



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/RW/5NR-ESASI/1/2
25 June 2013

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR SOUTH, EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA ON THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT AND REGIONAL SCENARIO ANALYSIS

Incheon City, Republic of Korea, 20-24 May 2013

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR SOUTH, EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA ON THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT AND REGIONAL SCENARIO ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

1. The workshop for South, East and Southeast Asia on the preparation of the Fifth National Report and Global Biodiversity Outlook and regional policy scenarios was held from 20 to 24 May 2013 in Incheon City, Republic of Korea, with the generous support from the Governments of the Republic of Korea, Japan and the Netherlands. The workshop was held in response to decision X/10 requesting the Executive Secretary to continue to provide support to countries for the preparation of the fifth national reports. The workshop was the third of a series of workshops being convened to strengthen the capacities of countries to prepare their fifth national reports and to facilitate the submission of the reports by the deadline of 31 March 2014.

2. The workshop was attended by government nominated representatives from the following countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, and Viet Nam. Participants were comprised of government officials and experts involved in the preparation of their country's fifth national report and/or the development and implementation of relevant biodiversity policies and programmes. Representatives from the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, South Asian Cooperative Environment Programme, UNDP Malaysia Country Office and Green Global Growth Institute also participated in the workshop. The list of participants is contained in annex I to this report.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP AND ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

3. The workshop was opened by Mr. Yoo Yeon-cheol, Director General for International Cooperation from the Ministry of the Environment of Korea. In his remarks he welcomed participants to Incheon City. He began by recalling the achievements of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in particular the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, and noting major threats to biodiversity globally. He also highlighted the actions taken by Korea after COP-10, including the adoption of a legal act on conservation and utilization of biodiversity. He stressed the importance of having the fifth national reports submitted in time for the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties as well as the significance of organizing this workshop now. In concluding, he hoped that all the countries in the region would update their national strategies and action plans as early as possible to achieve the Aichi Targets and submit their fifth national reports in time for their review at COP-12 in 2014.

/...

4. Mr. Robert Höft delivered an opening statement on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias. In his remarks, he noted that the workshop was the third of a series of workshops on national reporting which compliments and builds on the series of capacity-building workshops on national biodiversity strategies and actions plans, on indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and on synergies between conventions. He noted the rich biodiversity in the region and that this represented the region's natural capital and was therefore central to long-term human well-being. He highlighted the need for the region to address threats to biodiversity brought on by unprecedented economic development in the region, as well as the urgency for countries in the region to take actions to achieve the 2020 Aichi Targets. He stressed that having a meaningful number of the fifth national reports by the submission deadline would be important for the success of the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in October 2014, in Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea.

5. Following the introductory remarks and a quick round of introductions, participants were asked to consider three questions:

- (a) How directly involved are you in the preparation of your country's fifth national report?
- (b) How familiar are you with the use of biodiversity scenarios or models as support tools?
- (c) At what stage is your county in the NBSAP revision/development process?

During the subsequent discussion it was observed that most participants had been involved in the updating of their country's national biodiversity strategies and action plans and in the preparation of national reports and that most participants were unfamiliar with the use or development of biodiversity models and scenarios as a means of informing policy decisions. It was also noted that the countries in attendance were at various stages of updating their NBSAPs and had made varying progress in the preparation of their national reports. During the discussion several participants noted that they intended to link the preparation of their national report to the updating of their NBSAP.

ITEM 2. OVERVIEW OF THE OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAMME FOR THE WORKSHOP

6. Mr. Robert Höft provided an overview of the workshop, the anticipated outcomes and the working methods that were going to be used. In his remarks he emphasized that the national reporting process was closely linked to the process of NBSAP revision and development and that it was also important for the mid-term review of progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the preparation of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4).

7. In addition to plenary sessions on the first and last day, the workshop was organized in two parallel streams, one focusing on the preparation of the fifth national reports (agenda item 5) and the other focusing on the development and use of models and scenarios as tools to support policy analysis, planning and decision-making (agenda item 6). With this in mind, the workshop format featured a mix of presentations with question-and-answer sessions, discussions and exercises in small working groups, as well as individual exercises.

ITEMS 3 AND 4. EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PREPARATION OF THE FOURTH NATIONAL REPORTS AND PROGRESS IN THE UPDATING OF NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

8. Mr. Robert Höft provided an overview of the experiences and lessons learned from the fourth round of national reporting under the Convention, focusing on the factors that contributed to the high rate of submissions. Among the factors that contributed to the high rate of submission were changes in the format of the national reports, the development of supporting materials and tools, capacity development workshops, greater communication with Parties and the greater availability of biodiversity monitoring programmes and assessments among other things. However, it was also noted that challenges still remained particularly related to the timely submission of the reports. By the submission deadline of the fourth national reports, only 26

reports had been received. If a similar situation was to occur with the fifth national reports, this would create challenges for the preparation of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook as well as the mid-term assessment of progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 to be undertaken by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting in October 2014. Lessons learned from the previous round of reporting were also discussed, including the need to start the preparation of the national reports well before the deadline, and the need for more stakeholder involvement in the preparation of the report. A number of tools and resources to help Parties prepare their national reports and to revise their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, such as the NBSAP Forum, a joint initiative of UNEP, UNDP and the CBD Secretariat, with potentially additional partners, were highlighted. During the opening presentation, an update of the status of revision and development of NBSAPs was also presented.

9. Following the presentation Ms. Lu'Lu' Agustina from Indonesia introduced the country's experiences and lessons learned from the preparation of the fourth national report, highlighting the importance of establishing a multi-sector steering committee and theme task forces for coordination and preparation, and undertaking multi-stakeholder consultations at various levels. Among the issues discussed was the need to treat the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in a flexible manner and to adapt them to national circumstances. During the subsequent discussion, participants observed that the NBSAPs and national reports contained similar elements even though they were distinct processes.

10. Ms. Sheila Vergara, ASEAN Center for Biodiversity (ACB), introduced a tool developed by ACB to help countries prepare the fifth national report. The tool allowed several people to work on the preparation of their countries national report online and allowed the work to be more easily coordinated and monitored.

ITEM 5. PREPARATION OF THE PARTS AND APPENDICES OF THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT

(a) Assessing the status and trends of, and threats to, biodiversity and implications for human well-being (Part I of the fifth national report)

11. Mr. Lijie Cai (CBD) provided suggestions for the preparation of the first part of the fifth national report. It was suggested that in Part I of the national reports, Parties should focus on providing information on why biodiversity was important for their country, what major changes to the status and trends of biodiversity had taken place since the last national report, the main threats to biodiversity, the impacts of any changes to human wellbeing and any information on possible future changes. Participants were encouraged to use a variety of information sources in this section of the report, including indicators, expert assessments, graphs and maps. It was also emphasized that this part of the report should provide an analysis of the changing conditions of biodiversity and the implications for human wellbeing rather than only describing its status.

