



# CORAL TRIANGLE INITIATIVE

ON CORAL REEFS, FISHERIES AND FOOD SECURITY

## MINUTES OF MEETING



### **Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group Meeting**

ADB, Pasig City, Philippines  
25 April and 28 April 2012



**USAID** | **ASIA**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



# Contents

<b>I. Minutes of CTI MEWG Informal Meeting.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>TWG members and partners present.....</i>	4
<i>Proceedings .....</i>	4
1. Background.....	4
a. Welcome .....	4
b. Opening .....	4
c. Statement from the MEWG Chair .....	5
d. Meeting objectives.....	5
e. Agenda.....	5
2. Discussion.....	6
a. MEWG history, focal points and tasks as requested by SOM .....	6
b. CT6 updates on SCTR.....	7
c. Proposed CTI-CFF Indicators.....	7
d. Proposed draft TOR of MEWG .....	8
e. Other matters .....	9
3. Adjournment.....	9
<b>2. Minutes of CTI MEWG Organizational and 1<sup>st</sup> Formal Meeting.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>TWG members and partners present.....</i>	10
<i>Proceedings .....</i>	10
1. Background.....	10
a. Opening.....	10
b. Agenda .....	10
2. Discussion.....	11
a. Review and adoption of draft TOR.....	11
b. Election of CTI MEWG Chair and Vice Chair .....	11
c. Review of proposed set of indicators.....	11
d. Proposed list of MEWG-related activities and tasks and roadmap.....	11
3. Other Matters.....	12
a. Next MEWG meeting.....	12
b. MEWG country focal points.....	12
c. MEWG Concept Proposal to the HLFRR .....	12
4. Adjournment.....	13
<b>3. Annexes.....</b>	<b>14</b>

3.1. Fully annotated Draft CTI-CFF Indicators Table summarizing participant comments and suggested revisions from 25 April 2012 M&E Workshop Meeting.....	14
3.1.1. Goal 1 Target 1.1.....	14
3.1.2. Goal 1 Target 1.2.....	15
3.1.3. Goal 2 Target 2.1.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.1.4. Goal 2 Target 2.2.....	19
3.1.5. Goal 2 Target 2.3.....	21
3.1.6. Goal 2 Target 2.4.....	23
3.1.7. Goal 3 Target 3.1.....	26
3.1.8. Goal 4 Target 4.1.....	28
3.1.9. Goal 4 Target 4.2.....	30
3.1.10 Goal 5 Target 5.1.....	30
3.2. Draft CTI-CFF Indicators Table from 25 April 2011 M&E Workshop Meeting.....	33
3.2.1 Goal 1 Target 1.1.....	33
3.2.2 Goal 1 Target 1.2.....	33
3.2.3 Goal 2 Target 2.1.....	35
3.2.4 Goal 2 Target 2.2.....	36
3.2.5 Goal 2 Target 2.3.....	37
3.2.6 Goal 2 Target 2.4.....	39
3.2.7 Goal 3 Target 3.1.....	41
3.2.8 Goal 4 Target 4.1.....	43
3.2.9 Goal 4 Target 4.2.....	45
3.2.10 Goal 5 Target 5.1.....	45
3.3. Full text of final revised TOR as amended by the MEWG on 28 April 2012.....	48
1.0. Purpose and Tasks of the MEWG.....	48
2.0. Membership and Structure.....	48
3.0. Program Planning and Coordination.....	48
4.0. Administrative Support to the MEWG.....	49
5.0. Financial Arrangements.....	49
3.4. Full text of draft indicators, as amended and annotated by the MEWG on 28 April 2012.....	50
Goal 1 -- Priority seascapes designated and effectively managed.....	50
Goal 2 -- Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied.....	50
Goal 3 -- Marine protected areas (MPAs) established and effectively managed.....	51
Goal 4 -- Climate change adaptation measures achieved.....	52
Goal 5 -- Threatened species status improving.....	52
3.5. List of Participants.....	53

## **I. Minutes of CTI MEWG Informal Meeting**

**ADB, Pasig City, Philippines**

**25 April 2012**

### ***TWG members and partners present***

Ms Agnetha Vave-Karamui (Solomon Islands)  
Ms Rosalie Masu (Solomon Islands)  
U/Sec Manuel Gerochi (Philippines)  
Ms Theresa Mundita Lim (Philippines)  
Ms Luz Teresa Baskinas (Philippines)  
Mr. Jacob F. Meimban (Philippines)  
Ms Lynette Laroya (Philippines)  
Ms Vera Horigue (Philippines)  
Dr. Darmawan (CTI Regional Secretariat)

Mr. John Erick Avelino (DENR-Philippines)  
Dr. Alan T. White (TNC)  
Ms Annick Cros (CT Atlas/TNC)  
Ms Annabelle Trinidad (ADB/KM)  
Mr. Patrick Co (WWF)  
Dr. Rebecca Weeks (JCU)  
Mr. Reniel Cabral (ADB/KM)  
Mr. Nygiel Armada (PI)  
Mr. William Jatulan (PI)

### ***Proceedings***

This informal workshop meeting was called to prepare for the organizational and 1<sup>st</sup> formal meeting of the CTI Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG) set for 28 April 2012. The meeting started at 8:58am. It was hosted by the Philippines and presided by the Philippines as Chair, with Ms Baskinas serving as Lead Facilitator.

#### **I. Background**

##### **a. Welcome**

NCC-Philippines Chair Gerochi welcomed participants to the meeting. Underscoring “the need to systematically measure our efforts,” he said, “Without the support of a strong M&E system, it will be very difficult for the thematic working groups to understand how well they are doing and perform with any certainty that they are moving in the right direction.” He expressed frustration that although CTI “has projected an image that we are definitely successful in what we’re doing,” it has not progressed fast enough for the CT6 to actually start operationalizing the actions that they have agreed to. This was a matter that he had to take up with the SOM, he said. But in the meantime, the M&E system must put in place to generate the information that the SOM and other decision-makers need to take action. “The keyword is urgency,” he added.

##### **b. Opening**

In his opening remarks, CTI-CFF Interim Regional Secretariat Coordinator Dr. Darmawan traced the history of the MEWG, which was created in 2008 with the Philippines serving as ad hoc Chair. Since its initial establishment, the MEWG has identified and formulated measurable indicators for each target of the five goals in the CTI-CFF RPOA; developed a factsheet for each indicator on baseline information and requirements for measurement; and developed tables for insertion of numerical targets for each indicator by country. “These results have been

presented to CT6 countries; however, so far, there has been no feedback... and quantitative targets and baselines have yet to be established by the CT6,” Dr. Darmawan said. Noting that this informal MEWG meeting was scheduled around a workshop on the State of the Coral Triangle Report (SCTR) which emphasizes the higher level outcomes of CTI-CFF, Dr. Darmawan added that he hoped the TWG “would also develop indicators for the higher level objectives of CTI-CFF which are (i) sustained ecosystem services from coral reefs; (ii) sustained incomes and productivity from fisheries, and (iii) improved food security.”

**c. Statement from the MEWG Chair**

Ms Lim, current M&E focal point for the Philippines and Chair of MEWG, also spoke briefly to the group. She said she could only attend the morning sessions because of another commitment but would try to actively participate “as far as I can.” She added, “We need to make progress on the outcome of this working group. A lot of things are happening and we’re being overtaken by events.”

**d. Meeting objectives**

Ms Baskinas presented the meeting objectives listed below. She said a separate presentation on the outputs of this meeting would be given to members of the MEWG who were expected to arrive later in the day.

- 1) Updates on M&E tasks
- 2) Revisit the proposed set of M&E indicators -- The MEWG prepared a list of indicators (variables) for each target in the RPOA. “We need the help of the countries and partners to identify the quantitative and qualitative targets for each of the indicators,” Ms Baskinas said. She noted that:
  1. Indicators for CCA and MPA had been discussed and updated by the respective TWGs and would be further reviewed during this meeting.
  2. Indicators for EAFM would be reviewed here and further discussed at the next EAFM Regional Exchange in May 2012.
  3. The RPOA goals on seascapes and threatened species would be also presented at this meeting
- 3) Discuss membership and structure of the MEWG
- 4) Discuss the functions, general terms of reference (TOR), and tasks of the MEWG -- The MEWG had been an ad hoc group since it was formed in 2008; the meeting set for Saturday 28 April 2012 would be an organizational meeting toward formally constituting the group through the adoption of a draft TOR that would be endorsed to the SOM8 for confirmation. The review of this draft TOR was therefore a priority item in this meeting’s agenda.
- 5) Discuss the operational procedures and requirements of the MEWG
- 6) Discuss the list of MEWG-related activities and tasks and a roadmap to accomplish this.

**e. Agenda**

- 1) **MEWG history, focal points and tasks as requested by SOM.** This was to orient participants on the functions and work done by the MEWG since its creation in 2008.

- 2) **CT6 updates on SCTR.** This discussion focused in particular on Chapter 6 of SCTR on M&E, the role of the MEWG in the preparation of the SCTR and the role of the SCTR writers in the MEWG
- 3) **Proposed CTI-CFF indicators.** This involved the review of a proposed set of indicators for each target of the five goals of CTI-CFF under its RPOA for 2010-2020.
- 4) **Proposed draft TOR of MEWG.** A proposed draft of the MEWG TOR was presented and reviewed in this session. The review covered the following key elements of the draft TOR:
  - Scope, roles and functions of the MEWG
  - Membership and structure of the MEWG
  - Operational procedures and requirements of the MEWG

## 2. Discussion

Before the start of the business sessions, Ms Baskinas told participants that the meeting would be “very informal” and encouraged them to ask questions at any point during the sessions.

### a. MEWG history, focal points and tasks as requested by SOM

Ms Baskinas quickly ran through some of the highlights of the MEWG’s work, as follows:

- 1) Since its formation in 2008, the MEWG had been working on an ad hoc basis to develop the full CTI M&E system. The draft indicators have been presented to the SOM a number of times and further developed according to the SOM’s recommendations. An important challenge has been the development of quantitative targets for each of the indicators. The current draft that would be reviewed in this meeting included measurable indicators, but the targets still needed to be defined. Ms Baskinas said she hoped the group could help identify some of the targets.
- 2) There was a proposal from the NCC-Philippines Chair to set regional targets in addition to country aggregates that would be reported at the regional level.
- 3) SOM6 in Manado tasked the MEWG to develop an activity status and output tracking sheet for the nine regional priority actions, which involves tracking activities, not the indicators. The MEWG submitted its first status report to SOM7 in Jakarta last year.
- 4) The CT6 have already nominated their representatives to the MEWG but the list probably needs updating. The group would take time during this meeting to define some membership rules for the MEWG and decide if the writers of the SCTR and CTI partners should become members of the group.
- 5) SOM7 directed the Regional Secretariat to facilitate linkages between the MEWG and the thematic working groups. SOM7 also agreed to conduct the organizational and 1<sup>st</sup> formal meeting of the MEWG to start the process of formalizing the group.

- 6) The group hopes to again present its draft indicators to the upcoming SOM8 in 2012.

#### **b. CT6 updates on SCTR**

- 1) The SCTR will be produced periodically up to the end of the RPOA effective date. Ms Baskinas said MEWG follows a policy of inclusiveness, and asked the group for their views about inviting the SCTR writers to the MEWG. She explained that although in the Philippines SCTR writers are working closely with the MEWG (many of them are also MEWG members), “there is no link yet between the MEWG and the SCTR writers” at the regional level. But there is opportunity to establish such link when the regional SCTR writing team is organized during this week’s SCTR meeting.
- 2) Ms Trinidad (ADB/KM) said it would be wise for the SCTR team to become part of the MEWG, “so that the SCTR has a home already in one of the recognized working groups of the CTI-CFF.” Those present agreed that merging the SCTR team into the MEWG is a good idea. “The MEWG would be the relevant working group to have these inputs from the different TWGs because the SCTR outline says the countries should report against the indicators,” Ms. Vave-Karamui (Solomon Islands) noted.
- 3) Ms Trinidad remarked that the SCTR process is highly inclusive in that it is open to partners and all others who can contribute to the process. “I think we have to recognize and identify these institutions, and I have requested Dr. Darmawan to formalize the invitations,” she added. Dr. Darmawan reminded participants that as a technical working group, MEWG is “an open forum where the core members are the CT6 and partners and others are welcome to join.”
- 4) Ms Cros (CT Atlas/TNC) said it would be good for the CT Atlas to know “the roles of the MEWG members, and who is collecting data for the indicators.”
- 5) Dr. Darmawan proposed the creation of a CTI index that would contribute to the development of the CTI brand. Dr. White said the index could include just a few indicators and should be dynamic, “because we don’t have baseline data for all of the indicators.”
- 6) Ms Lim (Philippines) suggested that this would be the right time to consider the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, “since all countries are party to the CBD and there are targets there on MPAs and other aspects of the marine environment.” She added, “If we can, let’s have that at the back of our minds so in the CBD COP in Hyderabad, we can report the contribution of CTI-CFF with respect to the global targets for biodiversity.”

