groups, as requested.

The NCB should appoint a Chairperson and a Rapporteur for the Working Group.

1. During the Country Group session, each NCB should discuss the key findings and recommendations from the PoW studies that the NCB members feel are most relevant to the NSAP, and agree how this information should be incorporated into the NSAP?
2. The NCB members should also discuss and agree priorities for follow up actions from the PoWs, especially in relation to the MFF Small Grant Facility projects and larger projects 2008-09. (The modalities for implementing the Small Grant Facility and large projects should also be discussed, as necessary, with the UNDP/IUCN country offices.)
3. Please re-confirm that Gender is addressed adequately in the NSAP – how can we ensure that women will benefit from MFF projects and other activities?
4. Each NCB should prepare a short list of recommendations regarding its priorities for the “next steps” the MFF should take regarding the PoWs:
 - Of the PoWs already started, which ones should continue, and in what manner?
 - Should actions under any of the other PoWs be started? In particular,
PoW 8: Supporting environmentally sustainable livelihoods among coastal communities.
PoW 9: Improving community resilience to natural disasters.

are strongly in line with MFF’s Vision of “*a more healthy, prosperous and secure future for all sections of coastal populations in Indian Ocean countries...*” How can these two objectives best be incorporated into the NSAP and into MFF projects?
 - The NCB recommendations should identify actions that are considered a priority at national level, and actions that the MFF should consider implementing at regional level.
5. Each NCB will make a 20-30 min presentation in plenary on the decisions and other outcomes from the Working Group Session.

NOTE: A list of Questions raised during the PoW presentations, and in the discussions, is provided for reference.

ANNEX 3: SESSION 4 - COUNTRY WORKING GROUPS - 09.00-12.30 HRS

INDIA

BS Parsheera
JR Bhatt
K Kathiresan
JS Rawat
Gernot Brodnig
Bhujang Dharmaji
Keith Forbes
Laura Meadors (also Seychelles)

MALDIVES

Mohamed Zuhair
Ahmed Saleem
Marie Saleem
Aminath Shooza
Adam Shareef
Olof Linden (also Seychelles)
Ranjith Mahindapala

SRI LANKA

W R M S Wickramasinghe
Anil Premaratne
D M Jayanthi K Dissanayake
Tharuka Dissanaikie
Jayampathi Samarakoon
Greg Chapman
Shamen Vidanage
Shiranee Yasaratne
P M Anura de Silva
A Hettiarachchi

INDONESIA

Ibu Nur Hygiawati Rahayu
Ibu Diah Indrajati
Elaine Slammet
Sergio Feld
John Poulsen
Serena Fortuna

SEYCHELLES

Denis Matatiken
Ben Wandago
Jerker Tamelander
Laura Meadors (also India)
Olof Linden (also Maldives)
Kent Jingfors

THAILAND

Sonjai Havanond
Noporat Bamroongrugsu
Phansiri Winichagoon
Kobkun Rayanakorn
Janaka De Silva
Tim Greenhow
Maeve Nightingale (also Sri Lanka)

ANNEX 4: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MFF REGIONAL REVIEW FORUM

21-24 APRIL, 2008

HERITANCE HOTEL, AHUNGALLA, SRI LANKA

Name	Designation and Address	Telephone and Fax	Email address
1. Baig Saima / Ms.	Consultant, Ecosystem and Livelihood Group 2, IUCN, 4/1, Adams Avenue, Colombo 04, Sri Lanka	++ 94 11 255 9634- 5	saima.baig@gmail.com
2. Bamroongrugsa Noparat / Dr.	Associate Professor Prince of Songkla University, Faculty of Science Songkhla Thailand	+089-7330665	b_npr@hotmail.com
3. Bhatt JR / Dr	Director Ministry of Environment & Forestry Lodhi Road CGO Complex New Delhi-110003	+24363962	jrbhatt@nic.in
4. Boyle Tim / Mr.	Consultant 33/266, Moobaan Ladawan Soi, 6/4, Srinakharin Road Bangphli Samutprakarn Thailand 10540	+66-81-9005-402	timbobangkok@gmail.com
5. Brodnig Gernot / Mr.	Policy Advisor UNDP, Regional Centre in Bangkok UN Service Building, 3 rd floor Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok, 10200 GPO Box 618, Bangkok, Thailand	+66(0)22881461	gernot.brodnig@undp.org
6. Chapman Greg / Mr	Project Director-LIFT CARE International –Sri Lanka 7A, Gregory's Road Colombo 7. SRI LANKA	2662905-7, 2662916 2693168 (F)	Gregory@care.lk