12. Following a question and answer session on the first part of the fifth national reports, Mr. Kieran Mooney introduced a group exercise designed to help participants identify the type of information they might wish to include in their national reports (see annex II). The exercise consisted of a table based on the 20 Aichi Targets. It was suggested that participants initially focussed on Aichi Targets 5 to 15 and to identify, for each target, the status and trends of the relevant components of biodiversity (ecosystems, species, genes, pressures, threats, etc.) and to assess the implications of these trends for human wellbeing. Participants worked on completing the table in subregional groups.

13. In connection with Part I, Mr. Juhern Kim from Global Green Growth Institute based in Seoul, Republic of Korea, introduced methodologies and findings of the Economics of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity (TEEB) as well as recent developments in this field both at global level and national level.

(b) Implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and mainstreaming of biodiversity (Part II of the fifth national report)

14. Mr. Lijie Cai (CBD) provided suggestions on the preparation of the second part of the fifth national report which focused on the implementation of a country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan and the mainstreaming of biodiversity. It was suggested that in this Part, Parties should report on all the actions

taken to implement the Strategic Plan instead of focusing only on the implementation of the NBSAP. It was also suggested that Parties should consider reporting on the implementation of their old NBSAP as well as the progress which had been made in developing their new NBSAP. As with the first part of the report, Parties were encouraged to include more analysis than description, particularly on the effectiveness of the actions which had been taken. Where possible, Parties were also encouraged to incorporate case-studies into their national reports. It was also suggested that Parties should consider including information on any national biodiversity targets which had been set, and the effectiveness of biodiversity mainstreaming in this section of the report.

15. Following the presentation on Part II of the national report and the subsequent discussion, workshop participants divided again into groups and continued to work on the exercise they had started in the previous session. This time they were asked to consider all of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and to identify any related actions which had been taken to implement their country's NBSAP or the Convention. They were also asked to indicate the level of effectiveness of these actions. The information identified through this exercise was the type of information which should be included in Part II of the fifth national reports.

***(c) Assessing progress towards the 2020 biodiversity targets and relevant targets of MDGs
(Part III of the fifth national report)***

16. Prior to beginning the presentations related to the preparation of the third part of the fifth national reports the workshop participants convened in plenary in order to update each working group on the progress that had been made the previous day.

17. Mr. Lijie Cai provided suggestions on the preparation of the third part of the fifth national report which focused on assessing progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the relevant Millennium Development Goals. He informed the participants that the overall purpose of this part of the report was to provide an assessment of progress towards any national targets which had been set and towards the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He pointed out that the assessment contained in this section of the report should draw on, and build from, the information contained in the previous two parts of the report.

18. Following the presentation, Mr. Naoki Nakayama from Japan introduced its national targets and actions for achieving the 2020 Aichi Targets as well as indicators for measuring progress. Institutionally Japan had established a national committee for the United Nations Decade for Biodiversity. Japan also introduced its new NBSAP and its plan for preparing the fifth national report. Following a question and answer session, Dr. Xu Haigen from China made a presentation on how to select and use indicators for measuring progress towards the 2020 Aichi Targets, based on its experience of preparing the fourth national report. Following a question and answer session, Dr. K. Sivakumar from India introduced national developments since the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, including its progress in setting national targets to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, updating NBSAP, and ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. India also highlighted key developments that they were considering including in their fifth national report.

19. Following these presentations participants continued to work in groups on the exercise they had started the previous sessions. Participants were asked, for each of the Aichi Targets, to assess the level of progress that had been made towards their attainment, progress towards any associated Millennium Development Goals, to provide possible suggestions on any national targets which could be set, to identify any relevant indicators or sources of information and the possible stakeholders that should be consulted in setting national targets or who may have information to help assess the progress which had been made.

(e) Preparation of the executive summary and reviewing the implementation of thematic programmes of work and the cross-cutting issues under the Convention (Appendix III of the fifth national report)

20. Prior to beginning the presentations related to the preparation of the executive summary and appendices of the fifth national reports, the workshop participants convened in plenary in order to update each working group on the progress that had been made the previous day.

21. Mr. Kieran Mooney provided suggestions on the preparation of the executive summary of the fifth national report and emphasized that it was often the most read section of the report and that as such it should

contain the main messages of the entire report and present important facts, necessary background information and the major conclusions from the report. While the executive summary should be concise it should provide the reader with an overall sense of the complete report. As such the executive summary should draw from all sections of the report. It was also suggested that the executive summary could serve as a basis for additional communication or outreach materials.

22. With regard to the appendices it was noted that these offer Parties the opportunity to provide detailed information on topics which are nationally important without increasing the length of the main body of the report. It was suggested that appendix I could be used to provide information on the process followed for the preparation of the national report while appendix two could be used to include additional references or links to relevant reports. Lastly, the third appendix could be used to report on the implementation of any thematic programmes of work and cross-cutting issues under the Convention. It was noted that there were a number of COP decisions which required that such information be included in the national reports. Much of this information was likely to be reflected in the three main parts of the report given the broad scope of the national report and of the Strategic Plan. However, if there were specific issues which were particularly important, given national circumstances and which warranted more detailed and in-depth discussion, this information could be included in Appendix III. In concluding, it was noted that there was no obligation to include appendices in the national report and that Parties should only do so if it suited their needs.

23. Following the presentation on the preparation of the executive summary and appendices, participants continued their work on the table of exercises and a draft plan for the preparation of the fifth national report.

ITEM 6. USE OF INDICATORS FOR ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING

24. Mr. Robert Höft provided an overview of indicators as they related to monitoring changes in biodiversity, assessments and reporting. He noted that indicators were useful for tracking and monitoring progress, guiding policy development, highlighting those areas where action was needed and communicating with stakeholders. He however pointed out that while an indicator may provide information on a number of issues, a single indicator would never provide a complete picture and additional explanations and interpretation of the information were important to avoid misconceptions. He also pointed out that indicators could be divided into two categories: quantitative (numerical) indicators and qualitative indicators based on expert opinion, and that both types of indicators could be used in the national reports. Following this overview, the relevant COP decisions on indicators were presented. In particular, the indicator framework contained in decision XI/3, and the indicators database developed by the Secretariat were highlighted. In concluding his presentation Mr. Höft provided information on the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and noted that the Partnership had developed a range of tools and information related to indicators and national indicator development and that it had been running a series of indicators workshops in support of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. He also reported that the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership had organized a workshop for Biodiversity Indicator Development Facilitators (Cambridge, UK, 22-26 April 2013) and that the list of trained facilitators was available.¹ Ms. Sangay Dema from Bhutan, as trained facilitator of BIP from the region, shared her perspectives on indicator development and use.

ITEM 7. INFORMATION NEEDED FOR THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY OUTLOOK

25. Mr. Kieran Mooney provided an overview of the production plan for the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4). It was noted that the GBO was the flagship publication of the Convention and that the fourth edition of the report would provide a mid-term assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The main source of information for GBO-4 would be the fifth national reports and as such it would be important that the reports were submitted by the deadline, particularly as one of the main weaknesses of GBO-3 was the limited amount of national information that was included. It was also emphasized that there were a number of ways for

¹ <http://www.bipnational.net/LinkClick.aspx?link=176&tabid=38&language=en-US>.