#### **c. Proposed CTI-CFF Indicators**

- 1) The review of the proposed CTI-CFF indicators took up most of the day and produced two main outputs:
  - a. An annotated CTI-CFF Indicators Table (Annex 1) summarizing participant comments and suggested revisions; and
  - b. A draft CTI-CFF Indicators Table (Annex 2) that includes a revised set of indicator statements and descriptions based on participant comments and suggestions.

- 2) The draft CTI-CFF Indicator Table will be taken up further during the 1<sup>st</sup> formal MEWG meeting on 28 April 2012 and considered for endorsement to the concerned thematic working groups. It will then be submitted to the respective TWGs:
  - a. MPA – Philippines as MPA TWG Chair, supported by Dr. White
  - b. CCA – Indonesia as CCA TWG Chair, through Mr. Eko Rudianto (CTI-CFF Interim Regional Secretariat), supported by Dr. Catherine Courtney (PI) and Ms Britt Parker (NOAA)
  - c. Seascapes – Indonesia as Seascapes TWG Chair through Mr. Eko Rudianto
  - d. Threatened Species – Philippines as MPA TWG Chair (Goal 5 has been “adopted” by the MPA TWG), supported by Dr. White
  - e. EAFM – Malaysia as EAFM TWG Chair, supported by Dr. Robert Pomeroy (CTSP) and Mr. Armada (PI)
- 3) Dr. Darmawan said that if the MEWG agrees, the draft CTI-CFF Indicator Table could be presented as a product for the CTI-CFF booth being planned for the ICRS in July 2012.

#### **d. Proposed draft TOR of MEWG**

- 1) Ms Baskinas presented the draft TOR for the group to review, focusing in particular on the following three elements: (1) scope, roles and functions of the MEWG; membership and structure of the MEWG; and (3) operational procedures and requirements of the MEWG.
- 2) The functions, general TOR and tasks of the MEWG are defined by SOM6 (*Attachment 9-2: TOR for CTI Thematic Working Group*).
- 3) On the MEWG-specific elements of the TOR:
  - Under Tasks:
    - a. Add “Develop a CTI-CFF Index.”
    - b. Dr. Darmawan said the SCTR is a report of the MEWG, but a decision has to be made whether or not the SCTR should be the overall report of the MEWG, or a “partial report” (the current version does not cover all the M&E indicators). “At some point, you may want to have only one report, or it could be one of several reports,” he pointed out.
    - c. Add: “Consider CBD/Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the development of the CTI-CFF targets for MPAs and other aspects of the marine environment.”



d. Add: “Develop mechanism/protocol for CT Atlas to serve the MEWG’s GIS needs and develop and maintain the MEWG’s database system.”

- Under *Membership*:

- a. Consider adding for clarity: “Only CT6 representatives can serve as Chair and Vice Chair.”

- b. Consider adding for clarity: “Partners are non-voting members and cannot be nominated for Chair or Vice Chair.”

- Under *Monitoring and Reporting of Progress*:

- a. Take second bullet out and replace with a task statement that covers not only review but also preparation of SCTR

- Under *Financial Arrangements*:

- a. Dr. Darmawan corrected the task statement from “The MEWG will extend assistance in mobilizing financial resources...” to “In coordination with the Regional Secretariat, the MEWG shall mobilize financial resources...”

4) Others

- Mr. Armada observed that the M&E indicators “are quite dynamic” and suggested that there should be a provision in the TOR to develop through the CTI-CFF process a mechanism that will allow the MEWG to recommend to the SOM (or any CTI-CFF-prescribed protocol, such as through the Regional Secretariat) new indicators or revisions to indicators to ensure that the indicators remain current and relevant.

**e. Other matters**

- l) Responding to a question from Mr. Jatulan, Ms. Baskinas announced that the organizational meeting of the MEWG is an open session. “Everybody can come,” she said.

**3. Adjournment**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:48pm.

## 2. Minutes of CTI MEWG Organizational and 1<sup>st</sup> Formal Meeting Asian Development Bank, Pasig City, Philippines 28 April 2012

### **TWG members and partners present**

Dr. Dirhamsyah (Indonesia)	Dr. Darmawan (CTI Regional Secretariat)
Dr. Connie Fay Komilus (Malaysia)	Dr. Alan T. White (TNC)
Dr. Norasma Dacho (Malaysia)	Mr. Egide Cantin (TNC)
Ms Nurul Ainy binti Yahya (Malaysia)	Ms Annabelle Trinidad (ADB/KM)
Ms Luz Teresa Baskinas (Philippines/MEWG Secretariat)	Ms Jackie Thomas (WWF)
Mr. Jacob F. Meimban (Philippines/Chair)	Mr. Patrick Co (WWF)
Ms Lynette Laroya (Philippines)	Ms Dolores Ariadne D. Fabunan (GIZ)
Ms Agnetha Vave-Karamui (Solomon Islands)	Dr. Maria Beger (UQ)
Ms Rosalie Masu (Solomon Islands)	Mr. John Erick Avelino (DENR-Philippines)
Mr. Aleixo Leonito Amaral (Timor- Leste)	Ms Nora Rombano (DENR-Philippines)
	Mr. Nygiel Armada (PI)
	Mr. William Jatulan (PI)

### **Proceedings**

The meeting of the CTI Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG) was hosted by the Philippines and presided by Mr Jacob Meimban, representing the Philippines as *ad hoc* MEWG Chair, with Dr. Darmawan of the CTI Interim Regional Secretariat co-chairing. The six member countries of CTI, except PNG, were represented. The meeting was called to order at 9:19a.m.

#### **I. Background**

This meeting would be the 1<sup>st</sup> formal meeting of the CTI MEWG since its formation in 2008. With MEWG members serving on *ad hoc* basis up to this point, it would also serve as an organizational meeting to formalize the group's structure and membership. In addition, it would review the outputs of the 25 March 2012 MEWG informal workshop meeting.

##### **a. Opening**

The Chair opened the meeting with a short welcome statement, and requested those present to introduce themselves.

##### **b. Agenda**

The Chair presented the following meeting agenda, which was adopted by the body with no opposition.

#### **1) Review and adoption of draft TOR**

**(i) Proposed scope, roles and functions of the MEWG.** This would cover *Section 1.0. Purpose and Tasks of the MEWG* of the draft TOR.

**(ii) Proposed membership and structure.** This agenda item was to review *Section 2.0. Membership and Structure* of the draft TOR.

(iii) **Proposed operational procedures, requirements and communication protocols of the MEWG.** This agenda item referred to the following sections of the draft TOR:  
*Section 3.0. Program Planning and Coordination*  
*Section 4.0. Administrative Support to the MEWG*  
*Section 5.0. Financial Arrangements*

- 2) **Election of CTI MEWG Chair and Vice Chair.** This would formalize the designation of the Chair and Vice Chair.
- 3) **Proposed set of indicators.** This included a formal review of a set of draft indicators toward their adoption for endorsement to the SOM by the MEWG acting in their official capacity as a technical working group. The draft indicators were prepared earlier by the M&E Resource Team and submitted to but never taken up in the SOM. They were previously revised and updated by the *ad hoc* MEWG and MEWG Resource Team during their informal meeting on 25 April 2012, and then again during a workshop session on 27 April 2012 at the Regional State of the Coral Triangle Workshop (SCTR).
- 4) **Proposed list of MEWG-related activities, tasks and roadmap.** A list of proposed activities and tasks toward developing the full CTI M&E system, along with a roadmap for accomplishing them, would be presented for the MEWG's approval.
- 5) **Other matters.** This agenda item covered all other matters that might be brought up by members of the body, including the schedule and agenda of the next MEWG meeting.

## 2. Discussion

### a. Review and adoption of draft TOR

Led by the Chair and MEWG Secretariat, the body reviewed and revised section by section the draft TOR from the M&E workshop meeting on 25 April. The full text of the TOR, as amended by the MEWG during this meeting, is shown in Annex 3.3. On motion by Malaysia (Dr. Dacho), the MEWG adopted the TOR, as amended, for endorsement to SOM8.

### b. Election of CTI MEWG Chair and Vice Chair

The Philippines was elected MEWG Chair and Malaysia was elected Vice Chair on motion by Malaysia (Dr. Dacho) and Timor-Leste (Mr. Amaral), respectively.

### c. Review of proposed set of indicators

The body reviewed and revised the indicators and agreed to (1) officially endorse the indicators, as amended and annotated, to the five thematic working groups of CTI-CFF, and (2) formally request the respective thematic working groups and resource teams to provide the appropriate description for each indicator. The full text of the draft indicators, as amended and annotated by the MEWG during this meeting, is shown in Annex 3.4.

### d. Proposed list of MEWG-related activities and tasks and roadmap

The proposed activity/task list was adopted by the body, as amended (revisions are shown below in red text – additions are bolded, deletions are shown crossed-out; annotations are highlighted in yellow):

### **MEWG Activity/Task List**

April 2012 – Present MEWG Concept Proposal to the CTI-CFF High Level Financial Roundtable to be hosted by Asian Development Bank (ADB) on May 2-5, 2012

May 2012 – Present Goal 2 indicators at the EAFM Regional Exchange in Malaysia

June Aug 2012 – Formulate mechanism to complete M&E system (Note: USCTI to provide technical assistance)

July 2012 – Finalize list of indicators and descriptions and submit to CTI Interim Regional Secretariat for dissemination to the CT6, possibly at the launching of the SCTR at the ICRS (Cairns, Australia)

Sep 2012 – Prepare MEWG annual work plan and financial plan for presentation to SOM8

### **3. Other Matters**

#### **a. Next MEWG meeting**

The body agreed to meet again in September 2012 to prepare for their presentation of the full CTI M&E system and final list of indicators to SOM8. No decision was made on whether the meeting would be virtual or face-to-face, although the Secretariat pointed out that the MEWG planned for only one face-to-face meeting every year.

- i. **Host.** The Solomon Islands (Ms. Vave-Karamui) formally requested the Philippines, as MEWG Chair, to host the meeting; the Chair noted the request and asked the Secretariat to coordinate on the matter with NCC-Philippines.
- ii. **Agenda.** USCTI Lead for MEWG Dr. White suggested that the MEWG might consider, as a discussion point in their correspondence leading up to their proposed September 2012 meeting, the possible role of the MEWG in the management of M&E information system. He recommended that this additional role should be spelled out in the MEWG TOR and could be officially taken up in the next meeting. The Regional Secretariat concurred.

#### **b. MEWG country focal points**

The Co-Chair reminded the countries to submit the names of their respective focal points to the MEWG; the MEWG Secretariat will follow up on this request. The Solomon Islands (Ms Vave-Karamui) indicated that their previously named focal points are still current.

#### **c. MEWG Concept Proposal to the HLFR**

The Philippines presented a concept proposal for the CTI-CFF High Level Financial Roundtable hosted by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) on 3 May 2012. The proposal was for USD550,000 funding to support the development of the CTI M&E system, specifically: (1) Technical assistance to the MEWG in developing the M&E system; (2) Regional workshop to validate/ enhance the M&E system and process framework and developing communication messages; and (3) Development and production of IEC materials.

- i. The Chair instructed the MEWG Secretariat to note down, for consideration in future discussions with donors, Indonesia's (Dr. Dirhamsyah) suggestion that the proposal should include country

allocations to enable each country to collect primary data for the M&E system.

- ii. The MEWG Secretariat pointed out that the technical assistance requested under concept proposal for the HLFR included a needs-and-resources assessment to guide priorities for subsequent technical assistance proposals.

