
2. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) gave the opening presentation on behalf of Mr. Lijie Cai of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). He presented the recent Decision of the Fourteenth meeting of the Convention of the Parties (COP 14) to the CBD regarding the synchronization of national reporting (Decision 14/27), the assessment of effectiveness in the implementation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) (Decision 14/28) and the voluntary peer review mechanism (Decision 14/29) which are meant to assist the Parties in enhancing their reporting on the implementation of their commitments to the Convention. He thereafter went to highlight the various sections of the 6th National Reports (6NR) to the CBD citing examples from CBD Parties to show how these are written up for the ASEAN Member States to emulate in finalizing their 6NR.

3. The ACB led the discussion on the interactions of the AMS on the use of the CBD Online Reporting Tool in the preparation of their 6NR from the previous Aichi Targets Workshops held last March and October 2018 in Manila, Philippines. She described how the AMS encountered some difficulties in the format of the online 6NR, such as on relating the international target and the national target. She underlined the importance of providing CBD Secretariat feedback on the experiences of the AMS in order for them to refine the CBD Online Reporting Tool. India, Myanmar, the Philippines and Thailand shared their experiences in preparing their corresponding 6NRs with brief mention of lessons learned and challenges encountered.

4. The first workshop session dealt with the experiences of the AMS in using tools to evaluate NBSAP implementation with emphasis on Aichi Target 11. The first group, comprised of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Singapore, and Myanmar indicated that the stakeholder consultation was one of the primary tool they used. Other means mentioned in evaluating their NBSAP implementation especially on Aichi Target 11 were literature review, case studies, online platform, expert assessment and national indicators. They also cited some challenges that they encountered which delved on difficulties in getting data from other ministries, as well as limited capacity and funding.
5. The second group, comprised of Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia also reported using stakeholder consultations as a tool to evaluate their implementation of their NBSAPs, as well focus group discussions, knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) surveys. They also engaged consultants to cull out and synthesize information for further assessments. Some of the challenges they encountered included discrepancy in data due to area overlapping and differing map scales, among others.

6. Presentations were also made on the Situationers relating to Aichi Target 11. On Key Biodiversity areas (KBAs), the ACB reported on a new guideline for KBAs which enables the updating of initial KBA data. An exchange of views followed on the acceptability of KBA findings and the need for the AMS to validate the data such that each country now should set up national KBA committees. Also highlighted in the discussion was the importance of country ownership of these data. The workshop noted that given the availability of KBA data, it will be easier to move the discussion to the policy-making. This should also help guide decision-makers on whether to provide gazettlement to these areas which may potentially become protected areas.

7. As a continuation to the presentations on Situationers relating to Aichi Target 11, the ACB presented on the outcomes of the initial workshop on Aichi Target 11 last July 2018 in Manila, Philippines, which was also presented during COP 14 in Sharm-El-Sheikh, Egypt. Dr. Scott Perkin, Head of IUCN Asia Regional Office, talked about the Asia Protected Area Partnerships and the IUCN Green List as measures on how the AMS may enhance their implementation of their Aichi Target 11 commitments. Dr. Madhu Rao, Senior Regional Advisor of WCS, gave a comprehensive introduction on other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), which should guide AMS on how they may use the new concept to expand their level of achievement relating to Aichi Target 11. Dr. Mark Grindley, Myanmar Country Director of FFI, dissected the latest figures relating to Aichi Target 11 implementation relating to Southeast Asia. He also highlighted specific and innovative ways of conservation ecosystems and biodiversity in Myanmar ranging from locally-managed marine areas to peace zones. Ms. Florence Daguitan, Programme Coordinator of Tebtebba Foundation, showed the various ways how community-conserved areas contribute to the conservation of cultural and biological diversity. Ms. Luz Teresa Baskiñas, Vice-President for Project Development of WWF-Philippines, reported on their activities on enhancing protected area management in the Philippines. Lastly, Mr. Kahlil Panopio, Conservation Specialist of Haribon-Philippines, showed their activities to enhance Alliance for Zero Extinction which addresses Aichi Target 11.

8. A panel discussion was also organized to tackle on what more can be done to achieve Aichi Target 11 in the ASEAN region. Mr. Agus Budi Utomo, Regional Vice-Chair for Southeast Asia of the IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) suggested two over-arching questions on how the AMS may proceed further in implementing their Aichi Target 11 commitments: a) what are the national plans to strengthen national protected area networks, b) what are the plans to complement protected area networks with OECMs, which in essence are recognized but are established as protected areas. Dr. Suneetha Subramanian, Research Fellow of the UNU-IIGH, reported on the Satoyama Initiative, which are socio-
economic production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS) that can be another approach to further promote OECMs.