Parties to participate in the preparation of GBO-4, including by providing advance drafts of their fifth national reports and other assessments, providing case-studies, and participating in the peer-review process of the Outlook drafts. As such, he urged participants to provide advance drafts, case-studies and other related information as early as possible.

ITEM 8. USE OF SCENARIOS FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

26. The workshop started with an informal session in order to let the participant know each other. This was followed by a presentation on the process of biodiversity loss and on the use of biodiversity indicators at the national level. After the first presentation, the participants were divided into three groups to discuss the process of biodiversity loss, biodiversity indicators, and listing pressures and drivers on biodiversity. Finally, the results were discussed with all participants. In the afternoon an introductory presentation of the GLOBIO3 model was given, followed by a presentation and working session on an excel trainings tool on modeling biodiversity loss in terms of Mean Species Abundance, which was a result from the demand on land in a specific country. Information on each participant's country was included in the tool and participants were asked to make changes to the different pressures and drivers such as population growth and consumption increase, affecting biodiversity in order to establish the effect each driver had on biodiversity loss. The changes to the pressures resulted in changes of land use and to the MSA of a given country. At the end of the day the participants received homework regarding existing and new policy options related to NBSAPs in their country.

27. The workshop continued with a presentation on the difference between policy options and scenarios and a presentation on different policy options to address the pressures on biodiversity were presented. This was followed by defining the ambitions to be reached in the application of policy options.

28. During the last day of the workshop, a presentation on national modeling was given, introducing the CLUE and GLOBIO3 models. After the presentations, MSA maps of countries were handed out to the participants, which showed the future trends of biodiversity expressed in MSA in their country. The day ended with a presentation about the possibilities of a follow-up training and data requirements for modeling. The final presentation and working session concerned how to use the information of the workshop to take home and show others the relevance and benefits of policy options to reduce future biodiversity loss.

ITEM 9. NEXT STEPS: PLAN FOR PREPARING THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT AND EARLY SUBMISSIONS FOR GBO-4

29. Under this agenda item, participants from each country developed their plans for the preparation of the fifth national report, providing a likely calendar or the preparation process, completion and submission of the national report. The Secretariat and resource persons had one-on-one discussions with each country about their draft plans as well as possible challenges ahead.

ITEM 10. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

30. On the final day of the workshop, following the summary report from parallel workshops, participants identified conclusions from the workshop which were contained in annex III. Ms. Sheila Vergara from ASEAN Center for Biodiversity and Ms. Nisanthi Perera from South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (CAEP) introduced the support that their organizations could provide to member states in the subregions for preparing their fifth national reports. Ms. Nisanthi Perera also briefly introduced developments in a marine biodiversity strategy for South Asia. Mr. Spike Millington, East Asian-Australian Flyway Partnership, based in Incheon City, introduced the partnership and called for stronger links with CBD implementation activities at various levels, considering that migratory species knew no political borders.

31. Mr. Robert Höft, on behalf of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, thanked the Governments of Korea, Japan and the Netherlands for their support to the workshop. He also thanked the participants for their hard work throughout the workshop.

32. Ms. Yoon Eun Jung made closing remarks on the behalf of the Ministry of the Environment of Korea. Following these final remarks, the workshop closed at 1pm on 24 May 2013.

*Annex I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****Afghanistan**

1. Mr. Muhibullah Fazli
Wildlife Specialist
Natural Heritage Protection Division
National Environmental Protection Agency
Second Parwan Squir
Kabul
Afghanistan
E-Mail: fazli_mohib2011@yahoo.com
2. Mr. Jalaludin Naseri
Wetland Specialist
Natural Heritage Protection Division
National Environmental Protection Agency
Second Parwan Squir
Kabul
Afghanistan
E-Mail: dr.jalal_n@yahoo.com

Bangladesh

3. Mr. Golam Rabbani
Director General
Department of Environment
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paribesh Bhabam

E-16 Agarigoor
Sherie-Bangla tragan
Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh
E-Mail: rabbani1955@gmail.com
4. Mr. Abu Fazal Md Rafiuddin
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Room 1309 - Building 6
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka 1000
Bangladesh
E-Mail: rafi6031s@yahoo.com

Bhutan

5. Ms. Sangay Dema
Deputy Chief Biodiversity Officer
National Biodiversity Centre
Ministry of Agriculture and Forests
P.O. Box 875
Serbithang
Thimphu
Bhutan
E-Mail: sdema06@gmail.com
6. Mr. Karma C. Nyedrup
Environment Specialist
National Environment Commission Secretariat
P.O. Box 466
Thimphu
Bhutan
Tel.: +975 17646566
Fax: +975 2 323 385
E-Mail: kc@nec.gov.bt, nyedrupkc@yahoo.com

Cambodia

7. Ms. Somaly Chan
Director
Department of International Conventions and
Biodiversity
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
No. 48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmorn
Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel.: +855 23 6445 222
Fax: +855 23 721 073
E-Mail: somalychan.ca@gmail.com
cbd@gdancp-moe.org
8. Mr. Sothearith Yourk
Vice Chief and Biodiversity Officer
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
No. 48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmorn
Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel.: (855) 12 45 77 99
Fax: (855) 23 721 073
E-Mail: thearith.yourk@gmail.com

China

9. Mr. Xu Haigen
 Professor
 Deputy Director General
 Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences
 Ministry of Environmental Protection
 China
 Tel.: +86 25 85287081
 Fax: +86 25 854 1611
 E-Mail: xuhgs@sina.com, xhg@nies.org;

10. Mr. Mingxiang Huang

 Associate Research Fellow
 Technology Division of Information Center
 Ministry of Environmental Protection
 China
 Tel.: + 86 10 665 56596
 Fax: + 86 10 665 563 29
 E-Mail: huang.mingxiang@mep.gov.cn

India

11. Dr. K. Sivakumar
 Department of Endangered Species Management
 Wildlife Institute of India
 P.O. Box18
 Chandrabani
 Dehradun-248001
 India
 E-Mail: ksivakumar@wii.gov.in

Indonesia

12. Ms. Lu' Lu' Agustina
 Head
 Sub Division for Monitoring of Genetic Resources
 Ministry of the Environment
 Jl. DI Panjaitan Kav 24 Kebon Nanas
 Build. BA 4th floor
 Jakarta 13410
 Indonesia
 Tel.: +62 21 859 05770
 E-Mail: luluagustina@yahoo.com,

13. Ms. Rasyidah
 Head of Sub Division for Cultivated Land
 Ministry of Environment of Indonesia
 D.I. Panjaitan Kav 24 build B 4th floor
 Jakarta Timur 13410
 Indonesia
 Tel/Fax.: +6221 859 05770
 E-Mail: cidak18@yahoo.com, cidak@menlh.go.id

Japan

14. Mr. Hiroyuki Ishii
 Assistant Director
 Global Biodiversity Strategy Office
 Ministry of the Environment
 1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 Tokyo 100-8975
 Japan
 Tel.: +81 5521 8273
 E-Mail: hiroyuki_ishii@env.go.jp