#### **4. Adjournment**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10pm.

### 3. Annexes

#### 3.1. Fully annotated Draft CTI-CFF Indicators Table summarizing participant comments and suggested revisions from 25 April 2012 M&E Workshop Meeting

##### 3.1.1. Goal 1 Target 1.1

Goal 1: Priority Seascapes Designated and Effectively Managed			
Target 1.1 (Intermediate Result): "Priority Seascapes" designated, with investment plans complemented and sequenced by 2012			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
1.1.1	Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes designated	A seascape is a large marine management area defined by ecological considerations. Designation means that the seascape is recognized by national and/or transboundary/international agreements. The target for this goal is to designate a set of priority seascapes across the Coral Triangle to serve as the geographic focus of major investments and action during 2010 to 2020. Comprehensive <i>Seascape Investment Plans</i> for each priority seascape are completed, along with an overall scheme for the sequencing of investments across the 10-year timeframe of the <i>CTI Plan of Action</i> . [2012].	<p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> No need for "the sq.km" because it doesn't have any relevancy. It has to be the "number of designated seascape complete WITH its investment plan. Not just any seascape.</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISION:</b> Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes designated with investment plans</p>
1.1.2.	Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes under improved management	Improved management will be defined for each seascape by benchmarks for integrated coastal management that includes criteria for effectively managed -marine protected area management, fisheries management, and enforcement. The existence of and support for management plans that cover all or part of the seascape is also a prerequisite to qualify for "improved management" of the seascape.	<p><b>METACARD:</b> (Move to 1.2.1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include in indicator aspects of threatened species and climate change management initiatives in the design of the seascape (check description)</li> <li>2. Include in description local communities considered and involved in seascape management</li> </ol> <p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Deleted</p>

**3.1.2. Goal 1 Target 1.2**

Goal 1: Priority Seascapes Designated and Effectively Managed			
Target 1.2 (Intermediate Result): Marine and coastal resources within all "Priority Seascapes" are being sustainably managed			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
1.2.1 (PROPOSED)			<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED/NEW INDICATOR:</b> (from 1.1.2) Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes under improved management <i>Include in indicator aspects of threatened species and climate change management initiatives in the design of the seascape (check description)</i></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> (Description will define sustainably managed based on the seascape pillars, in the RPOA)</p> <p>Improved management will be defined for each seascape by benchmarks for integrated coastal management that includes criteria for effectively managed -marine protected area management, fisheries management, and enforcement. The existence of and support for management plans that cover all or part of the seascape is also a prerequisite to qualify for "improved management" of the seascape <i>(Include in description local communities considered and involved in seascape management)</i></p> <p>Text from RPOA:</p> <p>The general "model" referenced under REGIONAL ACTION 1 below will draw upon experience, best practices, and lessons learned to date on key elements of seascape programs, such as (but not limited to): (i) governance through appropriate institutions; (ii) marine protected area (MPA) networks; (iii) ecosystem-based management, including an ecosystem approach to fisheries management; (iv) integrated coastal management; (v) private sector engagement; (vi) enabling legal framework (conventions, laws, regulations, and policies); (vii) social and political support/commitment; (viii) sustainable financing; (ix) communications program; and (x) scientific research and monitoring.</p>

<b>Goal 1: Priority Seascapes Designated and Effectively Managed</b>			
<b>Target 1.2 (Intermediate Result): Marine and coastal resources within all "Priority Seascapes" are being sustainably managed</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Potential Revisions</b>
1.2.2	<b>Value (in US\$) of funding leveraged through sustainable financing schemes and private sector partnerships relative to the investment plan requirements</b>	A seascape is a large marine management area defined by ecological considerations. Designation means that the seascape is recognized by national and/or transboundary/international agreements. The target for this goal is to designate a set of priority seascapes across the Coral Triangle to serve as the geographic focus of major investments and action during 2010 to 2020. Comprehensive <i>Seascape Investment Plans</i> for each priority seascape are completed, along with an overall scheme for the sequencing of investments across the 10-year timeframe of the <i>CTI Plan of Action</i> . [2012]. The scale of investment will be measured by this indicator to determine the degree of financial sustainability for management.	<b>DARMAWAN:</b> Use the criteria of "sustainably managed" Seascape as the base to select indicators i.e. community involvement, public-private partnership scheme, small ecological footprint, resource efficiency, etc
1.2.3 (PROPOSED)			<b>METACARD:</b> Transboundary body established to govern, monitor and track efforts in the seascapes  <b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR</b> Governing body established to govern, monitor and track efforts in the seascape/s

### 3.1.3. Goal 2 Target 2.1

<b>Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied</b>			
<b>Target 2.1 (Intermediate Result): Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries management</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Potential Revisions</b>
2.1.1	<b>Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting EAFM at the national and regional levels</b>	At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns such as: i) overfishing of shared pelagic fish stocks; ii) illegal cross-border fishing by small-scale fishers (stimulated by depletion of local coastal fisheries), commercial-scale fishing operations, and trans-shipment; and iii) by-catch of migratory species.	<b>METACARD:</b> Revise description to clearly define what are EAFM policies  <b>DARMAWAN:</b> Policy already assumed adopted by all FAO members. First indicator will be do they have certain legislation as integral part of that "policy". Second indicator will be do they have regulatory framework for the implementation, enforcement, operationalization of that particular legislation.  <b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> 1. What is our definition of EAFM? Use 11 principles (but not necessarily have a one-to-one correspondence between principle and



Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.1 (Intermediate Result): Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries management			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p>policy/legislation. One policy/legislation can address multiple principles)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Focus on three indicators: (1) Legislation, (2) Regulatory framework, (3) Budget allocated</li> <li>3. No. of policies may not be a good indicator because you may have so many policies that are not being implemented. Better to have one strong policy that's being implemented. "Existence of policy" may be the better indicator. <b>Note:</b> This comment was made during discussion on LRFT, but participants agreed it applies to all targets.</li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> Strong legislations/regulations promoting EAFM at national (and regional) levels with regulatory framework and budget allocated (for operationalization) at national and local levels</p> <p><b>NYGIEL:</b> <b>Strong policies and regulations promoting EAFM at regional and national levels with regulatory framework and budget allocated for their operationalization</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED ADDITION TO DESCRIPTION: (WILLIAM – add at end of paragraph)</b> The CTI regional EAFM policy guidelines and national legislations of CT6 should conform with the FAO's EAFM principles such as: (1) Avoiding overfishing; (2) Ensuring reversibility and rebuilding; (3) Minimizing fisheries impact; (4) Considering species interactions; (5) Ensuring compatibility; (6) Applying the precautionary approach; (7) Improving human well-being and equity; (8) Allocating user rights; (9) Promoting sectoral integration; (10) Broadening stakeholders participation; (11) Maintaining ecosystem integrity</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: NYGIEL</b> As a general agreement, EAFM is already assumed adopted by the CT6 countries as members of FAO. At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns. The policies and legislation need to address the EAFM principles described in the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) (note: Does not have to be on a one-to-one correspondence between EAFM principle and policy/legislation. A policy can address multiple principles or several policies/legislations may need to address a principle)</p>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.1 (Intermediate Result): Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries management			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.1.2	Number and area (in square kilometers) of local government units with operational and effective coastal law (fisheries) enforcement units	At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns such as: i) overfishing of shared pelagic fish stocks; ii) illegal cross-border fishing by small-scale fishers (stimulated by depletion of local coastal fisheries), commercial-scale fishing operations, and trans-shipment; and iii) by-catch of migratory species. The manifestation of these policies is that local governments have active and effective coastal and fisheries law enforcement operations	<p><b>METACARD:</b> Rerword indicator to be more generic to CT6 (e.g. local jurisdictions, etc.) and refocus description on implementation system – not policy/laws -- BUT TARGET 2.1 IS POLICY!</p> <p><b>DARMAWAN</b> This should be the integral part of the regulatory framework. Do they have a pilot project to implement their framework in certain area of coastal/marine</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> <i>On METACARD comment that "Target 2.1 is policy":</i> Target is strong legislation/policy, so it does not make sense to have an indicator that measures square kilometers. <b>Note:</b> The explanation for this was alluded to but not explicitly articulated during the discussion: The presence of enforcement units (number of LGUs) that are actively operating in a significant portion of the management area (square kilometers) can be taken as an indicator that a strong policy/legislative/regulatory framework is in place.</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR: NYGIEL</b> <b>Strong regulatory framework promoting EAFM at regional and national levels with budget allocated for their implementation</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: NYGIEL</b> At the national and regional levels, a strong regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns. Regulatory framework will cover enforcement and compliance of policies and legislations on EAFM and budget has to be allocated for their effective implementation.</p>
			<p><b>METACARD:</b> National budget is allocated for EAFM policy implementation</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENT FROM DISCUSSION:</b> This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> "layer" in the process of putting in place EAFM: 1) Policy/legislation 2) regulatory framework and 3) budget allocated</p>

### 3.1.4. Goal 2 Target 2.2

<b>Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied</b>			
<b>Target 2.2 (Intermediate Result): Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region through a new sustainable coastal fisheries and poverty reduction initiative ("COASTFISH")</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Potential Revisions</b>
2.2.1	<b>Proportion of coastal areas (in sq km) with operational EAFM projects and programs</b>	Improving the status of human communities through the application of EAF as a management paradigm with active enforcement of fisheries laws that will ensure that fisheries over the long term will become sustainable is the ultimate goal of Goal 2 within the CTI Regional Plan of Action.	<p><b>METACARD:</b> Revise description and not focus too much on "enforcement" but implementation of various proj. Of EAFM (e.g. proportion of livelihood projects)</p> <p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> This should be part of the indicator on the "pilot project" above.</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reason why this indicator came out this way was because EAFM is not really widely applied yet, so the idea was to pull out areas of each country where EAFM was starting to happen.</li> <li>2. Transfer to Target 2.1 and make compatible with that target. (Note also suggestion below to combine "both indicators" (2.2.1 and 2.2.2))</li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED TARGET 2.2 (NYGIEL): Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region</b></p> <p>(Combine Indicators 2.2.1 and 2.2.2)</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR: (NYGIEL)</b> <b>Percent increase in average income (fishing and non-fishing) of coastal households</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: (NYGIEL)</b> Improving the status of human communities through the application of EAF as a management paradigm is the ultimate objective of Goal 2 of the CTI Regional Plan of Action. Significant improvement in incomes livelihoods and food security of people living in coastal communities is anticipated. Quantitative goals for each country will be set according to the level of effort anticipated in each country at the coastal and community level for fisheries management implementation.</p>
2.2.2	<b>Percent increase in average income (fishing and non-fishing) of coastal households involved with COASTFISH</b>	Through a new, collaborative Sustainable Coastal Fisheries and Poverty Reduction Initiative ("COASTFISH") designed to apply EAFM, significant improvement in incomes livelihoods and food security of people living in coastal communities is anticipated. Quantitative goals for each country will be set according to the level of effort anticipated in each country at the coastal and community	<p><b>METACARD:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Combine both indicators (2.2.1 and 2.2.2) to be able to define what is a measure of operational or (operational = increase in income of household)</li> <li>2. Change COASTFISH or enhance description for 2.2.2</li> </ol>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.2 (Intermediate Result): Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region through a new sustainable coastal fisheries and poverty reduction initiative ("COASTFISH")			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
	<b>METACARD:</b> Darmawan's social indicators (moved from Goal 3)	level for fisheries management implementation.	<b>PROPOSED REVISIONS: NYGIEL</b> (note: 2.2.2 is already combined with 2.2.1)
2.2.3 (PROPOSED)			<p><b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR:</b> Add new indicator to measure livelihood and food security (based on poverty threshold and food threshold)</p> <p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Need to have an indicator to measure livelihoods. Needs to set-up standard for "worthy" livelihoods linked with improve income, i.e. earn more than US\$ 1 or 2 per day, etc, combine livelihoods (seasonal fishers – farmers – informal sectors, etc). Need to set up output indicators for food security, i.e. daily catch, average fish catch/year/capita, fish/hectare/year/capita, etc.</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Livelihood should include both fishing and non-fishing</li> <li>2. Food security parameters would be poverty threshold, or the food threshold which are two different things. National thresholds may <u>not</u> apply in some countries where the coastal population make up only a small proportion of total population. (In the Solomon Islands, the national thresholds may approximate local thresholds because about 80 percent of the population is coastal but in PNG it would be very different. Need to think about how to compute for the coastal households (e.g. use the number of coastal provinces and apply some weighting factors to determine how much of this is actually coastal). Sustainability may be an issue (who will track after end-of-project).</li> </ol> <p><b>Note:</b> This is a good venue to identify higher level outcome indicators in the SCTR. The WGs are linked to the SCTR and the SCTR focuses on the higher level outcomes. If food security can be tracked here, then maybe the SCTR would be able to tackle related higher level outcomes.</p>