9. On the workshop session on the national SMART Action Plan to accelerate implementation of Aichi Target 11, the ACB started off on presenting the identified action plans of the AMS from the previous workshop on Aichi Target 11 to show which elements of Aichi Target 11 are needed to be identified into a more specific SMART action plans. The AMS reported which among the actions they have set out in their SMART Action Plans they will prioritize. The ASEAN Secretariat and invited international organisations also contributed in providing their priority actions to achieve Aichi Target 11. These priority actions and the requirements or needs to achieve these actions should be taken as initial ideas and suggestions and should not in any way be taken as statements of official policy. Below are the results of the workshop session:

### Priority Aichi Target 11 SMART Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASEAN MEMBER STATES</th>
<th>PRIORITY ACTIONS UNTIL OCTOBER 2020</th>
<th>NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>- identify new potential RAMSAR site by 2020;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- potential OECMs: 7 sites in Banteay Meanchey Province as Natural Heritage Site (forest, bat cave, wildlife, historical buildings, and ecotourism area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- expert in site identification and assessment; technical support, tools, and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- financial support for site establishment and community outreach, education, and skills in sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>- designate customary forest (sustainable use of non-timber and forest products)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- capacity-building for local communities (knowledge of conservation-based management of customary forest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>- stop hydropower development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- stop perimeter development for mining project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- remove 24 areas for National Biodiversity Conservation Area (NCBA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- national strategy: forest cover 70% for 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- identify new potential areas for RAMSAR sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASEAN MEMBER STATES</th>
<th>PRIORITY ACTIONS UNTIL OCTOBER 2020</th>
<th>NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Malaysia            | - execute ecological fiscal transfer (EFT)  
                      - implement objectives in National Framework for Protected Areas  
                      - update protected area (PA) masterlist | - inputs/examples of OECMs from other countries  
                      - possible OECM categories (e.g. fisheries conservation zones) |
| Myanmar             | - increase in PAs (terrestrial and marine)  
                      - approve proposed PAs  
                      - identify new potential sites for PAs  
                      - identify and recognize community-conserved protected areas  
                      - Ecological representation  
                      - establish new PAs in different ecoregions (NBSAP 2015-2020, p. 74)  
                      - Effective management and equity  
                      - collaboration with relevant I/NGOs  
                      - co-management  
                      - Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)  
                      - management plans  
                      - OECMs  
                      - identify and recognize OECMs  
                      - inventory of eligible areas (LMMAs, fish conservation areas)  
                      - Over-all coordination  
                      - coordination through National Biodiversity Conservation Committee (NBCC)  
                      - Connectivity and Corridors  
                      - landscape plan for Dona Tanintharyi Landscape  
                      - marine landscape project (WCS, FFI)  
                      - Myeik (Auckland Bay) mangrove landscape project  
                      - connection between Lampi Marin PA, Langan Island Groups, Moscos Island groups in southern part of Myanmar  
                      - WCS-FFI Rakhine marine areas connectivity project  
                      - Integration into wider integration | - funding for consultation process among various stakeholders)  
                      - active participation  
                      - increased staffing, equipment, capacity development  
                      - gap analysis in ecological representation of PAs; budgets, experts/technical support  
                      - funding, staff, equipment, capacity development  
                      - funding for workshops  
                      - active participation from different working groups under NBCC  
                      - funding |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASEAN MEMBER STATES</th>
<th>PRIORITY ACTIONS UNTIL OCTOBER 2020</th>
<th>NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **seascape/landscapes**  
• connectivity | | |
| Philippines | - completion and approval of National PA System Master Plan  
- establish and operationalize area management academy by 2020  
- map and document ICCAs (spatial disaggregation of ICCAs within PAs and outside PAs) | - funding for roll-out; donor’s forum  
- funding support  
- funding for mapping; ground-truthing, and for collation of existing data |
| Thailand | - enhance understanding and integrating management of PAs and other conservation areas under OECMs, RAMSAR | - handbook or guidelines for clarity for all conservation areas |
| ASEAN Secretariat | - refer to the AWGNCB Action Plan, component # 1 Protected Areas for terrestrial: (baseline: 13% (ABO2, 2017; target: 17%))  
- refer to AWGCME Action Plan - at least 8 coastal/marine areas designated as ASEAN Heritage Parks  
- on Management Effectiveness - AWGNCB Action Plan - to be included in the next Regional Action Plan for AHP Post-2020 | |
| IUCN | | - training in the Green List standard for AMS  
- free membership in APAP for AMS PA agencies and free participation in technical workshops |
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