15. Mr. Naoki Nakayama
 Deputy Director
 Global Biodiversity Stratgy Office, Nature
 Conservation Bureau
 Ministry of the Environment
 1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 Tokyo 100-8975
 Japan
 Tel.: +81 5521 8275
 E-Mail: naoki_nakayama@env.go.jp

Lao People's Democratic Republic

16. Mr. Bouaphanh Phanthavong
Deputy Director
Department of Forest Resources Management
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
P.O. Box 2932
Vientiane
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Tel.: +856 21 216921; 217161
E-Mail: phanthavong2020@hotmail.com
17. Mr. Banethom Thepsombath
MEA Programme Officer
IUCN Lao
E-Mail: banethom.thepsombath@iucn.org,
latsamay.sylavong@iucn.org

Malaysia

18. Ms. Rahmah Ashari
Assistant Project Coordinator
NBSAP Project
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 2, Wisma Sumber Asli, No. 25
Persiaran Perdana, Precinct 4
Putrajaya 62574
Malaysia
E-Mail: rahmah@nre.gov.my
19. Ms. Therese Tiu Kok Moi
Principal Assistant Secretary
Biodiversity and Forestry Management Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 2, Wisma Sumber Asli, No. 25
Persiaran Perdana, Precinct 4
Putrajaya 62574
Malaysia
Tel.: +603 8886 1133
E-Mail: therese@nre.gov.my

Maldives

20. Ms. Muhusina Abdul Rahman
Environment Analyst
Environment Department/ Biodiversity Conservation
Ministry of Environment and Energy
Ameenee Magu, Maafannu 20392
Malé
Maldives
Tel.: +9603004317, +960 7707931
Fax: +9603004301
E-Mail:
muhusina.abdulrahman@environment.gov.mv
muhusina.abdulrahman@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.environment.gov.mv>
21. Ms. Ilham Atho Mohamed
Assistant Director
Ministry of Energy and Environment
Ameenee Magu
Maafannu
Malé 20392
Maldives
Tel.: +960 786 2036
E-Mail: ilham.mohamed@environment.gov.mv
Web: www.mhe.gov.mv

Mongolia

22. Ms. Munkhjargal Myagmar
Researcher
School of Biology and Biotechnology
National University of Mongolia
Mongolia
E-Mail: moojii05@yahoo.com
23. Ms. Yondon Onon
Officer
Ministry of Environment and Green Development
Mongolia
E-Mail: onon@mne.gov.mn

Myanmar

24. Dr. Naing Zaw Htun
Assistant Director
Forest Department
Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry
Nay Pyi Taw , Myanmar
Tel.: 0943 12363 1
E-Mail: nzhtun@gmail.com; nwedjdmoj@gmail.com
25. Mr. Win Myint
Deputy Director
Planning and Statistics Department
Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry
Nay Pyi Taw
Myanmar
E-Mail: winmyintfd@gmail.com,
dgpsmof@mptmail.net.mm

Nepal

26. Mr. Sagar Kumar Rimal
Chief, Biodiversity Section
Environment Division
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
P.O. Box 3987
Singha Durbar
Kathmandu
Nepal
Tel.: +977 1 421 1892
Fax: +977 1 421 1868
E-Mail: skrimal@mfsc.gov.np, rimalsagar@yahoo.com
27. Mr. Nabin Prakash Upadhyaya
Training Officer
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
P.O. Box 3987
Singha Durbar
Kathmandu
Nepal
E-Mail: nabinupadhyaya@yahoo.com

Pakistan

28. Mr. Abdul Munaf Qaimkhani
Deputy Inspector General (Forests)
Ministry of Climate Change
LG & RD Complex, G-5/2
Islamabad
Pakistan
Tel.: +92 0 51 9245585 / 925 9031
Fax: +92 0 51 924 5590
E-Mail: amqaimkhani@yahoo.com
29. Mr. Naeem Ashraf Raja
Director, Biodiversity Program
Biodiversity Directorate
Ministry of Climate Change
LG & RD Complex, G-5/2
Islamabad
Pakistan
Tel.: 92 51 9245601
Fax: 92 51 9205290
E-Mail: naeemashrafraja@yahoo.com

Philippines

30. Ms. Nancy Reaño-Corpuz
Senior Ecosystem Management Specialist
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Quezon Avenue
Diliman
Quezon City 1100
Philippines
Tel.: +632 924 6031,+632 9204486
E-Mail: nancycorpuz@yahoo.com
Web: www.pawb.gov.ph
31. Ms. Mercedita Agcaoili Sombilla
Director, Agriculture Staff
National Economic and Development Authority
12 Jose Maria Escriva Ave.
Pagig, Metro Manila
Philippines
E-Mail: masombilla@neda.gov.ph

Republic of Korea

32. Eunjung Yoon
Deputy Director - Nature Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment
Government Complex-Gwacheon, 1 Jungang-dong
Seoul , Republic of Korea
E-Mail: wetpaper@hanmail.net
Web: <http://www.me.go.kr>
33. Hyunwoo Lee
Senior Researcher - Global Strategy Center
Korea Environment Institute (KEI)
E-Mail: hwlee@kei.re.kr

Singapore

- 34 Ms. Rachel Lim Li-Feng
Biodiversity Manager
Biodiversity, Information and Policy Branch
National Biodiversity Centre
Singapore
Tel.: +65 64651681
E-Mail: lim_li-feng@nparks.gov.sg
35. Mr. Jeremy Woon Ren Wei
Biodiversity Manager
International Relations
National Biodiversity Centre
Singapore
Tel.: +65 6465 1679
E-Mail: JEREMY_WOON@nparks.gov.sg

Sri Lanka

36. Ms. R.H.M.P. Abeykoon
Director
Ministry of Environment and Renewable Energy
82, "Sampathpaya"
Rajamalwatta Road
Battaramulla
Sri Lanka
E-Mail: pathma66a@gmail.com
37. Ms. Saranga Jayasundara

Programme Assistant
Ministry of Environment and Renewable Energy
82, "Sampathpaya"
Rajamalwatta Road
Battaramulla
Sri Lanka
E-Mail: sarangajay78@gmail.com

Thailand

38. Mr. Panuwat Kamuttachart
Senior Environmental Official
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
60/1 Phibul Wattana 7
Rama VI Road, Phayathai
Bangkok 10400
Thailand
Tel.: +662 265 6640
Fax: +662 265 6640
E-Mail: panuwatonep@gmail.com
39. Mr. Wanlop Preechamart
Senior Environmental Official - Biological Diversity Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning
60/1 Soi Phibul Wattana 7, Rama VI Road
Bangkok 10400, Thailand
Tel.: 662 265 6640
E-Mail: wanloponep@gmail.com

Timor-Leste

40. Mr. Marcal Gusmao
Senior Lecturer and ABS Focal Point
Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture
National University of East Timor
Dili
Timor-Leste
E-Mail: marcalgusmao@gmail.com
41. Mr. Manuel Mendes
Head
Department for Protected Areas and National Parks
National Directorate of Forestry
Rua de Caicoli
Dili
Timor-Leste
Tel.: +6707731 2321
E-Mail: lai_luhat78@yahoo.com