### 3.1.5. Goal 2 Target 2.3

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.3.1	National policies, laws, agreements, or regulations adopted on allowable size limits for tuna species	<p>To move towards EAF of tuna fisheries is effective, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable and that, in particular, tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages are adequately protected. Such measures will help ensure long-term contribution of tuna fishers to economic growth, incomes, employment, and food security.</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (add) Note: the regional policies or agreements may spell out the CTI standards or certification of tuna products from the region</p>	<p><b>METACARD:</b> No. of policies/ agreements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For management of tuna fisheries – including creating a forum</li> <li>2. No. of implementing rules/NPOA adopted by CT6 to implement regional tuna fisheries policies/ agreement</li> </ol> <p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Indicator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership in RMFO</li> <li>2. Ratification of International law (UNIA'95)</li> <li>3. National Legislation</li> <li>4. Implementing Regulatory Framework</li> <li>5. Establishment of Tuna Forum for CTI-CFF</li> </ol> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> Is "number" the best indicator of progress? Spirit = comprehensive geographic, policy and jurisdictional scope</p> <p><b>Note:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Darmawan's suggestions above were discussed in general terms (not specifically) during the meeting</li> <li>2. Additional comment above was made during discussion on LRFT, but participants agreed it applies to all targets, <u>contradicting the proposed revision (under METACARD) above.</u></li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATORS: (WILLIAM)</b> <b>Note:</b> Contradicts "ADDITIONAL COMMENTS" above on use of "number of policies" as indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of policies or agreements adopted at the regional level for the management in CTI</li> <li>2. Number of national policies, laws, or regulations implementing the regional policies and agreements for the management of tuna</li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR: (NYGIEL)</b> <b>Number of policies and agreements among the CT6 countries for the management of tuna</b></p>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: (NYGIEL)</b> To move towards EAFM of tuna, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable. This includes creating a forum among the CT6 nations to serve as venue to agree on regional measures for the management of tuna. The policies shall include implementing rules and NPOAs adopted by the CT6 to implement regional tuna fisheries policies and agreements, ratification of membership in RFMO, ratification of international laws (UNIA '95), and national legislations on management of tuna species.</p>
2.3.2	<b>Number of sites and area (sq. km.) covered by temporal closed season of tuna spawning grounds (tuna spawning grounds are assumed to be known)</b>	To move towards EAF of tuna fisheries is effective, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable and that, in particular, tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages are adequately protected. Such measures will help ensure long-term contribution of tuna fishers to economic growth, incomes, employment, and food security.	<p><b>METACARD:</b> How will team get the boundaries for the spawning grounds? (to be able to calculate area and for enforcement)</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> Measurement of spag area is quite difficult.</p> <p><b>NYGIEL -- (Recommended for deletion)</b></p>
2.3.3	<b>Change in conservation status of tuna based from IUCN-red list criteria assessment</b>	To move towards EAF of tuna fisheries is effective, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable and that, in particular, tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages are adequately protected. Such measures will help ensure long-term contribution of tuna fishers to economic growth, incomes, employment, and food security. Change in conservation status is an impact indicator which will capture intermediate indicators pertaining to closed seasons and will reflect the overall status of tuna stocks of concern.	<p><b>METACARD:</b> Indicators on process to be able to establish a baseline and then a measure of IUCN status (process indicators) What tuna species? Bluefin vs skipjack</p> <p><b>DARMAWAN</b> Which bluefin species is on IUCN redlist? Perhaps it is the Mediteranian/Atlantic Bluefin, not the Indian Ocean Bluefin. Australia got the biggest quota in the CCSBT.</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> Change in conservation status should be decided by a proposed CTI body/forum, not necessarily based on the IUCN Red List <b>Note:</b> Include forum in draft CTI EAFM Regional Framework</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> Change in conservation status of tuna (to be decided by CTI as a body or by a forum designated by the CT6 according to IUCN-red list criteria assessment or other criteria to be determined by CTI)</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b></p>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (add as last paragraph) Note: CTI should develop its own list of tuna species that need to be protected and managed</p> <p><b>NYGIEL:</b> Change in conservation status is an impact indicator which will reflect the overall status of tuna stocks of concern.</p> <p>(<b>Note:</b> Include forum in draft CTI EAFM Regional Framework)</p>
2.3.4			<p><b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR:</b> Number of countries/markets adhering to tuna product standards or certification agreed within CTI</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR:</b> To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in tuna, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the tuna fisheries. An important action, external to the source countries, is that primary consumption countries agree to standards for the supply of fish. The main standard they need to adopt is the fish were caught using ecological sustainable methods and not destructive means. Such measures will help ensure long-term economic incentives to achieve this target.</p> <p><b>COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> Adapt this indicator from Target 2.4 because tuna is a high-value commodity and a very important commercial species especially for Sols and PNG (where tuna makes up a huge portion of GDP)</p>

**3.1.6. Goal 2 Target 2.4**

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.4.1	Number of national policies, laws, agreements, or regulations adopted on live reef fish trade	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). A first step in this process is to provide the legal basis for management through improved	<p><b>METACARD:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of policy/ agreements dealing with (a) live reef fisheries certification; (b) reef-based ornaments</li> <li>No. of CT6 implementing rules/NPOA to implement: (a) live reef fisheries, (b) reef-based ornaments</li> </ol>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved			
		<p>policies, laws, agreements and regulations as required within countries. Such measures will help ensure long-term provisions to achieve this target.</p>	<p>Is "number" the best indicator of progress? Spirit = comprehensive geographic, policy and jurisdictional scope</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of policies/legislations may not be a good indicator because you may have so many policies that are not being implemented. Better to have one strong policy that's being implemented.</li> <li>"Existence of policy" may be the better indicator</li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> Strong policy/legislation adopted on live reef fish trade to decrease level of destructive fishing practices linked to the trade.</p> <p>Or: <b>(WILLIAM) Note:</b> Contradicts ADDITIONAL COMMENTS above</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of regional policies or agreements adopted on a) live reef fish trade and b) ornamental fisheries</li> <li>Number of national policies, laws or regulations implementing regional agreements on a) live reef fish trade and b) ornamental fisheries</li> </ol> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: (NYGIEL)</b> To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornamentals, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornamentals). A first step in this process is to provide the legal basis for management through improved policies, laws, agreements and regulations primarily on certification. The policies shall include implementing rules and NPOAs adopted by the CT6 to implement live reef and reef-based ornamentals certification.</p>
2.4.2	<b>Number and area (sq km) of locally managed areas for live reef fish trade</b>	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornamentals, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornamentals). The most essential part in the process to improve practices will be to implement field programs that engage fishing communities in the implementation of best practices in the local context. Such programs will help ensure that locally-destructive fishing practices are minimized.	
2.4.3	<b>Number of key "demand" countries that adopt live-reef food and ornamental fish supply-to-consumption standards</b>	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornamentals, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornamentals). An important action, external to the source countries, is that primary consumption	<p><b>METACARD:</b> No. of countries adhering to markets/certification (live reef fish and ornamental fisheries) agreed by CTI/CT6</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b></p>



Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved			
	agreed upon by CT6 countries	countries agree to standards for the supply of fish. The main standard they need to adopt is the fish were caught using ecological sustainable methods and not through poison or other destructive means. Such measures will help ensure long-term economic incentives to achieve this target.	<p>Replicate (adapt) this indicator in Target 2.3 (tuna)</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR: (WILLIAM)</b> Number of countries/markets adhering to live-reef fish and ornamental fisheries product standards or certification agreed within CTI</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: (NYGIEL)</b> To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornamentals, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornamentals). An important action, external to the source countries, is that primary consumption countries agree to standards for the supply of fish, particularly, certification.</p>
2.4.4	<b>Change in conservation status of live reef fish species based from IUCN-red list criteria assessments</b>	<p>To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornamentals, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornamentals). A first step in this process is to provide the legal basis for management through improved policies, laws, agreements and regulations as required within countries followed by improved field management. Such measures will help ensure long-term provisions to achieve this target and can be tracked through the overall status rating provided through IUCN criteria.</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> Note: CTI should develop its own list</p>	<p><b>METACARD:</b> Link 2.4.4 to 2.4.2 to identify areas engaged in LRFT and track the status of the fish species and abundance</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b> Change in conservation status should be decided by a proposed CTI body/forum, not necessarily based on the IUCN Red List. <b>Note:</b> This comment was made during discussion on tuna, but I suppose this also applies here.</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> Change in conservation status of live reef fish species (to be decided by CTI as a body or by a forum designated by the CT6 according to IUCN-red list criteria assessment or other criteria to be determined by CTI)</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION: (NYGIEL)</b> Change in conservation status is an impact indicator which will reflect the overall status of live reef fish of concern.</p>

**3.1.7. Goal 3 Target 3.1**

Goal 3: Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Established and Effectively Managed			
Target 3.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-Wide Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) in place and fully functional by 2020.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
3.1.1.			<p><b>ALAN:</b> Include new indicator on CTMPAS framework</p> <p><b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR: (ALAN)</b> CTMPAS Framework developed and adopted by CT6</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR: (ALAN)</b> A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) Framework</i> is a prerequisite to implementation of the CTMPAS –composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region’s rich biological diversity. Stages in the development and adoption of the CTMPAS Framework include drafting, refining and adopting the CTMPAS Framework by CT6.</p>
3.1.2	<b>Percent/area of total marine habitat area in CT region in some form of protected status.</b>	Marine habitats are designated as marine protected areas with legal or traditional protection status. A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i> in place -- composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region’s rich biological diversity. In accordance with emerging scientific consensus, the <i>CTMPAS</i> will include quantitative targets for each country and for the region as a whole.	<p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Focus the indicator on the “system”. What is the indicator of a workable system in this regard. <b>Note:</b> Alan added a new indicator (3.1.1 above).</p> <p><b>ALAN:</b> Include marine management areas as well as MPAs</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR</b> Percent/Area of total marine habitat area in CT region in marine protected or managed areas</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR REVISED INDICATOR</b> Marine habitats are designated as marine protected or management areas with legal or traditional protection status to ensure that the long-term integrity of the marine habitats is maintained. Marine protected/managed areas help to minimize threats of all kinds from degrading the areas under management and to maintain sustainable supplies of fisheries and other ecosystem services intact.</p>
3.1.3	<b>Percent/area of each major marine and coastal habitat type in strictly protected</b>	Marine and coastal habitat types include coral reefs, sea grass beds, mangroves and open-water. Strictly no take replenishment zones have legal designation within a marine protected area	<p><b>ALAN:</b> Shift qualifies for no-take areas to the description.</p>

Goal 3: Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Established and Effectively Managed			
Target 3.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-Wide Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) in place and fully functional by 2020.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
	“no-take replenishment zones” to ensure long-term, sustainable supplies of fisheries.	wherein no extractive activities of any kind are allowed. A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i> in place -- composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region’s rich biological diversity. In accordance with emerging scientific consensus, the <i>CTMPAS</i> will include quantitative targets for each country and for the region as a whole.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR</b> Percent/Area of each major marine and coastal habitat type in strictly protected “no-take replenishment zones”</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR REVISED INDICATOR</b> Marine and coastal habitat types include coral reefs, sea grass beds, mangroves and open-water. Strictly no take replenishment zones have legal designation within a marine protected area wherein no extractive activities of any kind are allowed to ensure that marine protected/ managed areas contribute substantially to fisheries production. An essential component of the <i>CTMPAS</i>—composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected and resilient—is where no extraction is allowed and will provide a “core” conservation and fisheries management tool within the <i>CTMPAS</i></p>
3.1.4	Percent/Area (in sq km) of marine protected areas under “effective” management	Effective management is measured by an accepted protocol for MPA management effectiveness as established/developed by each country and applicable at a regional scale. A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i> in place -- composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region’s rich biological diversity.	<p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Focus on indicator for “effectively managed MPA”. What will be the output of “effective managed MPA” directly linked to community’s welfare criteria? <b>Note:</b> Addressed under Description</p> <p><b>ALAN:</b> Note value of indicator for contribution to socio economic benefits through “effectively managed MPAs”</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION</b> Effective management is measured by an accepted protocol for MPA management effectiveness as established/developed by each country and applicable at a regional scale (under development). The comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i>—composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed—will emphasize the contribute to socio-economic benefits of human communities residing in the areas of effective MPAs through improve fish production, enhanced opportunities for tourism and others direct and indirect benefits of healthy coral reef and associated system.</p>
3.1.5			<p><b>ALAN:</b> Add indicator on portion of MPAs within <i>CTMPAS</i>.</p> <p><b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR: (ALAN)</b> Percent/Area of marine protected/ managed areas included in <i>CTMPAS</i></p>

Goal 3: Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Established and Effectively Managed			
Target 3.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-Wide Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) in place and fully functional by 2020.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR:</b>                      The CTMPAS Framework will stipulate the criteria for inclusion of MPAs into the CTMPAS and what constitutes a regional contribution. This indicator will measure the area and/or proportion of all MPAs in the CT that qualify to be included within the CTMPAS Framework as adopted by the CT6.</p>

**3.1.8. Goal 4 Target 4.1**

Goal 4: Climate Change Adaptation Measures Achieved			
Target 4.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-wide early action plan for climate adaptation for the near-shore marine and coastal environment developed and implemented			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
RPOA 4.1.1	Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations on climate change adaptation proposed, adopted, and implemented / Number of CT6 countries with national climate change adaptation plan or framework.	Climate change adaptation measures will need to be locally relevant. Generally, adaptation will be measured through the incorporation of locally appropriate actions as derived from policies, laws, agreements or regulations within local government development and resource management plans as well as technical and financial support from national institutions designated to support adaptation to climate change.	<p>CCA TWG: <i>Number of national adaptation projects planned and implemented</i></p> <p><b>METACARD:</b>                      Retain this indicator. CCA TWG revision is new indicator</p>
RPOA4.1.2	Number of vulnerability assessments completed that have identified early actions to address multiple aspects of climate change impacts / Area (in sq km) covered by climate change vulnerability assessments on and identified early actions to address climate change impacts.	Climate change impacts common to all countries and specific to geographic locations need to be assessed in order to identify early actions. It is expected that each CT6 country will conduct vulnerability assessments, forums and work with local government and with other organizations to conduct the assessments and provide technical assistance to identify early actions that can be incorporated into region, national, and local plans. It is expected that all aspects of vulnerability will be considered (e.g. socioeconomic, population, infrastructure, biological, etc.) will be incorporated in the assessment process so that awareness about multiple aspects of climate change impacts is improved.	<p>CCA TWG - <i>Delete: see REAP indicators 3, and 5. Getting a standardized approach to monitor "area covered" might be difficult.</i></p> <p><b>METACARD:</b>                      This indicator is a bit difficult to track. How do you propose we do this? "New" incorporates indicator for local governments:</p>