7. Corcoran Emily / Ms.	Senior Programme Officer One Ocean Programme UNEP-WCMC 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK www.unep-wcmc.org/oneocean	Tel:+44 1223 277314 ext 289 Fax: +441223 277136	emily.corcoran@unep-wcmc.org
8. De Silva Janaka / Dr	Programme Coordinator IUCN Thailand Programme, IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63, Soi 39 Prompong, Bangkok, Thailand		janaka@iucnt.org
9. De Silva P M Anura / Mr	Señor Deputy Conservator of Forests, Forest Department, Rajamalwatta Road, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka	+ 94 11 2 866626	fordep@slt.net.lk
10. Dharmaji Bhujang / Mr	UNEP/MFF Climate Change Consultant 260, 10B Cross, 29 Main, JP Nagar First Phase, Bangalore, India	+918026645353	bhujangdharmaji@gmail.com
11. Dissanaïke Tharuka / Ms	Environment, Energy and Disaster Management UNDP Sri Lanka 202-204, Bauddhaloka Mawatha, Colombo 07, Sri Lanka	+94-11-2580691	tharuka.dissanaïke@undp.org
12. Dissanayake Jayanthi / Ms	Environment Management Officer Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources Sampathpaya Battaramulla.	2887061 (t) 2887068 (f)	jayanthi@menr.lk
13. Dolcemascolo Glenn / Mr.	UNEP International Environment House I, B-402 Chemin des Anemones, 11 1219 Geneva, Switzerland	+41 22 917-8448	glenn.dolcemascolo@unep.ch
14. Dougherty. Michael / Mr	IUCN Asia Regional Communication Coordinator, IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63, Soi 39 Prompong, Bangkok, Thailand	6681 3714687	michael@iucnt.org

15. Epps. Minna / Ms	Communication Officer, Regional Programme Coordination IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63, Soi 39 Prompong, Bangkok, Thailand	+ 6626624029 Ext 108 Mob: +66-8-7082 3331	minna@iucnt.org
16. Feld. Sergio / Mr	Policy Advisor UNDP Regional Centre for Asia and Pacific in Bangkok Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, UN Service Building, 3 rd Floor Bangkok 10200 Thailand	+66892044934	sergio.feld@undp.org
17. Forbes. Keith / Mr	Consultant Natural Resources Economics Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Office: Room C-48 FAO Regional Officer for Asia and the Pacific, 39 Phra Athit Road Bangkok 10200 Thailand	+662 6974142 Mob; +66866200013	keith.forbes@fao.org
18. Fortuna Serena / Ms.	Associate Programme Officer UNEP Regional Officer for Asia and the Pacific, UN building, 2 nd Floor, Rajdamern Avenue, Bangkok 10200, Thailand	+ 662 288 1808	fortunas@un.org
19. Granlund Andres / Mr	Counsellor & Sida Regional Advisor on Environment, SENSE, 17 th floor, Unit 1706, Embassy of Sweden, One Pacific Place, 140 Sukhumvit Road, Bangkok 10110. Thailand	(662)2637258/00 (662)2637255	anders.granlund@foreign.ministry.se
20. Greenhow Tim / Mr.	Consultant KVALLSV.10 7TR SE-14631 TULLINGE Sweden	+4686980585	tim.greenhow@sipuinternational.se