Viet Nam

42. Mr. Le Ngoc Hung
Biodiversity Conservation Agency
Vietnam Environment Administration
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
10 Tpn That Thuyet St. Can Gray dis
Hanoi
Viet Nam
E-Mail: ngochung109vea@gmail.com
Web: www.vea.gov.vn
43. Ms. Mac Thi Minh Tra
Centre for Environment Monitoring
Vietnam Environment Administration
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
10 Tpn That Thuyet St. Can Gray dis
Hanoi
Viet Nam
Tel.: +84 435771816
Fax: +84 435 771855

E-Mail: mactra@vea.gov.vn, mactra@cem.gov.vn

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

United Nations Development Programme Malaysia

44. Ms. Pek Chuan Gan
Programme Manager
Environment and Energy
United Nations Development Programme Malaysia
Tel.: +603 209 155179

Inter-Governmental Organizations

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity

45. Ms. Sheila Vergara
Director
Biodiversity Information Management
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
3/F, ERDB Bldg., UPLB Forestry Campus
University of the Philippines, Los Banos, College
Laguna 4031
Philippines
Tel.: +63 49 536-3989; +639175336214
Fax: +63 49 536-2865
E-Mail: sgvergara@aseanbiodiversity.org,
gsrodulfo@aseanbiodiversity.org
Web: <http://www.aseanbiodiversity.org>

Global Green Growth Institute

46. Mr. Juhern Kim
Project Coordinator
Green Growth Planning and Implementation Department
Global Green Growth Institute
c/o Asia Research Centre
18th Floor Jeong dong Bld. 15-5
Jeong-dong, Jung-gu, Seoul
Republic of Korea
E-Mail: zestor33@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.gggi.org>

South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme

47. Ms. Nishanthi Perera
Programme Officer
South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme
#10 Anderson Road
Colombo 5
Sri Lanka
Tel.: +94 11 536 2851
E-Mail: po_sacep@eol.lk, nmperera@yahoo.com
Web: www.sacep.org

East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership

48. Mr. Spike Millington

Chief Executive

Non-Governmental Organizations

Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL)

49. Ms. Fenneke Brascamp
Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL)
PO Box 303, 3720 AM Bilthoven
Netherlands
E-Mail: fennekebrascamp@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.pbl.nl/en>
50. Mr. Tonnie Tekelenburg
Nature, Landscape and Biodiversity (NLB) Team
Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL)
PO Box 303, 3720 AM Bilthoven
Netherlands
Tel.: 3130 27 42608
E-Mail: tonnie.tekelenburg@pbl.nl
Web: <http://www.pbl.nl/en>
51. Mr. Wilbert van Rooij
Plansup
Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL)
PO Box 303, 3720 AM Bilthoven
Netherlands
Tel.: +31 610163488
E-Mail: wilbert@aidenvironment.org, plansup.consult@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.pbl.nl/en>

SCBD

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

52. Mr. Lijie Cai
National Reports Officer
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W. Suite 800
Montreal Quebec, Canada
Tel.: +514 287 7016
E-Mail: lijie.cai@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int
53. Mr. Robert Höft
Environmental Affairs Officer, Scientific Assessment
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal Quebec, Canada
Tel.: 1-514-287-7028
E-Mail: robert.hoft@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int
54. Mr. Kieran Noonan-Mooney
Programme Assistant
STTM
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal Quebec, Canada
E-Mail: kieran.mooney@cbd.int

Annex II

WORKSHEET FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT

The following worksheet was compiled from work provided by some participants, with some adjustments by the Secretariat. The information presented in the table is for illustration purposes only as it reflects only some of the issues discussed during the course of the workshop.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
Target 1- Awareness increased	<p>State: Awareness of citizens of biodiversity yet to be increased</p> <p>Pressures: -Urbanization, -Lack of exposure to natural surroundings. -Demanding academic curriculum for students.</p>	<p>Impacts: Lack of public support for biodiversity actions</p> <p>Inadequate public actions to protect biodiversity</p>	<p>Actions: Organize awareness activities for the public</p> <p>Incorporate biodiversity into school curriculum</p> <p>Use various media to communicate importance of biodiversity</p>	<p>Medium (activities organized in connection with IBD, WED, etc.)</p> <p>Medium (biodiversity components included in school education however still optional in many schools)</p> <p>Medium (several media such as TV, internet are used)</p>	Medium	<p>By 2020, achieve a [30%] increase in the number of public and private organizations that participate in biodiversity conservation activities.</p> <p>Track volunteers [by 2015, to have 2000 volunteers] vs participants in programmes [awareness group]</p>	<p>Participation and Partnership: Number of Agencies/Private Companies/NGOs/Academic Institutions involved in biodiversity actions</p> <p>Education and Awareness: Number of Outreach or Public Awareness Events Held in the City per year</p> <p>Biodiversity in school curriculum</p>	NGOs, RMBR, NParks, schools.
Target 2 - Biodiversity values integrated	<p>Status: No system of national and sub-national accounting having incorporated biodiversity values</p>	<p>Ecosystem services not valued properly thus related actions not provided with appropriate financial support</p>	<p>Actions: -Develop macroeconomic indicators that account for natural capital values</p>	<p>Low for all actions (limited technical capacities and resources)</p>	Low	<p>By 2020, to establish natural capital accounting system</p> <p>By 2020, to incorporate biodiversity and</p>	<p>National TEEB undertaken</p> <p>National economic accounting system that has included</p>	<p>Planning Ministry, Development Ministry, Ministry of the Environment, national statistics office</p>

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	<p>Challenges:</p> <p>Low awareness of biodiversity values</p> <p>No national or subnational studies undertaken of the values of biodiversity</p> <p>Lack of mainstreaming of biodiversity into various sectors</p>	<p>Inadequate policy design and implementation</p> <p>Market distortion</p>	<p>-Develop national accounts for prioritized natural resources – minerals and</p> <p>-Develop ecosystem accounts for Southern Palawan and the Laguna Lake basin</p> <p>-Build capacity for institutionalization of the prioritized SEEA modules.</p>			ecosystem services accounting into national economic accounting system	biodiversity values	
Target 3 – Incentives reformed	<p>Status:</p> <p>-Republic Act 7900, also known as the High-Value Crops Development Act, passed in 2002</p> <p>-The 1960s Green Revolution strategy adopted, and as a result, the total area planted to high yield rice increased from 10% to 60% in just a decade.</p> <p>As of 2008 28 GMOs approved for importation.</p>	<p>It encourages the replacement of traditional varieties with those that are more popular for export. This also led to increased use of fertilizers, pesticides and water.</p> <p>Biotechnology’s potential to negatively impact on biodiversity in light of poor implementation of the regulations, particularly in terms</p>	<p>In 2005, Executive Order (EO) No. 481 established and implemented the National Organic Agriculture Program by the National Organic Agriculture Board. This was followed two years after by EO No. 29 or the DA-Sustainable Agriculture Development Program.</p> <p>Research projects</p>	<p>Medium (enforcement of executive orders has produced some results)</p> <p>Low (lack of</p>	Low	By 2020 subsidies not friendly to biodiversity will be eliminated, and incentives favorable to biodiversity in place and implemented.	<p>Number of programmes of payment for ecosystem services in place</p> <p>Incentives perverse to biodiversity identified and removed</p> <p>Incentives favorable to biodiversity developed and implemented</p>	<p>Planning Ministry, Ministry of Agriculture, industries, NGOs, local communities</p>