Goal 4: Climate Change Adaptation Measures Achieved			
Target 4.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-wide early action plan for climate adaptation for the near-shore marine and coastal environment developed and implemented			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
RPOA4.1.3	Number of local governments, MPAs, and km of coastline that have integrated climate adaptation into local governance (plans and actions)	Climate change adaptation measures will need to be specified as relevant for locations. Generally, adaptation will be measured through the incorporation of locally appropriate actions within local government development and resource management plans and within MPA management. The plans should consider variation in resilience to climate change and be supported by required budget for implementation.	CCA TWG - Retain (this is also partially covered in the "new" indicator)
REAP 1	Hectares of mangrove restored		CCA TWG - Revise: Hectares of mangrove restored to protect coastal communities against storm surge  <b>METACARD:</b> 1. Delete motivation "storm surges." 2. Agree with CCA TWG but change "restored" to "protected" or "managed" 3. Change "mangrove" to "existing mangroves (including restored mangroves)" (Combine REAP 1 and 2)
REAP 2	Hectares of mangrove protected		CCA TWG - Delete.
REAP 3	Number of climate risk and vulnerability assessments conducted		CCA TWG - Retain
REAP 4	Number of national and sub-national plans integrating climate risk reduction		CCA TWG - Delete: Already covered in RPOA Indicator 4.1.3
REAP 5	Number of early adaptation actions initiated, implemented, and monitored		CCA TWG - Retain (this is also partially covered in the "new" indicator)
New	Number of local government achieving level 1, 2, and 3 benchmarks (see benchmarks for CCA)		CCA TWG - Add  <b>METACARD:</b> Word to combine local governments, communities etc. to apply for all CT6 countries
PROPOSED NEW			<b>METACARD:</b> (from 4.1.1 - Add new indicator) Number of national adaptation projects planned and implemented

### 3.1.9. Goal 4 Target 4.2

Goal 4: Climate Change Adaptation Measures Achieved			
Target 4.2 (Intermediate Result): Networked national centers of excellence on climate change adaptation for marine and coastal environments are established and in full operation			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
RPOA4.2.1	Number of institutions designated to address climate change adaption coordinated with national government support	Climate change adaptation measures will need to be specified as relevant for locations. Generally, adaptation will be measured through the incorporation of locally appropriate actions within local government development and resource management plans, and MPAS, as well as technical and financial support derived from national institutions designated to support adaptation to climate change.	<p>CCA TWG – Retain</p> <p><b>METACARD:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Networked institutions should cover full geographic scope of countries and CT.</li> <li>2. Description should also highlight Target 4.2 “Networked national center of excellence...”</li> <li>3. Review description for 4.2.1. It should fit in to how to measure and quantify “centers of excellence”</li> <li>4. CCA TWG add descriptions please</li> </ol> <p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Focus on the definition of effective “network”, not the number of the centers. The indicator should indicate the existence of effectively working network i.e. existence of moderated communication/exchange, numbers of training demanded, etc..</p>
REAP 6	Number of regional, national, and local institutions with strengthened capacity to address new and emerging climate issues		<p>CCA TWG – Retain</p> <p><b>METACARD:</b> Delete</p>

### 3.1.10. Goal 5 Target 5.1

Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving			
Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improve status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
5.1.1	Number policies, laws, agreements, or regulations standardized throughout the region for threatened and endangered species	Policies, laws, and agreements need to be standardized in relation to the conservation status of the species within each country. Each country must conduct an assessment to determine the status	<p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ratified international law</li> <li>2. National legislation</li> <li>3. Implementing regulatory framework</li> </ol> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (Indicator) 1. Number of policies or , agreements adopted at the regional level that are in</p>

Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving			
Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improve status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p>compliance with the international agreements on threatened species;            2. Number of policies, laws or regulations in CT6 implementing international agreements on threatened species            3. Number of local laws within CT6 addressing the gaps to protect threatened species  <b>Note:</b> Contradicts general participant consensus(?) on use of "number of policies as indicator?"</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (Description – add at end of paragraph)            The agreements, policies, laws or regulations are three-tiered – regional, national and local. The CTI regional agreements and policies should conform to the international agreements on threatened where CT6 countries are signatory to. Subsequently, the national policies, laws, and regulations of CT6 on threatened species should implement the abovementioned agreements and where necessary, local laws or regulations within CT6 need to be adopted to address certain gaps. All these agreements, policies, laws and regulations should also lay out the regulatory framework for enforcement at the regional, national and local levels.</p>
5.1.2	<b>Area (in square kilometers) of protected marine habitat that contributes to conservation of for threatened and endangered species protected</b>	Area of protected marine habitat that contributes to conservation contains critical habitat, defined by each species as breeding, nesting, nursery, and foraging areas in each country and areas of transnational importance. Protected critical habitat is defined by local and national legislation and transboundary agreements between two or more countries and is enforced. These areas should factor into the establishment of marine protected area networks. (This is a subset of Goal 3 indicator 3.1.1)	<p><b>DARMAWAN:</b>            Focus on certain protected area especially managed to protect certain species            Indicator: Specific area for specific species</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (Description -- add at end of paragraph)            Note: MPAs where its objectives includes among other protection or conservation of threatened species should be covered by this indicator</p>
5.1.3	<b>Change in conservation status of threatened and endangered marine species assessed under IUCN red-list criteria</b>	The status of the species is improving as determined by IUCN criteria for change in status from endangered to threatened or less.	<p><b>DARMAWAN:</b> (Indicator)            1. existence of specific program aimed for specific species (see indicator on regulatory framework, pilot projects)            2. output of such regulation or projects – will need a baseline data on the actual population/stocks for measuring progress.</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (indicator)            Number of threatened species with improved status</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (Description – add at end of paragraph)            Note: The MEWG recommends that CTI develops its own list of threatened species that need to be protected and that's unique, peculiar or significant to the region.</p>

Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving			
Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improve status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p><b>Note:</b> Address IUU fishing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to draft indicator/description for IUU</li> <li>2. Ask ICRI/Kent Carpenter to help identify species (inventory)</li> </ol>



### 3.2. Draft CTI-CFF Indicators Table from 25 April 2011 M&E Workshop Meeting

#### 3.2.1. Goal 1 Target 1.1

Goal 1: Priority Seascapes Designated and Effectively Managed			
Target 1.1 (Intermediate Result): "Priority Seascapes" designated, with investment plans complemented and sequenced by 2012			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
1.1.1	Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes designated	A seascape is a large marine management area defined by ecological considerations. Designation means that the seascape is recognized by national and/or transboundary/international agreements. The target for this goal is to designate a set of priority seascapes across the Coral Triangle to serve as the geographic focus of major investments and action during 2010 to 2020. Comprehensive <i>Seascape Investment Plans</i> for each priority seascape are completed, along with an overall scheme for the sequencing of investments across the 10-year timeframe of the <i>CTI Plan of Action</i> . [2012].	<b>PROPOSED REVISION:</b> Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes designated with investment plans
1.1.2.	Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes under improved management	Improved management will be defined for each seascape by benchmarks for integrated coastal management that includes criteria for effectively managed -marine protected area management, fisheries management, and enforcement. The existence of and support for management plans that cover all or part of the seascape is also a prerequisite to qualify for "improved management" of the seascape.	<b>PROPOSED REVISION:</b> Move to 1.2.1

#### 3.2.2. Goal 1 Target 1.2

Goal 1: Priority Seascapes Designated and Effectively Managed			
Target 1.2 (Intermediate Result): Marine and coastal resources within all "Priority Seascapes" are being sustainably managed			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
1.2.1 (PROPOSED)			<b>PROPOSED REVISED/NEW INDICATOR:</b> (from 1.1.2) Number/area (in sq km) of priority seascapes under improved management  <b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> (The following proposed description defines sustainably managed based on the seascape pillars cited in the RPOA, and include aspects of threatened species and climate change management initiatives in the design of the seascape)

Goal 1: Priority Seascapes Designated and Effectively Managed			
Target 1.2 (Intermediate Result): Marine and coastal resources within all "Priority Seascapes" are being sustainably managed			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			Improved management will be defined for each seascape by benchmarks for integrated coastal management that includes criteria for effectively managed - marine protected area management, fisheries management, climate change adaptation, protection of threatened species and enforcement. The existence of and support for management plans that cover all or part of the seascape is also a prerequisite to qualify for "improved management" of the seascape, which as referenced in the RPOA, will draw upon experience, best practices, and lessons learned to date on key elements of seascape programs, such as (but not limited to): (i) governance through appropriate institutions; (ii) marine protected area (MPA) networks; (iii) ecosystem-based management, including an ecosystem approach to fisheries management; (iv) integrated coastal management; (v) private sector engagement; (vi) enabling legal framework (conventions, laws, regulations, and policies); (vii) social and political support/commitment; (viii) sustainable financing; (ix) communications program; and (x) scientific research and monitoring.
1.2.2	<b>Value (in US\$) of funding leveraged through sustainable financing schemes and private sector partnerships relative to the investment plan requirements</b>	A seascape is a large marine management area defined by ecological considerations. Designation means that the seascape is recognized by national and/or transboundary/international agreements. The target for this goal is to designate a set of priority seascapes across the Coral Triangle to serve as the geographic focus of major investments and action during 2010 to 2020. Comprehensive <i>Seascape Investment Plans</i> for each priority seascape are completed, along with an overall scheme for the sequencing of investments across the 10-year timeframe of the <i>CTI Plan of Action</i> . [2012]. The scale of investment will be measured by this indicator to determine the degree of financial sustainability for management.	<b>DARMAWAN:</b> Use the criteria of "sustainably managed" Seascape as the base to select indicators i.e. community involvement, public-private partnership scheme, small ecological footprint, resource efficiency, etc
1.2.3 (PROPOSED)			<b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR</b> Governing body established to govern, monitor and track efforts in the seascape/s  <b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR</b>

### 3.2.3. Goal 2 Target 2.1

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.1 (Intermediate Result): Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries management			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.1.1	Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting EAFM at the national and regional levels	At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns such as: i) overfishing of shared pelagic fish stocks; ii) illegal cross-border fishing by small-scale fishers (stimulated by depletion of local coastal fisheries), commercial-scale fishing operations, and trans-shipment; and iii) by-catch of migratory species.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b>  <b>Strong policies and regulations promoting EAFM at regional and national levels with regulatory framework and budget allocated for their operationalization</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b>            As a general agreement, EAFM is already assumed adopted by the CT6 countries as members of FAO. At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns. The policies and legislation need to address the EAFM principles described in the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF)            (note: Does not have to be on a one-to-one correspondence between EAFM principle and policy/legislation. A policy can address multiple principles or several policies/legislations may need to address a principle)</p>
2.1.2	Number and area (in square kilometers) of local government units with operational and effective coastal law (fisheries) enforcement units	At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns such as: i) overfishing of shared pelagic fish stocks; ii) illegal cross-border fishing by small-scale fishers (stimulated by depletion of local coastal fisheries), commercial-scale fishing operations, and trans-shipment; and iii) by-catch of migratory species. The manifestation of these policies is that local governments have active and effective coastal and fisheries law enforcement operations	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b>  <b>Strong regulatory framework promoting EAFM at regional and national levels with budget allocated for their implementation</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b>            At the national and regional levels, a strong regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns. Regulatory framework will cover enforcement and compliance of policies and legislations on EAFM and budget has to be allocated for their effective implementation.</p>
			<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b>  <b>Strong policies and regulations promoting EAFM at regional and national levels with regulatory framework and budget allocated for their operationalization</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b>            As a general agreement, EAFM is already assumed adopted by the CT6 countries as members of FAO. At the national and regional levels, a strong legislative, policy and regulatory framework must be in place for achieving EAFM as a key step towards addressing common concerns. The policies and legislation need to address the EAFM principles described in the FAO Code of Conduct for</p>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.1 (Intermediate Result): Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries management			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) (note: Does not have to be on a one-to-one correspondence between EAFM principle and policy/legislation. A policy can address multiple principles or several policies/legislations may need to address a principle)

### 3.2.4. Goal 2 Target 2.2

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.2 (Intermediate Result): Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region through a new sustainable coastal fisheries and poverty reduction initiative ("COASTFISH")			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.2.1	Proportion of coastal areas (in sq km) with operational EAFM projects and programs	Improving the status of human communities through the application of EAF as a management paradigm with active enforcement of fisheries laws that will ensure that fisheries over the long term will become sustainable is the ultimate goal of Goal 2 within the CTI Regional Plan of Action.	<b>PROPOSED TARGET 2.2: Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region</b>  (Combine Indicators 2.2.1 and 2.2.2)  <b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> <b>Percent increase in average income (fishing and non-fishing) of coastal households</b>  <b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> Improving the status of human communities through the application of EAF as a management paradigm is the ultimate objective of Goal 2 of the CTI Regional Plan of Action. Significant improvement in incomes livelihoods and food security of people living in coastal communities is anticipated. Quantitative goals for each country will be set according to the level of effort anticipated in each country at the coastal and community level for fisheries management implementation.
2.2.2	Percent increase in average income (fishing and non-fishing) of coastal households involved with COASTFISH	Through a new, collaborative Sustainable Coastal Fisheries and Poverty Reduction Initiative ("COASTFISH") designed to apply EAFM, significant improvement in incomes livelihoods and food security of people living in coastal communities is anticipated. Quantitative goals for each country will be set according to the level of effort anticipated in each country at the coastal and community level for fisheries management implementation.	(note: Target 2.2.2 is already combined with Target 2.2.1)
2.2.3 (PROPOSED)			Add new indicator to measure livelihood and food security (based on poverty