21. Havanond Sonjai / Dr.	Expert, Coastal & Mangrove Resources Management Department of Marine and Coastal Resources, 92, Soi Ari (Paholyothin 7), Payathai, Bangkok, 10400	+6622982166	sonjai_h@hotmail.com
22. Hettiarachchi A. / Mr.	IUCN, 53, Horton Place, Colombo 07, Sri Lanka	++94 11 2682418	mff1@iucnsl.org
23. Indrajati Diah / Ibu	DG of Regional Dev-Moffa Min of Home Affairs JL Taman Makam Pahlawan No. 20, Kalibata South Jakarta Indonesia	+62217942659	dindrajati@yahoo.com
24. Jingfors Kent / Mr.	Regional Programme Co-ordinator IUCN Asia Regional Office 63, Soi 39 Prompong, Sukhumvit Bangkok, THAILAND	(+66 2) 662 4061	kent@iucnt.org
25. Kabraji Aban / Ms.	Regional Director, Asia IUCN Asia Regional Office 63 Sukhumvit Soi 39 Sukhumvit Road, Wattana Bangkok 10110 Thailand	++66 2 662 4029 - 33 (Auto) Ext. 102	amkrdo@iucnt.org
26. Kathiresan K/ Prof.	CAS in Marine Biology Annamalai University Parangipettai - 608 502 Tamil Nadu India	91 - 4144 - 243223 (Off), 238419 (Res.) FAX: 91 - 4144 - 243555 (Off), 238419 (Res.)	kathirsum@rediffmail.com (per.) cdl_aucasmb@sancharnet.in (off.)
27. Kran Marcia V.J / Ms.	Head of Policy & Programmes & Officer in Charge UNDP Regional Centre for Asia and Pacific in Bangkok Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, UN Service Building, 3 rd Floor Bangkok 10200 Thailand	+66(0)22881838	marcia.kran@undp.org
28. Krohn Laksa Knut Olav / Mr	Advisor, Civil Society Dept, NORAD	+4722242629	knut.laksa@norad.no

29. Linden Olof / Prof.	Consultant, WMU Box 500, 20124 Malmo Sweden	+46706465323	olof.linden@wmu.se
30. Lovdal Trond Mr	Senior Advisor NORAD Norway	+4722240202	Trond.lovdal@norad.no
31. Macintosh Donald / Dr	Coordinator, Mangroves for the Future (MFF) IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63 Soi Prompong, Sukhumvit Soi 39, Klongton - Nua, Wattana, Bangkok 10110, Thailand.	Tel. ++ 66 2 662 4029 ext. 144 Fax. ++ 66 2 662 4387 Mobile: 0898119408	don@iucnt.org
32. Mahindapala Ranjith / Dr	Country Representative, IUCN, 53, Hortan Place, Colombo 07, Sri Lanka	++94 11 2682416	ranjith@iucnsl.org
33. Masakazu Kashio / Mr.	Forest Resources Officer FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Maliwan Mansion, Phra Atit Road, Bangkok, Thailand 10200	+6626974141 (direct line)	Masakazu.Kashio@fao.org
34. Matatiken Denis / Mr	Director General, Nature Conservation Division Department of Environment, PO Box 445, Victoria, Mche' Seychelles	+248670500 or +248723417	boga@seychelles.net ; d.matatiken@env.gov.sc
35. Meadors Laura / Ms	MFF Consultant 1660 Bay Street, Suite 104, San Francisco, CA 94123 USA	+01 (415) 216 7468	LMEADORS@gmail.com
36. Moore Patti / Ms.	Head, RELPA IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63, Soi 39 Prompong, Bangkok, Thailand		pmoore@iucnt.org
37. Nightingale Maeve / Ms	Ecosystems & Livelihoods Group 2, Asia IUCN - The World Conservation Union 4/1 Adams Avenue Colombo 4 Sri Lanka	Telephone : + 94 11 2559634 or 2559635 Fax: + 94 11 2559637 Mobile: + 94 773950642	mns@iucnsl.org

38. Parsheera. B S / Mr	Addl. Secretary Ministry of Environment & Forests, Gov. of India Lodhi Road CGO Complex New Delhi-110003	+911124361308	Parsheera_mef@nic.in
39. Poulsen. John / Dr	Programme Coordinator for Indonesia IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Asia Regional Office 63 Soi Prompong, Sukhumvit Soi 39, Klongton - Nua, Wattana, Bangkok, 10110, THAILAND	Tel: + 662 662 4029 / 33 Extension 126 Fax: + 66- 26624388 Mobile: +66- 892028690	Poulsen@iucnt.org Skype: john.grynderup.poulsen
40. Premaratne Anil / Mr	Addl. Director Coast Conservation Department 4 th floor, The Secretariat Maligawatte, Colombo 10. Sri Lanka	+ 94 112472623	apremaratne@fisheries.gov.lk
41. Rahayu Nur Hygiawati / Ibu	Planning Staff National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) Taman Suropati, No.2, Jakarta 10310, Indonesia	+62213107960	Nur.hrahayu@bappenas.go.id
42. Rawat J S / Dr	FPO IUCN India Office 20 Anand Lou New Delhi 110049	+911126257742	jsrawat@iucnt.org
43. Rayanakorn Kobkun / Dr.	Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand	+6653942552, 0819509610	kobkun@chiangmai.ac.th
44. Raza Rizvi Ali / Mr	Regional Group Head Ecosystem & Livelihoods Group 2, Asia The World Conservation Union (IUCN) 4/1 Adams Avenue, Colombo 4, SRI LANKA	Ph: ++94 11 2559634/35 ext. 203 ++94 11 2559636 (direct) ++94 77 3868637 (mobile) Fax: ++94 11 2559637	ARR@iucnsl.org
45. Saleem Ahmed / Mr	Director General Environment Research Centre Jam Aludin Complex, 3 rd floor, Nikagas Magu Male, Maldives	+9603335949	saleem@erc.gov.mv