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
		of monitoring.	promoting indigenous crops through techno-demo farms and sustainable agriculture.	resources for research projects, application of research results limited)				
Target 4 – Sustainable consumption and production	Status: Lack of framework governing sustainable consumption and production (SCP) including monitoring of trends		-Implementation of several key laws (e.g., Renewable Energy Act, Biofuels Act, Clean Air Act, Executive Order 301 -Establishing a Green Procurement Program) in the field of SCP -Support the relevant agencies through technical assistance and capacity building in their efforts to enforce the law.	Low for all actions (enforcement weak and capacities limited)	low	By 2020 comprehensive policy frameworks in place to promote sustainable production and consumption		Relevant government departments, industries, consumers, NGOs, local communities
Target 5 – Habitat loss halved or reduced	State: Inland water ecosystems, marine & coastal ecosystems and island ecosystems have experienced significant losses since latter 1950s. Main Pressures:	Three ecosystem types are vulnerable and habitats are lost or fragmented for a number of endemic and endangered species. Serious threats to livelihood of a large	Designation of new protected areas (terrestrial & marine) including national parks and Ramsar wetlands Introduction of the Strategic EIA in	Middle (new national parks, Ramsar wetlands are designated, the number of marine parks has doubled) Middle (EIA Act revised and guidelines for	Medium	Reduce the rate of loss of natural habitats, as well as their degradation and fragmentation	Percentage of tidal flats restored Habitats restored or recovered for some species Etc.	MOE, development sectors, local communities, etc.

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	Development activities.	number of people living in coastal areas and islands and relying on fisheries for food and using coasts as natural barriers from disasters.	planning and programme development	implementation completed)				
Target 6 – Sustainable management	<p>Status: Over exploitation of marine resources and forest products</p> <p>Pressures; -Infrastructure development in ecologically sensitive areas -Change in land-use pattern -Tourism -Pollution -Poor literacy -Lack of alternate livelihoods</p>	<p>Impacts:</p> <p>-Loss of biodiversity and threats to livelihood and food security -Climate change related issues -Un-eco-friendly tourism leads to degradation of biodiversity; threat to future livelihoods and food security</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <p>-Sustainable use of resources and regulating fishery -Ban on NTFP inside the PAs and regulation in other forests -Infrastructure development regulated in the ecologically sensitive areas -Eco-tourism promoted in the wilderness areas</p>	<p>Low (lack of effective enforcement Medium (lack of effective enforcement outside PAs) Medium (still there is a pressure to develop areas which are backward but these areas are ecologically sensitive) Medium (Tourism regulated inside PAs but still require more streamlining)</p>	Moderate (it is improving some parts of India, however, situation is getting worse in some places due to over exploitation and lack of enforcement of relevant policies)	75% of resources would be sustainably managed by 2020	<p>Trends in fish catch and export</p> <p>Trends in development index of coastal communities</p> <p>Trends in NTFP collections in India</p> <p>Trends in pollutants in marine and other ecosystems</p> <p>Trends in status of key stone species in selected environment</p>	<p>Agriculture (fisheries), Environment and Forests, Industries, Tourism, etc.</p> <p>Local communities</p>
Target 7 – Sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forestry	<p>State: Agriculture and aquaculture unsustainable</p> <p>Pressures: -Population growth</p>	<p>Impacts:</p> <p>-Uncontrolled forest clearance for agricultural lands -Mangrove destruction</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <p>-Control land clearance for agriculture -Regulate aquaculture</p>	<p>-medium -medium</p>	4/10	<p>-Promote sustainable agriculture to farmers (2020) - Promote community forest management involving local</p>	<p>-number of farmers involved in promoting sustainable agriculture -number of local communities</p>	<p>Royal forest department (RFD), Department of agriculture (DOA), Department of Live stocks Development sectors (DLD),</p>

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	-Increasing consumption of fish -Policy to increasing agriculture products (rice, shrimp, rubber) for export	-Coastal erosion -Land slide -Water pollution	-Adjust relevant export policies -Collaboration between upstream and downstream to protect watersheds			communities (2020)	involved in community forest management	Local communities
Target 8 – Pollution reduced	State: Pollution to agricultural ecosystems increased Pressures: -Increasing use of pesticide impact on fauna in soil, freshwater and pollinators - Increasing use of inorganic fertilizers impact on soil fauna, freshwater -Untreated effluent from industries -Sewage contamination -Improper management of solid waste	Impacts: -Creation of low oxygenated water resulting algal blooms with implications for livelihood, - Health, -Tourism -Quality of drinking water -Infrastructure	Actions: Regulate the use and type of fertilizers Monitoring runoff water Artificial wetlands created for water pretreatment	Low (lack of effective enforcement) Low (lack of resources for consistent monitoring) High (natural solution with minimum maintenance)	Moderate (some success in some ecosystems and with some types actions but progress is lacking in many ecosystems)	Nitrogen use efficiency increased by 50% in all production systems	Water quality Fertilizer consumption C/N ratio of soil production systems Quality of Soil Fauna	Horticultural industry Agricultural Department And Farmers Fisheries department and fishermen Water Management institutes Planning Ministry
Target 9 – Invasive alien species	Status: The impact caused by IAS is particularly strong that tends to intensify on a long	Impacts: IAS reduces the populations and distributions of native species	Eradication projects of IAS under IAS act Identify black list of IAS	Medium (some measures taken to eradicate some IAS) Low (list is yet to be developed)	Medium	-Identify IAS based upon the results of examinations of the enforcement status for the IAS Act, and lay out the order of	The number of species designated as IAS or as being on a list of invasive alien species threatening biodiversity, human	MOE, departments of agriculture, horticulture, quarantine, transportation, tourism sectors and

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	time basis. The number of IAS is rapidly increasing. Pressures: -Increasing international trade -Increasing international shipping -International tourism	through predation and competition. It will also impact on fishery and horticulture.				priority for controlling these invasive species, etc.	health and or economy development in Japan	etc.
Target 10 – Pressures on vulnerable ecosystems reduced	Status: - 503,389 ha of marine habitats of coral reefs have been protected in the form of marine parks in Malaysia Vulnerable ecosystem: mangrove - 689,067 ha of mangroves have been specifically protected as Mangrove	Impacts: Reduced functions of coral reefs as fish nursery, affecting production of fish resource, and the livelihood of local people. Reduced aesthetic value of the ocean- and reduced economic benefit.	- Limit carrying capacity in Marine Parks for tourists - Coral reef regeneration projects - Reduce emission of GHG from other sectors (transport, energy etc.)	High (This has been done by applying mechanisms such as Payment for Ecosystem Services) High (proven methodologies are being applied) Medium (this action involves various sectors and requires long time)	Medium 40 marine parks in Peninsular Malaysia 9 marine parks in Sabah and Sarawak	Increased areas of coral reefs protected Increased area of coral reefs rehabilitated	Areas of coral reef protected Areas of (degraded) coral reefs rehabilitated	Marine Park Department Sabah Parks Sarawak Forestry Department NRE NGOs Local communities Fisheries Department