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.2 (Intermediate Result): Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region through a new sustainable coastal fisheries and poverty reduction initiative ("COASTFISH")			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p>threshold and food threshold)</p> <p>Need to have an indicator to measure livelihoods. Need to set-up standard for "worthy" livelihoods linked with improved income, i.e. earn more than US\$ 1 or 2 per day, etc, combine livelihoods (seasonal fishers – farmers – informal sectors, etc).</p> <p>Need to set up output indicators for food security, i.e. daily catch, average fish catch/year/capita, fish/hectare/year/capita, etc.</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DISCUSSION:</b></p> <p>3. Livelihood should include both fishing and non-fishing</p> <p>4. Food security parameters would be poverty threshold, or the food threshold which are two different things. National thresholds may <u>not</u> apply in some countries where the coastal population makes up only a small proportion of total population. (In the Solomon Islands, the national thresholds may approximate local thresholds because about 80 percent of the population is coastal but in PNG it would be very different. Need to think about how to compute the coastal households (e.g. use the number of coastal provinces and apply some weighting factors to determine how much of this is actually coastal). Sustainability may be an issue (who will track after end-of-project).</p> <p><b>Note:</b> This is a good venue to identify higher level outcome indicators in the SCTR. The WGs are linked to the SCTR and the SCTR focuses on the higher level outcomes. If food security can be tracked here, then maybe the SCTR would be able to tackle related higher level outcomes.</p>

### 3.2.5. Goal 2 Target 2.3

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.3.1	National policies, laws, agreements, or regulations adopted on allowable size limits for tuna species	To move towards EAF of tuna fisheries is effective, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable and that, in particular, tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages are adequately protected. Such measures will	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b></p> <p><b>Number of policies and agreements among the CT6 countries for the management of tuna</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b></p> <p>To move towards EAFM of tuna, national and regional measures will need to be in</p>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
		<p>help ensure long-term contribution of tuna fishers to economic growth, incomes, employment, and food security.</p> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> (add) Note: the regional policies or agreements may spell out the CTI standards or certification of tuna products from the region</p>	<p>place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable. This includes creating a forum among the CT6 nations to serve as venue to agree on regional measures for the management of tuna. The policies shall include implementing rules and NPOAs adopted by the CT6 to implement regional tuna fisheries policies and agreements, ratification of membership in RFMO, ratification of international laws (UNIA '95), and national legislations on management of tuna species.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> There seemed to be a general agreement among participants that "number of policies" is <u>not</u> a good indicator that "effective management is in place" – this indicator still counts "number of policies"?</p>
2.3.2	<b>Number of sites and area (sq. km.) covered by temporal closed season of tuna spawning grounds (tuna spawning grounds are assumed to be known)</b>	To move towards EAF of tuna fisheries is effective, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable and that, in particular, tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages are adequately protected. Such measures will help ensure long-term contribution of tuna fishers to economic growth, incomes, employment, and food security.	<p><b>(Recommended for deletion)</b> Reason: Difficult to measure area for the spawning grounds</p>
2.3.3	<b>Change in conservation status of tuna based from IUCN-red list criteria assessment</b>	To move towards EAF of tuna fisheries is effective, national and regional measures will need to be in place to help ensure that exploitation of shared stocks for all species of tuna is sustainable and that, in particular, tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages are adequately protected. Such measures will help ensure long-term contribution of tuna fishers to economic growth, incomes, employment, and food security. Change in conservation status is an impact indicator which will capture intermediate indicators pertaining to closed seasons and will reflect the overall status of tuna stocks of concern.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> <b>Change in conservation status of tuna (to be decided by CTI as a body or by a forum designated by the CT6 according to IUCN-red list criteria assessment or other criteria to be determined by CTI)</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> Change in conservation status is an impact indicator which will reflect the overall status of tuna stocks of concern.</p> <p><b>(Note:</b> Include forum in draft CTI EAFM Regional Framework)</p>
2.3.4			<p><b>PROPOSED ADDITIONAL INDICATOR:</b> <b>Number of countries adhering to markets/certification (tuna fisheries) agreed by CTI/CT6</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR:</b> To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in tuna, it will be</p>

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<p>necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the tuna fisheries. An important action, external to the source countries, is that primary consumption countries agree to standards for the supply of fish. The main standard they need to adopt is the fish were caught using ecological sustainable methods and not destructive means. Such measures will help ensure long-term economic incentives to achieve this target.</p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b> Adapt this indicator from Target 2.4 because tuna is a high-value commodity and a very important commercial species especially for the Solomons and PNG (where tuna makes up a huge portion of GDP)</p>

**3.2.6. Goal 2 Target 2.4**

Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied			
Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
2.4.1	Number of national policies, laws, agreements, or regulations adopted on live reef fish trade	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). A first step in this process is to provide the legal basis for management through improved policies, laws, agreements and regulations as required within countries. Such measures will help ensure long-term provisions to achieve this target.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> <b>Strong policy/legislation adopted on live reef fish trade to decrease level of destructive fishing practices linked to the trade</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). A first step in this process is to provide the legal basis for management through improved policies, laws, agreements and regulations primarily on certification. The policies shall include implementing rules and NPOAs adopted by the CT6 to implement live reef and reef-based ornaments certification.</p> <p>Or <b>WILLIAM's</b> proposed revisions: 1. Number of regional policies or agreements adopted on a) live reef fish trade and b) ornamental fisheries 2. Number of national policies, laws or regulations implementing regional agreements on a) live reef fish trade and b) ornamental fisheries</p>

<b>Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied</b>			
<b>Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved</b>			
			<b>Note:</b> There were comments from some participants that "number of policies" is not a good indicator of effective management .
2.4.2	<b>Number and area (sq km) of locally managed areas for live reef fish trade</b>	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). The most essential part in the process to improve practices will be to implement field programs that engage fishing communities in the implementation of best practices in the local context. Such programs will help ensure that locally-destructive fishing practices are minimized.	
2.4.3	<b>Number of key "demand" countries that adopt live-reef food and ornamental fish supply-to-consumption standards agreed upon by CT6 countries</b>	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). An important action, external to the source countries, is that primary consumption countries agree to standards for the supply of fish. The main standard they need to adopt is the fish were caught using ecological sustainable methods and not through poison or other destructive means. Such measures will help ensure long-term economic incentives to achieve this target.	<b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> <b>Number of countries adhering to markets/certification (live reef fish and ornamental fisheries) agreed by CTI/CT6</b>  <b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). An important action, external to the source countries, is that primary consumption countries agree to standards for the supply of fish, particularly, certification.
2.4.4	<b>Change in conservation status of live reef fish species based from IUCN-red list criteria assessments</b>	To improve management and build a more sustainable trade in live reef fish and reef-based ornaments, it will be necessary to decrease the level of destructive fishing practices linked to the live reef fish trade (food and ornaments). A first step in this process is to provide the legal basis for management through improved policies, laws, agreements and regulations as required within countries followed by improved field management. Such measures will help ensure long-term provisions to achieve this target and can be tracked through the overall status rating provided through IUCN criteria.  <b>WILLIAM:</b>	<b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> <b>Change in conservation status of live reef fish species (to be decided by CTI as a body or by a forum designated by the CT6 according to IUCN-red list criteria assessment or other criteria to be determined by CTI)</b>  <b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> Change in conservation status is an impact indicator which will reflect the overall status of live reef fish of concern.



<b>Goal 2: Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied</b>		
<b>Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved</b>		
		Note: CTI should develop its own list

**3.2.7. Goal 3 Target 3.1**

<b>Goal 3: Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Established and Effectively Managed</b>			
<b>Target 3.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-Wide Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) in place and fully functional by 2020.</b>			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
3.1.1.			<p><b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR:</b> CTMPAS Framework developed and adopted by CT6</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR:</b> A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) Framework</i> is a prerequisite to implementation of the CTMPAS –composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region's rich biological diversity. Stages in the development and adoption of the CTMPAS Framework include drafting, refining and adopting the CTMPAS Framework by CT6.</p>
3.1.2	<b>Percent/area of total marine habitat area in CT region in some form of protected status.</b>	Marine habitats are designated as marine protected areas with legal or traditional protection status. A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i> in place -- composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region's rich biological diversity. In accordance with emerging scientific consensus, the <i>CTMPAS</i> will include quantitative targets for each country and for the region as a whole.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> Percent/Area of total marine habitat area in CT region in marine protected or managed areas</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR REVISED INDICATOR</b> Marine habitats are designated as marine protected or management areas with legal or traditional protection status to ensure that the long-term integrity of the marine habitats is maintained. Marine protected/managed areas help to minimize threats of all kinds from degrading the areas under management and to maintain sustainable supplies of fisheries and other ecosystem services intact.</p>
3.1.3	<b>Percent/area of each major marine and coastal habitat type</b>	Marine and coastal habitat types include coral reefs, sea grass beds, mangroves and open-water. Strictly	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR</b> Percent/Area of each major marine and coastal habitat type in strictly protected</p>

Goal 3: Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Established and Effectively Managed			
Target 3.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-Wide Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) in place and fully functional by 2020.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
	in strictly protected “no-take replenishment zones” to ensure long-term, sustainable supplies of fisheries.	no take replenishment zones have legal designation within a marine protected area wherein no extractive activities of any kind are allowed. A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i> in place - composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region’s rich biological diversity. In accordance with emerging scientific consensus, the <i>CTMPAS</i> will include quantitative targets for each country and for the region as a whole.	<p>“no-take replenishment zones”</p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR REVISED INDICATOR</b>  Marine and coastal habitat types include coral reefs, sea grass beds, mangroves and open-water. Strictly no take replenishment zones have legal designation within a marine protected area wherein no extractive activities of any kind are allowed to ensure that marine protected/ managed areas contribute substantially to fisheries production. An essential component of the <i>CTMPAS</i>—composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected and resilient—is where no extraction is allowed and will provide a “core” conservation and fisheries management tool within the <i>CTMPAS</i></p>
3.1.4	Percent/Area (in sq km) of marine protected areas under “effective” management	Effective management is measured by an accepted protocol for MPA management effectiveness as established/developed by each country and applicable at a regional scale. A comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i> in place -- composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed, and designed in ways that (i) generate significant income, livelihoods, and food security benefits for coastal communities; and (ii) conserve the region’s rich biological diversity.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION</b>  Effective management is measured by an accepted protocol for MPA management effectiveness as established/developed by each country and applicable at a regional scale (under development). The comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-managed region-wide <i>Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS)</i>—composed of prioritized individual MPAs and networks of MPAs that are connected, resilient, and sustainably financed—will emphasize the contribute to socio-economic benefits of human communities residing in the areas of effective MPAs through improve fish production, enhanced opportunities for tourism and others direct and indirect benefits of healthy coral reef and associated system.</p>
3.1.5			<p><b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR:</b>  Percent/Area of marine protected/ managed areas included in <i>CTMPAS</i></p> <p><b>PROPOSED DESCRIPTION FOR NEW INDICATOR:</b>  The <i>CTMPAS</i> Framework will stipulate the criteria for inclusion of MPAs into the <i>CTMPAS</i> and what constitutes a regional contribution. This indicator will measure the area and/or proportion of all MPAs in the CT that qualify to be included within the <i>CTMPAS</i> Framework as adopted by the CT6.</p>

### 3.2.8. Goal 4 Target 4.1

Goal 4: Climate Change Adaptation Measures Achieved			
Target 4.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-wide early action plan for climate adaptation for the near-shore marine and coastal environment developed and implemented			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
RPOA 4.1.1	Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations on climate change adaptation proposed, adopted, and implemented / Number of CT6 countries with national climate change adaptation plan or framework.	Climate change adaptation measures will need to be locally relevant. Generally, adaptation will be measured through the incorporation of locally appropriate actions as derived from policies, laws, agreements or regulations within local government development and resource management plans as well as technical and financial support from national institutions designated to support adaptation to climate change.	CCA TWG: <i>Number of national adaptation projects planned and implemented</i>  Retain this indicator. CCA TWG revision is new indicator (see "New" below)
RPOA4.1.2	Number of vulnerability assessments completed that have identified early actions to address multiple aspects of climate change impacts / Area (in sq km) covered by climate change vulnerability assessments on and identified early actions to address climate change impacts.	Climate change impacts common to all countries and specific to geographic locations need to be assessed in order to identify early actions. It is expected that each CT6 country will conduct vulnerability assessments, forums and work with local government and with other organizations to conduct the assessments and provide technical assistance to identify early actions that can be incorporated into region, national, and local plans. It is expected that all aspects of vulnerability will be considered (e.g. socioeconomic, population, infrastructure, biological, etc.) will be incorporated in the assessment process so that awareness about multiple aspects of climate change impacts is improved.	<b>DELETE?</b> This indicator is a bit difficult to track. Covered by REAP 3, REAP 5 and "New" below.
RPOA4.1.3	Number of local governments, MPAs, and km of coastline that have integrated climate adaptation into local governance (plans and actions)	Climate change adaptation measures will need to be specified as relevant for locations. Generally, adaptation will be measured through the incorporation of locally appropriate actions within local government development and resource management plans and within MPA management. The plans should consider variation in resilience to climate change and be supported by required budget for implementation.	CCA TWG - <i>Retain (this is also partially covered in the "new" indicator</i>
REAP 1	Hectares of mangrove restored		CCA TWG - <i>Revise: Hectares of mangrove restored to protect coastal communities against storm surge</i>  <b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATOR:</b> Hectares of existing mangroves (including restored mangroves) protected or