46. Saleem Marie / Ms	Reef Ecologist Marine Research Centre H White Waves Male Maldives	+9603322242, 7783694	msaleem@mrc.gov.mv
47. Samarakoon J. / Dr	Consultant 39A, Fairline Road Dehiwala Sri Lanka OR C/O IUCNSL	2739249 0776975816 (M)	samarakoon@eureka.lk
48. Shadie Peter / Mr.	Co-ordinator, Regional Protected Areas Programme, IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63, Sukhumvit Soi 39, Sukhumvit Road, Wattana Bangkok, Thailand	+6626624029 Ext. 302; +66813731020	shadie@iucnt.org
49. Shareef Adam / Mr	Programme Officer – MFF M Vigeon Unigasmagu Male Maldives	+9607741200	adam.shareef@undp.com
50. Shooza Aminath / Ms.	Programme Associate UNDP UN Building Male Maldives	+960 770 8770	aminath.shooza@undp.org
51. Slammet Elaine / Ms	UNDP Indonesia Menara Thamrin Building F18eq Jl.Mh Thamrin, Kav 3 Central Jakarta Indonesia.	+62213141308 ext. 503	elaine.slamet@undp.org
52. Sumanadasa, M / Mr	Addl. Secretary, Admin and Promotion Ministry of Environment and NR Sampathpaya, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka	+ 94 11 2875205	ms1949@gmail.com
53. Tamelander. Jerker / Mr	IUCN GMP PO Box 13513 DSM, Tanzania	tel: +255 22 2669 084/5 mob: +255 786 942119 fax: +255 22 2669 089	jerker.tamelander@iucn.org

54. Vidanage Shamen / Mr	Acting Programme Coordinator IUCN - Sri Lanka Country Programme No. 53, Horton Place Colombo 07 SRI LANKA	Tel (0094 11) 2698021 (direct), 2694094 (Ext. 315) Fax (0094 11) 2682470	spv@iucnsl.org
55. Wandago Ben / Mr.	Programme Officer IUCN_ESARO, PO Box 68200-00200 Nairobi Kenya.	+254-20-890605-12	Ben.Wandago@iucn.org
56. Wickramasinghe W.R.M.S. / Mr	Addl. Secretary, Ministry of Environment and NR Sampathpaya, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka	+94 11 2875327 +94 11 2879834	wrms@menr.lk
57. Winichagoon Phansiri / Ms.	Programme Manager, Environment Unit, UNDP Thailand 12 th Floor, United Nations Building Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok	Tel: +66 (2) 288 1827 Fax: +66 (2) 2804294	Phansiri.winichagoon@undp.org
58. Yakupitiyage Amararatne / Dr	Associate Professor & Coordinator Aquaculture & Aquatic Resources Management FoS School of Environment, Resources and Development Asian Institute of Technology GPO Box 4, Pathumthani 12120 Thailand	+(66-2) 524 5456	amara@ait.ac.th
59. Yasaratne Shiranee / Ms	Coordinator - RBBP IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63 Soi Prompong, Sukhumvit Soi 39, Klongton - Nua, Wattana, Bangkok 10110, Thailand.	+662 662 4029	shiranee@iucnt.org
60. Zuhair Mohamed / Mr	Director General Ministry of Environment, Energy & Water, 3rd floor, Fen Building, Ameenee Magu Male, 20-03, Maldives	+ (960) 332 4861	mohamed.zuhair@environment.gov.mv