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	Reserve Marine ecosystems still vulnerable primarily due to climate change and human activities such as tourism - coral reef.							
Target 11 – Protected areas	Status: 10.6%- classified as terrestrial protected areas in Malaysia. Total marine parks and marine protected areas (strictly no take zone): 53 sites (1.1%) 6 RAMSAR sites 1 East Asia Australasia Flyway Partnership site 1 Man and Biosphere site and 1 will be nominated (Crocker Range Park, Sabah)		Initiatives to gazette areas as protected areas for example the Crocker Range in Sabah as Man and Biosphere (MAB) sites The Central Forest Spine (CFS) project aims to create linkages for the 37 forest complexes in Peninsular Malaysia. Mapping of potential areas to be gazetted as marine protected areas	High (There is ready buy in for gazettement of these sites from respective state governments) Medium (requires buy-in from state governments). Very effective but gazettement of PA takes very long time. Gazettement of Tun Mustapha Park in Sabah (1.02 million hectare) is being	Between medium and high -10.6% terrestrial protected areas -Connectivity is being established in the Belom-Temenggor Forest Reserve Area in the northern states of Peninsular Malaysia.) -RAMSAR management plan is in place and some are work in progress (needs to be	Percentage of terrestrial protected areas (as much as possible with representation of major important terrestrial ecosystems) Increased forest connectivity within the CFS. Increase measures taken to conserve flagship species. Increased measures taken to protect marine and coastal	% of terrestrial protected areas by 2020 Gazettement of protected areas for forest connectivity. Measures put in place to conserve flagship species & number of threatened flagship species. Hectarage of mangroves areas planted Areas of coastal and marine ecosystems	NRE Other relevant federal government departments and agencies State governments NGOs Local communities

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
				planned in the near future.	validated)	areas. Increase in the areas of marine and coastal protected areas by 2020.	effectively managed.	
Target 12 – Extinction prevented	<p>State: A number of species are threatened with extinction</p> <p>Pressures: Sea turtle due to loss of habitat and use as food. Gobi bear and wild buffalo due to loss of habitat Kaspian tiger and lions are due to habitat loss and poaching Vulture used as diclofenic medicine</p>	<p>Impacts:</p> <p>Food security and livelihood</p> <p>Loss of species in the Gobi ecosystem</p> <p>Impact food chain in the wild</p> <p>Loss of biodiversity and loose natural scavengers</p> <p>Loss of biodiversity and ecosystem change and loss of country’s national animal</p>	<p>Establish no go zone</p> <p>Re-introduce endangered species</p> <p>Regulate use of animals for medicinal purposes</p>	<p>Low (lack of financial and technical resources)</p> <p>Low (lack of resource and technical capacities)</p> <p>Medium (regulations in place however enforcement weak)</p>	Between low and medium	<p>Rate of extinction brought down to zero by 2020</p> <p>Improve the status of key threatened species</p>	<p>Trends in extinction</p> <p>Number of endangered species re-introduced</p> <p>Number of endangered species protected</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment, Private sector, local communities, NGOs</p>

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	in domestic animals							
Target 13 – Genetic diversity maintained	<p>State: genetic diversity of plants, animals and wild relatives is declining</p> <p>Pressures: -Introduction of new crop and domestic animal varieties - GMOs - introduction of invasive alien species</p>	<p>Impacts:</p> <p>Threat for crop wild relatives</p> <p>Threat for some domesticated animal breeds</p> <p>Human health</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <p>Establish gene banks</p> <p>Regulate introduction of new varieties, import of GMOs and invasive species</p>	<p>Low (gene banks have not been established due to lack of resources)</p> <p>Low (No adequate regulations in place and law enforcement weak, lack of means to track GMOs and IAS)</p>	Low	<p>Establish effective monitoring system to monitor the implementation of the outcomes of the CWR and wild domestic animal breeds</p> <p>Improve ex situ conservation facilities</p> <p>Establish and maintain gene bank</p>	<p>Number of threatened crop wild relatives</p> <p>No of threatened domesticated animal breeds in wild</p> <p>No of Gene Banks</p>	<p>Department of Agriculture</p> <p>Department of Livestock</p> <p>Research Institutes</p>
Target 14 – Ecosystems and essential services safeguarded	<p>Status:</p> <p>Wetlands being encroached by development</p> <p>Rivers being tapped for industrial purposes</p> <p>Commercial logging in watershed areas</p> <p>Mining impacting rivers and ground water</p>	<p>Impacts:</p> <p>Losing natural filters</p> <p>Impacting the aquatic ecosystem</p> <p>Affecting the water yield and increase in floods</p> <p>Polluting and impacting aquatic ecosystems</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <p>Evaluation of ecosystem services</p> <p>Assessment of development activities on biodiversity and ecosystem services it provides</p> <p>Involve private sector in protecting ecosystem services</p>	<p>Low (lack of financial support)</p> <p>Low (Lack of resources and technical capacities)</p> <p>Low (lack of incentives and enforcement of relevant regulations)</p>	low	By 2020, all critical watersheds for water yield and forest area for carbon sequestration conserved.	<p>Quantity and Quality of water and quality of air,</p> <p>Ecosystems services evaluated and recognized</p>	Relevant government departments, industries, NGOs,
Target 15 – Ecosystems	Status:	Impacts:	National Movement	Good (all	Good (the ratio of	Increasing forest	Trend of forest cover	Ministry of the

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
restored and enhanced	Ecosystem restoration or enhancement not happening Challenges: Land use change Decentralization policy affected on spatial planning Utilization of peat land to increasing oil palm production	Reduced carbon storage function , thus increasing climate change threat to human life	on Land and Forest Rehabilitation (<i>GNRHL</i>) Towards Green Indonesia Programme	stakeholders including private sectors have been involved on GNRHL and participation of the local government in Towards Green Indonesia Programs increasing every year)	forests to total terrestrial area has increased significantly from 48.97% in 2002 to 52.52% in 2010)	cover by at least 5% by 2020	Number of local governments involved in Towards Green Indonesia Programs	Environment, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Development Planning, local governments, local communities
Target 16 – Nagoya Protocol	Status: Ratification in process and expected in 2014	Impacts: National ABS regime to be developed Access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing from their use will be facilitated	The Nagoya Protocol has been sent to the Parliament for ratification	High (Ratification is expected before COP 12 in 2014)	High		Ratification of Nagoya Protocol on ABS, National ABS regime in place, including relevant legal and policy frameworks	MOE, relevant industrial sectors, local communities, etc.
Target 17 – NBSAPs adopted	Status: NBSAP updating is progressing well and will be completed by the end of 2013	A new strategy and action plan in place to address major threats to biodiversity			High (Updated NBSAP will be available by end of 2013 and expected to be adopted as a legal document by the Parliament)		NBSAP updated NBSAP adopted as a legal document by the Parliament	All relevant stakeholders