Goal 4: Climate Change Adaptation Measures Achieved			
Target 4.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-wide early action plan for climate adaptation for the near-shore marine and coastal environment developed and implemented			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			managed to protect coastal communities  <b>DESCRIPTION:</b> c/o CCA TWG
REAP 2	Hectares of mangrove protected		CCA TWG - Delete.
REAP 3	Number of climate risk and vulnerability assessments conducted		CCA TWG – Retain  <b>DESCRIPTION:</b> c/o CCA TWG
REAP 4	Number of national and sub-national plans integrating climate risk reduction		CCA TWG - Delete: Already covered in RPOA Indicator 4.1.3
REAP 5	Number of early adaptation actions initiated, implemented, and monitored		CCA TWG - Retain (this is also partially covered in the “new” indicator)  <b>DESCRIPTION:</b> c/o CCA TWG
New	Number of local government achieving level 1, 2, and 3 benchmarks (see benchmarks for CCA)		CCA TWG – Add  <b>PROPOSED REVISION:</b> (Use a word that includes local governments, communities etc. to apply to all CT6 countries)  <b>Note:</b> No recommendations were made during workshop. How about: <b>Number of local stakeholders achieving level 1, 2, and 3 benchmarks (see benchmarks for CCA)</b>  <b>DESCRIPTION:</b> c/o CCA TWG
PROPOSED NEW			<b>PROPOSED NEW INDICATOR:</b> Number of national adaptation projects planned and implemented  <b>DESCRIPTION:</b> c/o CCA TWG

### 3.2.9. Goal 4 Target 4.2

Goal 4: Climate Change Adaptation Measures Achieved			
Target 4.2 (Intermediate Result): Networked national centers of excellence on climate change adaptation for marine and coastal environments are established and in full operation			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
RPOA4.2.1	Number of institutions designated to address climate change adaption coordinated with national government support	Climate change adaptation measures will need to be specified as relevant for locations. Generally, adaptation will be measured through the incorporation of locally appropriate actions within local government development and resource management plans, and MPAS, as well as technical and financial support derived from national institutions designated to support adaptation to climate change.	CCA TWG – <i>Retain</i>  <b>PROPOSED REVISIONS:</b> Focus on the definition of effective “network”, not the number of the centers. The indicator should indicate the existence of effectively working network i.e. existence of moderated communication/exchange, numbers of training demanded, etc.
REAP 6	Number of regional, national, and local institutions with strengthened capacity to address new and emerging climate issues		CCA TWG – <i>Retain</i>  <b>PROPOSED REVISIONS:</b> <b>DELETE</b>

### 3.2.10. Goal 5 Target 5.1

Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving			
Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improved status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
5.1.1	Number policies, laws, agreements, or regulations standardized throughout the region for threatened and endangered species	Policies, laws, and agreements need to be standardized in relation to the conservation status of the species within each country. Each country must conduct an assessment to determine the status	<b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATORS</b> 1. Number of policies or , agreements adopted at the regional level that are in compliance with the international agreements on threatened species; 2. Number of policies, laws or regulations in CT6 implementing international agreements on threatened species 3. Number of local laws within CT6 addressing the gaps to protect threatened species  <b>Note:</b> There were comments from some participants that “number of policies” is not a good indicator for effective management?  <b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION</b> Policies, laws, and agreements need to be standardized in relation to the conservation status of the species within each country. Each country must conduct an assessment to determine the status. <i>The agreements, policies, laws</i>

Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving			
Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improved status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			<i>or regulations are three-tiered – regional, national and local. The CTI regional agreements and policies should conform to the international agreements on threatened where CT6 countries are signatory to. Subsequently, the national policies, laws, and regulations of CT6 on threatened species should implement the abovementioned agreements and where necessary, local laws or regulations within CT6 need to be adopted to address certain gaps. All these agreements, policies, laws and regulations should also lay out the regulatory framework for enforcement at the regional, national and local levels.</i>
5.1.2	<b>Area (in square kilometers) of protected marine habitat that contributes to conservation of for threatened and endangered species protected</b>	Area of protected marine habitat that contributes to conservation contains critical habitat, defined by each species as breeding, nesting, nursery, and foraging areas in each country and areas of transnational importance. Protected critical habitat is defined by local and national legislation and transboundary agreements between two or more countries and is enforced. These areas should factor into the establishment of marine protected area networks. (This is a subset of Goal 3 indicator 3.1.1)	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION:</b> Area of protected marine habitat that contributes to conservation contains critical habitat, defined by each species as breeding, nesting, nursery, and foraging areas in each country and areas of transnational importance. Protected critical habitat is defined by local and national legislation and transboundary agreements between two or more countries and is enforced. These areas should factor into the establishment of marine protected area networks. (This is a subset of Goal 3 indicator 3.1.1)</p> <p><i>Note: MPAs where its objectives includes among other protection or conservation of threatened species should be covered by this indicator</i></p>
5.1.3	<b>Change in conservation status of threatened and endangered marine species assessed under IUCN red-list criteria</b>	The status of the species is improving as determined by IUCN criteria for change in status from endangered to threatened or less.	<p><b>PROPOSED REVISED INDICATORS:</b></p> <p><b>DARMAWAN:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of specific program aimed for specific species (see indicator on regulatory framework, pilot projects)</li> <li>Output of such regulation or projects – will need a baseline data on the actual population/stocks for measuring progress.</li> </ol> <p><b>WILLIAM:</b> Number of threatened species with improved status</p> <p><b>PROPOSED REVISED DESCRIPTION</b> The status of the species is improving as determined by IUCN criteria for change in status from endangered to threatened or less. <i>Note: The MEWG recommends that CTI develops its own list of threatened species that need to be protected and that's unique, peculiar or significant to the region.</i></p>
			<b>Note:</b> Address IUU fishing

Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving			
Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improved status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.			
#	Indicator	Description	Potential Revisions
			3. Need to draft indicator/description for IUU 4. Ask ICRI/Kent Carpenter to help identify species (inventory)

### 3.3. Full text of MEWG TOR, as amended and adopted by the MEWG on 28 April 2012

(Revisions are shown in red text -- additions are bolded, deletions are shown crossed-out)

#### 1.0. Purpose and Tasks of the MEWG

The primary function of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG), as provided by SOM6, is to provide technical inputs and recommendations to the Regional Secretariat and the National Coordinating Committees of the CT6 in achieving the over-arching goals that have been set forth in the RPOA. Generally as approved by the SOM6, the Working Groups shall:

- Convene Working Group meetings and discussions by creating CT6 team and partner for each theme.
- Coordinate and assist identification, compilation, and consultation of thematic issues in CT6.
- Assist regional exchange and workshop as public consultation.
- Communicate with CT6 focal points, experts, partners, and other groups on specific theme.
- Prepare technical and communication material on working group matters to be distributed to Regional Secretariat and CT countries.

Specifically, the MEWG may also perform the following functions:

1. Develop and oversee the implementation of the CTI M&E System, which will help track and report on progress on the RPOA objectives and targets including alignment to meeting CT6's commitment to international conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity
2. Oversee and coordinate **with the CTI Regional Secretariat on** the preparation of the regional State of the Coral Triangle Report
3. Coordinate with the other WGs and partners the preparation of activity status and output tracking sheets for the regional priority actions
4. Coordinate the organization and conduct of relevant regional exchanges, conferences or meetings
5. In relation to item (i), coordinate the development of a CTI Index.
6. ~~Work with CT Atlas for the management of the data~~

#### 2.0. Membership and Structure

2.1. Membership. The MEWG shall be composed of at least two representatives from each of the CT6 (Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands and Timor Leste), a representative from the Regional Secretariat and CTI-CFF partners. The NCC of CT6 countries shall designate representatives to the MEWG meetings. However, decision-making shall be lodged with the CT6 members.

2.2. Term of the Chair and Vice Chair. The term of the Chair and Vice Chair is two years starting on 01 January of the year, following the confirmation of the SOM. The MEWG will decide the subsequent Chair and Vice Chair.

#### 3.0. Program Planning and Coordination

3.1. Regular MEWG meetings. The MEWG shall conduct at least one meeting annually to prepare the annual report and submit to the SOM. The schedule of the meetings will take into consideration planned CTI regional events and SOM / MM meetings. In addition to the annual meeting, conference calls may be arranged among the MEWG focal points to keep the CT6 abreast with the



developments on the MEWG work plans across the CT6. The Chair shall inform the TWG focal points of the CT6 at least two weeks prior to the date of the conference call and the agenda.

3.2. MEWG Annual Work and Financial Plan Preparation and Presentation to SOM. In coordination with and support from the CTI-CFF Regional Secretariat, the MEWG shall prepare an annual work **and financial** plan showing directions and activities leading towards the successful completion of the priority actions set forth by SOM on M&E. The MEWG shall encourage the support and participation of the CTI-CFF development partners and other TWGs in drawing the MEWG annual work plan.

Resource allocation needed to complete the activities presented in the annual work plan shall be integral in the work plan preparation. The funding sources from within the CT6 governments and development partner organizations will be identified and form part of the presentation of the work plan to SOM.

3.3. Collaboration with other TWGs. The MEWG shall coordinate and collaborate with other CTI TWGs and the Regional Secretariat in the planning and conduct of regional priority actions.

3.4. Collaboration with Technical Experts and Supporting Institutions and Organizations. The MEWG shall invite and duly recognize the technical experts and supporting institutions (e.g. academe and research organizations) as technical advisers to the TWG. The Regional Secretariat shall assist the MEWG in putting together a pool of technical advisors which will be called on for specific questions or issues. The specific functions of the technical advisors are:

- To provide technical support in the compilation, review and analysis of data/information and provide decision support regarding issues relating to M&E of the RPOA goal and targets
- To provide technical support in the preparation of communication messages including press releases, and other information and communication materials
- To guide the preparation and/ or review of concept notes and or funding applications (grammar correction)
- To guide the preparation of reports of CTI regional activities concerning M&E

3.5. Monitoring and Reporting of Progress. The MEWG shall develop an M&E system and indicators to track and report on progress work plan implementation of the TWGs and the achievement of the RPOA goal and targets.

3.6. Mechanisms to Change Indicators. The MEWG may recommend a change in the M&E indicators, or review and endorse any change requested by another TWG to make a change in its M&E indicators. The consensus needed from the CT6 on such decisions will be coursed through the Regional Secretariat.

#### 4.0. Administrative Support to the MEWG

The administrative support for the TWG shall be provided by the country chairing the TWG. Coordination with other CT6 countries pertaining to schedules of activities, collaboration with other countries and other related activities should be coordinated with the regional secretariat.

#### 5.0. Financial Arrangements.

The MEWG ~~will mobilize~~ **shall provide assistance to the Regional Secretariat in mobilizing financial resources in to** support ~~to~~ the implementation of the annual work plan as well as ~~in~~ the operations of the TWG.

### 3.4. Full text of draft indicators, as amended and annotated by the MEWG on 28 April 2012

(Revisions are shown in red text – additions are bolded, deletions are shown crossed-out; annotations are highlighted in yellow).

#### Goal 1 -- Priority seascapes designated and effectively managed

Target 1.1. (Intermediate Result): “Priority Seascapes” designated, with investment plans complemented and sequenced by 2012

Indicator 1.1.1. Number/area (~~in sq-km~~) of priority seascapes designated with investment plans (Note: Include in the description the CTI definition of “seascape” and “priority seascape.” Also, the description may prescribe a standard unit of measure for this indicator.)

Target 1.2 (Intermediate Result): Marine and coastal resources within all “Priority Seascapes” are being sustainably managed

Indicator 1.2.1. Number/area (~~in sq-km~~) of priority seascapes under improved management (Note: The description may prescribe a standard unit of measure for this indicator.)

Indicator 1.2.2. Value (in US\$) of funding leveraged through sustainable financing schemes and private sector partnerships relative to the investment plan requirements

Indicator 1.2.3. **Governing Coordinating** body established to guide, monitor and track efforts in the seascape/s. (Note: In the description, explain the function of this coordinating body, i.e., that it is not intend to usurp the authority of any existing government institution but to work alongside and collaborate with them to ensure that the seascape is properly managed.)

#### Goal 2 -- Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources is fully applied

Target 2.1 (Intermediate Result): Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries management

Indicator 2.1.1. Number of policies and regulations promoting EAFM at regional and national levels with regulatory framework and budget allocated for their operationalization

**Indicator 2.1.2. Number of projects or programs to implement the principles of the EAFM** (Note: Include in the description that every project under the CTI will be required to set their baselines before program implementation, specifically including, in addition to biophysical and governance baselines, socioeconomic baseline indicators so that they are able to track their progress in addressing poverty issues. The MEWG Secretariat and EAFM Resource Team will craft the description for this indicator.)

Target 2.2 (Intermediate Result): Improved income, livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities across the region

Indicator 2.2.1. ~~Percent~~ **Percentage** increase in average income (fishing and non-fishing) of coastal households (Note: Include in the description that, in evaluating a program, Indicator 2.2.1 must be used in conjunction with Indicator 2.2.2, so that a determination can be made of how the increase in real income compares with what is needed to ensure good welfare.)

Indicator 2.2.2. ~~Livelihood and food security (based on poverty threshold and food threshold)~~ **Percentage change in poverty threshold and food threshold levels compared to baseline levels**

Target 2.3 (Intermediate Result): Effective measures in place to help ensure exploitation of shared tuna stocks is sustainable, with tuna spawning areas and juvenile growth stages adequately protected

Indicator 2.3.1. Number of policies and agreements among the CT6 countries for the management of tuna

Indicator 2.3.2. Change in conservation status of tuna (Note: In the description, state that "change in conservation status" would be decided by CTI as a body or by a forum designated by the CT6 according to IUCN-red list criteria assessment or other criteria to be determined by CTI)

Indicator 2.3.3. Number of countries adhering to markets/certification (tuna fisheries) agreed by CTI/CT6

(Note: Consider as additional indicators (1) membership in international or regional fisheries management bodies, and (2) adoption/ratification of international/regional tuna laws or agreements, e.g. Convention on Migratory Species)

Target 2.4 (Intermediate Result): A more effective management and more sustainable trade in live-reef fish and reef-based ornaments achieved

Indicator 2.4.1. ~~Strong policy/legislation~~ **Number of policies/legislations** adopted on live reef fish trade to decrease level of destructive fishing practices linked to the trade. (Note: An additional indicator may be needed to show that policies/legislations are being enforced effectively. The MEWG seeks inputs from the LRFT TWG on what is the best indicator to use.)

Indicator 2.4.2. Number and area (~~sq-km~~) of locally managed areas for live reef fish trade (Note: The description may prescribe a standard unit of measure for this indicator.)

Indicator 2.4.3. Number of countries adhering to markets/certification (live reef fish and ornamental fisheries) agreed by CTI/CT6

Indicator 2.4.4. Change in conservation status of live reef fish species (Note: In the description, state that "change in conservation status" would be decided by CTI as a body or by a forum designated by the CT6 according to IUCN-red list criteria assessment or other criteria to be determined by CTI)

### **Goal 3 -- Marine protected areas (MPAs) established and effectively managed**

Target 3.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-Wide Coral Triangle MPA System (CTMPAS) in place and fully functional by 2020.

Indicator 3.1.1. CTMPAS Framework developed and adopted by CT6

Indicator 3.1.2. Percent/area of total marine habitat area in CT region in marine protected or managed areas

Indicator 3.1.3. Percent/area of each major marine and coastal habitat type in strictly protected “no-take replenishment zones”

Indicator 3.1.4. Percent/Area (**in-sq-km**) of marine protected areas under “effective” management (Note: The description may prescribe a standard unit of measure for this indicator.)

Indicator 3.1.5. Percent/Area of marine protected/managed areas included in CTMPAS

#### **Goal 4 -- Climate change adaptation measures achieved**

Target 4.1 (Intermediate Result): Region-wide early action for climate adaptation plan for the near-shore marine and coastal environment developed and implemented

Indicator 4.1.1. A region-wide early action plan (REAP) has been developed

Indicator 4.1.2. Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations on climate change adaptation proposed, adopted, and implemented

Indicator 4.1.3. Number of CT6 countries with national climate change adaptation plan or framework

Indicator 4.1.4. Number of local governments and km of coastline that have integrated climate adaptation into local governance (plans and actions)

Indicator 4.1.5. Area (**Hectares**) of mangrove restored, protected or managed to protect coastal communities (REAP 1 & 2) (Note: The description may prescribe a standard unit of measure for this indicator.)

Indicator 4.1.6. Number of climate risk and vulnerability assessments conducted (REAP 3)

Indicator 4.1.7. Number of early adaptation actions initiated, implemented, and monitored (REAP 5)

Indicator 4.1.8. Number of local governments and communities achieving level 1, 2, and 3 of REAP benchmarks for local climate change adaptation

Indicator 4.1.9. Number of national adaptation projects planned and implemented

Target 4.2 (Intermediate Result): Networked national centers of excellence on climate change adaptation for marine and coastal environments are established and in full operation

Indicator 4.2.1. Number of institutions designated and networked to address climate change adaptation coordinated with national government support

(Note: Consider “area of coral reefs protected or managed” as an additional indicator. Also consider reducing the number of indicators.)

#### **Goal 5 -- Threatened species status improving**

Target 5.1 (Intermediate Result): Improved status of sharks, sea turtles, marine mammals and other identified threatened species.

Indicator 5.1.1. Number of policies or agreements adopted at the regional, national and local levels that are in compliance with the international agreements on threatened species

Indicator 5.1.2. Area (**in-square-kilometers**) of protected marine habitat that contributes to conservation of for threatened and endangered species protected (Note: The description may prescribe a standard unit of measure for this indicator.)

Indicator 5.1.3. Number of threatened species with improved status based on a CTI-developed list of species

### 3.5. List of Participants

#### Note:

- \* Participants who attended the April 25 MEWG workshop only
- \*\* Participants who attended the April 28 formal MEWG meeting only
- \*\*\* Participants who attended both the April 25 and April 28 MEWG meetings

#### **Amaral, Aleixo Leonito \*\***

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries  
National Directorate of Fisheries and  
Aquaculture, State Secretariat of Fisheries,  
Dili, Timor Leste  
Tel: +670 7507658  
Email: aleixo\_la@yahoo.com

#### **Masu, Rosalie \*\*\***

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources  
Email: jteri@fisheries.gov.sb

#### **Vave-Karamui, Agnetha \*\*\***

Ministry of Environment, Conservation,  
Climate Change, Disaster and Meteorology  
PO Box 21, Honiara, Solomon Islands  
Tel: +677 23031  
Email: agnetha.vavekaramui@gmail.com

#### **Dirhamsyah \*\***

Research Center for Oceanography  
Indonesia Institute of Sciences (LIPI)  
Jalan Pasir Putih 1, Ancol Timur, Indonesia  
Tel: +62 21 64713850  
Email: dirham2161@yahoo.com

#### **Lim, Theresa Mundita S.(Dr) \***

Department of Environment and Natural  
Resources, Protected Area and Wildlife  
Bureau, Ninoy Aquino Parks and Wildlife  
Center North Avenue, Quezon City,  
Philippines  
Tel: +632 924 0109  
Email: munditalim@yahoo.com

#### **Komilus, Connie Fay(Dr.) \*\***

Deputy Dean, Ministry of Science, Technology  
and Innovation Malaysia (MOSTI)  
UMS Sandakan, School of Sustainable  
Agriculture, Mile 10, Jalan SG Batang, KGSG  
Batang, Sandakan, 9000 Malaysia  
Tel: +603 8885 8203  
Email: komilus@gmail.com,  
ckomilus@yahoo.com

#### **Dacho, Norasma(Dr.) \*\***

Fisheries Officer  
Ministry of Science, Technology and  
Innovation Malaysia (MOSTI)  
Department of Fisheries Sabah, Head of  
Conservation and Environment Section  
Tel: +603 8885 8203  
Email: noraieni@mosti.gov.my

#### **Darmawan, (Dr) \*\*\***

Regional Secretariat  
Coral Triangle Initiative Secretariat  
Mina Bahari II Bldg, 7th Fl., Ministry of Marine  
Affairs and Fisheries, Medan Merdeka Timur  
16, Jakarta  
Tel: +62-8111 874482  
Email: darmawan@indo.net.id

#### **Armada, Nygiel \*\*\***

Sr. Fisheries Management Advisor  
US CTI Support Program Integrator  
307 Onate Street, Mandurriao, Iloilo City,  
5000  
Philippines  
Tel: +63 9 189 859981  
Email: narmada@usti.org

#### **Jatulan, William \*\*\***

Senior Regional Coordinator  
US CTI Support Program Integrator  
16-A Edison St. Lahug,  
Cebu City, 6000  
Philippines  
Tel: +63 917 3217592  
Email: [wjatulan@uscti.org](mailto:wjatulan@uscti.org)  
Skype: william.p.jatulan

#### **Sia, Asuncion Evangelista \*\*\***

US CTI Support Program Integrator  
Tel: +63 917 3248703  
Email: ciony.sia@gmail.com

**Cabral, Reniel \***  
PRIMEX  
Email: [reniel.cabral@gmail.com](mailto:reniel.cabral@gmail.com)

**Cantin, Egide \*\***  
Senior Conservation Finance Specialist  
Asia Pacific Resource Centre  
The Nature Conservancy  
51 Edmonstone Street, South Brisbane ,  
Queensland  
4101 Australia  
Tel: +61 7 3214 6900  
Email: [ecantin@tnc.org](mailto:ecantin@tnc.org)

**Cros, Annick \***  
Program Coordinator  
Asia-Pacific Program  
The Nature Conservancy  
USA  
Tel: +1808 5876208  
Email: [acros@tnc.org](mailto:acros@tnc.org)

**Nurul, ainy Yahya \*\***  
Bahagian Hal Ehwal Antarabangsa  
Jabatan Peguam Negara Malaysia  
Tel: +603-88722403, +603-88902218  
Email: [nurulainy@agc.gov.my](mailto:nurulainy@agc.gov.my)

**Thomas, Jackie \*\***  
Pacific Policy Officer  
World Wildlife Fund  
South Pacific Program  
Private Mail Bag, 4 Ma'afu Street, Suva,  
Fiji Islands  
Tel: +679 3315533  
Email: [jthomas@wwfpacific.org.fj](mailto:jthomas@wwfpacific.org.fj)

**Trinidad, Annabelle \*\*\***  
Consultant  
Asian Development Bank  
Cabanatan Road, Philam Homes  
Quezon City, Philippines  
Tel: +63 29175299041  
Email: [abbietrinidad@gmail.com](mailto:abbietrinidad@gmail.com)

**Weeks, Rebecca \***  
James Cook University  
Townsville, Queensland 4811, Australia.  
Tel: (+617) 4781 6134  
Email: [rebecca.weeks@jcu.edu.au](mailto:rebecca.weeks@jcu.edu.au)  
Skype: rebeccaweeks

**White, Alan (Dr) \*\*\***  
Senior Marine Scientist  
The Nature Conservancy  
923 Nu-uauu Avenue  
Honolulu HI 96817  
USA  
Tel: +1-808 687 6218  
E-mail: [alan\\_white@tnc.org](mailto:alan_white@tnc.org)

**Baskinas, Luz Teresa \*\*\***  
Vice President for Project Development and  
Grants  
World Wide Fund for Nature - Philippines  
4th Flr. JBD Building, 65 Mindanao Avenue,  
Quezon City 1105 Philippines  
Tel: +632 920 7923, +63 918 9100250  
Email: [lbaskinas@wwf.org.ph](mailto:lbaskinas@wwf.org.ph)

**Beger, Maria(Dr.) \*\***  
Environmental Decisions Group  
Center of Excellence for Environmental  
Decisions  
The University of Queensland, Brisbane,  
Australia  
Tel: (+614 1759 3080)  
Email: [m.beger@uq.edu.au](mailto:m.beger@uq.edu.au)  
Skype: mariabeger

**Co, Patrick \*\*\***  
World Wide Fund for Nature – Philippines  
4th Flr. JBD Building, 65 Mindanao Avenue,  
Quezon City 1105 Philippines  
Tel: +632 920 7923, (+63917) 8902880  
Email: [pco@wwf.org.ph](mailto:pco@wwf.org.ph)

**Gerochi, Manuel \***  
Under Secretary for Staff Bureau  
Department of Environment and Natural  
Resources, Visayas Avenue, Diliman  
Quezon City, 1100, Philippines  
Tel: +632 928 7861, +632 926 2567  
Email: [usecnccc@denr.gov.ph](mailto:usecnccc@denr.gov.ph)

**Laroya, Lynette \*\*\***  
Senior Ecosystems Management Specialist  
Protected Area and Wildlife Bureau  
Department of Environment and Natural  
Resources  
NAPWC, Quezon Avenue, Diliman, Quezon  
City, Philippines  
Tel: +632 925 8947, +63 9272679598  
Email: [lynette\\_laroya@yahoo.com](mailto:lynette_laroya@yahoo.com)

**Meimban, Jr, Jacob \*\***

Executive Director, Coastal and Marine Management Office (CMMO), Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Protected Area and Wildlife Bureau  
Tel: (+632 925-8948; +632 924-6031)  
Email: jakemeimban@yahoo.com

**Avelino, John Erick \*\*\***

Coastal and Marine Management Office (CMMO), Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Protected Area and Wildlife Bureau  
Tel: (+632 925-8948; +632 924-6031)  
Email: [jeavelino@yahoo.com.ph](mailto:jeavelino@yahoo.com.ph)

**Rombano, Nora \*\***

Coastal and Marine Management Office (CMMO), Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Protected Area and Wildlife Bureau  
Tel: (+632 925-8948; +632 924-6031)  
Email: nrombano@gmail.com

**Dolores Ariadne D. Diamante-Fabunan\*\***

Senior Adviser, Adaptation to Climate Change in Coastal Areas (ACCCoast)  
German Development Cooperation Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH  
2/F, PDCP Bank Centre; Corner V.A. Rufino & L.P. Leviste Streets, Salcedo Village, Makati City, Philippines  
2/F DENR-PAWB-CMMO, Ninoy Aquino Parks and Wildlife Center, North Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines  
Tel: + 63 920 949 7925  
E-mail: dolores.fabunan@giz.de