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
Target 18 – Traditional knowledge respected	Status: Indigenous knowledge not fully documented	Low appreciation for IPs and their culture	The issuance in 2006 of NCIP Administrative Order No. 01 entitled Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) Guidelines. This was updated in 2013. From 2005 to 2008, NCIP has documented the indigenous knowledge systems and practices (IKSP) of 16 tribes nationwide. Other organizations have also contributed to documenting IKSPs		Medium	By 2020, traditional knowledge associated with biodiversity conservation and sustainable use will be documented and their application promoted.	Databases to document traditional knowledge established	MOE, Cultural agency, local and indigenous communities and so on.
Target 19 – Knowledge improved, shared and applied	Status: Lack of a systematic reporting system and a database that can help manage information needed for decision making Lack of an effective		-A Biodiversity Information Sharing Network established in 2002. -OBIS (Ocean Biogeographic Information System) node that will enable occurrence data					

Aichi Biodiversity Target	Part 1 Biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being		Part 2 The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity		Part 3 Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant Millennium Development Goals.			
	State of relevant biodiversity component or pressure	Impacts on or implications for human wellbeing	Implementation Actions/Case studies	Action Effectiveness	Assessment of progress towards Aichi Targets and MDGs	Proposed National Target	Indicators/ Other information	Stakeholders
	and sustained monitoring and evaluation mechanism has made it difficult to assess outcomes and impacts of biodiversity conservation efforts in the country		sharing within the region. -Several biodiversity monitoring tools have been developed. -The Biodiversity Monitoring System (BMS) was introduced in 1999 as a tool to collect data on priority species and resource use and to guide decision-making by the Protected Areas Management Board (PAMB).					
Target 20 – Financial resources increased	Status: Public expenditure for the environment and natural resources (ENR) sector is low		In 2009, DENR proposed a budget of PhP 12.4 Billion, 40.71% higher than the 2008 budget. The 2009 budget represents roughly 1% of the proposed total national budget of PhP 1.415 Trillion.	Low (Despite the increase, public expenditure still remains low considering the expanding mandate brought about by the enactment of recent laws and executive issuances)				

Annex III

**CONCLUSIONS OF THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR SOUTH, EAST AND
SOUTHEAST ASIA ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT
AND REGIONAL SCENARIO ANALYSIS**

Conclusions from the workshop on the fifth national report

- The workshop was timely and practical. However in the future it would be advisable not to split participants into two groups, as the preparation of national reports and scenario analysis can be linked.
- The workshop was helpful in both updating NBSAPs and preparing the fifth national report;
- Countries should initiate the process of preparing the fifth national report as early as possible to ensure they are ready by the deadline.
- The processes of updating NBSAPs and preparing the fifth national report should be linked considering that much of the work undertaken to update the NBSAPs can be directly used in the national report and *vice versa*;
- The guidelines for the fifth national report provide guidance on the scope, format and content of the fifth national reports, however countries have the flexibility to reflect their national situation in ways they see appropriate;
- Countries should try to do as much analysis as possible in the fifth national report, however it may be challenging considering time constraints for preparing such a report before the deadline;
- Information from reports prepared by countries for other relevant Conventions can be used in preparing the fifth national report;
- The best available data and information should be used in the fifth national report. However when data and information are limited expert opinion or assessments can be used;
- National reports should reflect national circumstances in a comprehensive way, including challenges in mobilizing resources for implementation;
- The usefulness of scenario analysis models is noted, however there are challenges particularly in terms of resources, technical capacities and sustainability;
- National targets should be developed in light of national circumstances while in line with Aichi Targets;
- The inadequacy of resources particularly level of funding for the preparation of the fifth national report is noted.

Conclusions from the workshop on scenario analysis:

- The methodology is helpful to understand how to assess biodiversity at the global, regional and national levels;
- It is close to reality and based on reliable data;
- The visualizations in maps and graphs are also helpful;
- The model(s) is/are a communication tool rather than a research instrument;
- The models add new information to existing data;
- The type of assessment meets the criteria of appropriate indicators;

- The model links impact with biodiversity by way of pressures = peoples actions;The concept uses the most important indicators for biodiversity loss:
 - loss of ecosystem area extent and
 - loss of biodiversity “quality” in remaining nature area/cultural landscapes.
- The tool offers to assess:
 - past, present and future/desired situations of (state)
 - production sectors (mainstreaming) and/or
 - governmental policy options (goal oriented indicator);
- It is important to show policy makers the impact of their own policies by using this tool;
- The results are for policy makers, not for biodiversity scientists only;
- Modelling can be a solution when data are not available and monitoring is too expensive;
- The tool is helpful in choosing best policy options and interventions as well as supporting policy decision making;
- Models must be mainstreamed and sustainability guaranteed by local people using it;
- Time is needed to learn and internalize relevant concepts and methodologies;
- Further understanding and in-depth technical training is needed;
- Efforts are needed to get the “best” data involved rather than “garbage in = garbage out”
- An internet application of such tools can be developed;
- The minimum data requirements for working the model is always possible and not difficult.

*Annex IV***LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

Document symbol	Document title
UNEP/CBD/RW/5NR-ESASI/1/1	Provisional agenda
UNEP/CBD/RW/5NR-ESASI/1/1/Add.1	Annotations to the provisional agenda
Relevant COP decisions, supporting tools and background documents	
Decision XI/3	Monitoring Progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets
Decision X/10	National reporting: review of experience and proposals for the fifth national report
Decision X/2	The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets
UNEP/CBD/COP/11/27	Monitoring Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, Including Progress in the Preparation of the Fourth Edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook
UNEP/CBD/COP/10/8	Implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan and Progress Towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target
UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/2	Suggested Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets
UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/3	Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020: Provisional Technical Rationale, Possible Indicators and Suggested Milestones for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets
UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/3	Global Biodiversity Outlook: Considerations for the preparation of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook
	Guidelines and a resource manual for the fifth national report available at the CBD website at http://www.cbd.int/nr5/
	Reports of Workshops on the Preparation of the Fourth National Reports available at http://www.cbd.int/reports/nr4/workshops/
	Report of the first meeting of the Advisory Group for GBO-4 http://www.cbd.int/gbo/gbo4/UNEP-CBD-GBO-4AG-2.pdf
	Technical report: Current and future status of biodiversity in Central America: http://www.sica.int/ccad/temporal/NAGOYA/INFORMEGLOBIO.pdf
	GBO3: BIODIVERSITY SCENARIOS: PROJECTIONS OF 21st CENTURY CHANGE IN BIODIVERSITY AND ASSOCIATED ECOSYSTEM SERVICES http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-50-en.pdf
	GBO2: Cross -Roads of Life on Earth Exploring means to meet the 2010 Biodiversity Target http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-31.pdf
UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/11 (2012),	Proceedings from the expert group meeting on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development and the expert group analysis of the root causes of, and inter-linkages between, biodiversity loss and poverty
UNEP/CBD/RW/5NR-AFR-LDC/1/2 UNEP/CBD/RW/5NR-AFR-LDC/2/2	Reports of the First and Second Regional Workshops for African Least Developed Countries on the Preparation of the Fifth National Report and regional scenario analysis