



**UNDP/GEF PROJECT ENTITLED “REDUCING ENVIRONMENTAL STRESS IN THE
YELLOW SEA LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM”**

UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/3
Date: 12 October 2005
English only

**Second Regional Working Group Meeting
For the Biodiversity Component of
The UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project**
Jeju, Korea, 9th to 12th November 2005

Meeting Report

OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome addresses

- 1.1.1 Mr. Jeffrey Archer on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme UNDP/ Global Environment Facility (GEF) Yellow Sea Large Marine Ecosystem (YSLME) Project Management Office (PMO) opened the meeting, welcoming all participants to Jeju Island. He thanked the Cheju National University International Centre for the splendid venue and for the meeting arrangements, and noted especially the attendance of a large number of observers.
- 1.1.2 Mr. LEE Yoon, the Chairperson of the Regional Working Group for Biodiversity, welcomed the group to Jeju. He briefly presented the agenda for the meeting and summarized the objectives of the meeting.

1.2 Introduction of the members

- 1.2.1 Participants of the Regional Working Group (RWG) for Biodiversity were invited to introduce themselves and each gave a description of their background and involvement in the project. Observers also introduced themselves, describing their areas of potential input to the project. The list of participants is attached to this report as [Annex I](#).

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

2.1 Documentation Available to the Meeting

- 2.1.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to introduce the documents prepared for the meeting.
- 2.1.2 Mr. Archer from the PMO introduced the list of documents (Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/inf.1) and informed the meeting that the documents in front of them included the discussion documents (Expected Outcomes and Outputs of the 2nd RWG-B meeting, Activities to be Implemented 2005 to 2006, A Brief Description of the Governance Analysis, and Workplan for the Biodiversity Component 2005 to 2006), and the informational documents, Report of the 1st RWG-B Meeting, Report of the 1st RSTP Meeting, and the Report for the Technical Meeting for the Cooperative Study Cruises (October, 2005) provided as background documents for the discussion. The Secretariat made special mention that the document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/5 was missing from the documentation, as this relied on the data and information collection reports from the participating countries, which had not been received prior to the meeting.

2.2 Organisation of Work

- 2.2.1 The Secretariat introduced the document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/inf.3 describing the Provisional Working Programme for the meeting and noted that the meeting would be conducted in plenary as best as possible, but suggested that some aspects be addressed in sessional working groups where necessary.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

- 3.1 The Secretariat briefly explained each agenda item, referring to the Provisional Agenda (Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/1) and Provisional Working Programme (Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/inf.3).
- 3.2 Participants were then asked to consider the documents prepared by the Secretariat, and to propose any amendments or additions that they might wish.
- 3.3 **The meeting adopted the agenda with no modification, which is attached as [Annex II](#) to this report.**

4. EXPECTED OUTPUTS FROM THE SECOND RWG-B MEETING

- 4.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to introduce Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/4, and explain the expected outputs from this Meeting.
- 4.2 Mr. Archer presented the outcomes and outputs anticipated from the meeting, stating that the main objectives were: the review and synthesis of biodiversity data and information for the Yellow Sea acquired through the recent data collection exercise; to analyse gaps in this data; identify the difficulties and barriers to data and information collection; and to discuss the preparation of data and information for input to the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA).
- 4.3 He reported that the major outcomes of the meeting were expected to be:
 - An awareness of the quality, gaps, difficulties and barriers to collecting data and information on Biodiversity, and an understanding of mechanisms to address these issues.
 - An awareness of the region-wide status and patterns-of-change in biodiversity, habitats and vulnerable species, and their protection in the Yellow Sea;
 - A revised list of 'perceived problems' and Causal Chain Analysis agreed at the first RWG-Biodiversity (RWG-B) meeting.
 - An improved state-of-knowledge of the existing national laws and regulations on biodiversity, habitat protection and vulnerable species and how these may contribute to potential governance issues.
 - An agreement on Biodiversity Component inputs for the preparation of the Draft TDA.
 - Understanding of the Biodiversity Component's role in the upcoming Cooperative Surveys of the Yellow Sea Marine Basin.
 - Agreement on activities to be implemented during 2005 to 2006 including the objectives of the body-of-work that is required to be implemented prior to the next RWG-B meeting, the role of consultants and members of the RWG-B in the process.
 - Agreement on list and schedule of activities for the RWG-B for 2005 to 2006.
- 4.4 Mr. Archer then informed the group of what tangible outputs were expected from the meeting. These were:

- A set of mechanisms to address the gaps, data issues and the barriers and difficulties to collection of data and information, etc.
- A listing of the format and presentation of data for input to the final TDA document.
- An updated causal chain and governance analysis based on contemporary biodiversity information, finalized for input to the Draft TDA.
- A workplan for the Regional Working Group – Biodiversity showing activities for 2005 to 2006, to submit for approval to the 2nd PSC Meeting.
- Approved statements of works for each of the impending consultant activities and proposals for suitable candidates.
- A workplan and list of responsibilities for activities leading up to, during, and after the co-operative cruise for the Biodiversity component.

4.5 Participants were then asked to consider the expected outcomes and outputs from the meeting, and to propose any amendments or additions that they might wish.

4.6 **There were no further issues or modifications to the list of outputs.**

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE ON-GOING ACTIVITIES UNDER THE BIODIVERSITY COMPONENT

5.1 REVIEW OF COLLECTED BIODIVERSITY DATA AND INFORMATION

5.1.1 The Chairman invited the Secretariat to introduce the expected outputs for this agenda item.

5.1.2 Mr. Archer briefly described the outputs expected from the collected biodiversity data and information and the actions required from the working group after considering the presentations from each country. These were to: discuss the results of the reports; review the data table (agreed at the First RWG-B Meeting); identify gaps in the data; discuss and agree upon the format of data to be analysed; and consider the presentation of data in the TDA, and later, in the GIS database.

5.1.3 Mr. Archer also mentioned that the group should relate the findings back to the original table of 'Perceived Problems of the Yellow Sea' to check for validity and, if possible, provide a diagnoses of the state of the Yellow Sea as it relates to Biodiversity issues.

5.1.4 Mr. Lee Yoon of the National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI) and Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MOMAF, Korea, gave a presentation describing the status of data collection for Republic of Korea.

5.1.5 He stated that data for 'Habitat Loss: Changes in area and length of selected habitats' was available in Korea, with 'actions of reclamation' data from 1963 to the present (40 years) being available; Reclamation area data is also 'available' although no temporal scale was given, and habitat type

(using RAMSAR Classification) was also available but with only less than 20 years worth of data.

- 5.1.6 With regard to 'Habitat Loss: Percentage Change of Habitats Under Protection', Mr. Lee reported that number and total area information was 'available', and that there was a lack of GIS information, however maps were available depicting this information.
- 5.1.7 For 'Percentage Change of Habitats Utilized for Sustainable Use' - zoning plans, number and total area data were 'available', although there was no definition of temporal scale.
- 5.1.8 Data for 'Habitat Conservation: Change in selected habitats before and after utilization and non-utilization' was also available, with the number and size of area being available for only the last 2-3 years. Data on the conversion of areas to salt pans activities is available, but there exists no official version of aquaculture data.
- 5.1.9 For 'Introduced Species for Culture', number of species introduced for culture was available for the last 50 years, but for species accidentally introduced to the wild through culture activities, data is only available for some species (e.g the bivalve *Mytilus edulis*, but not for fishes), but date of introduction cannot be determined (not even to year, or decade). For Abundance of introduced species, data for number and abundance still requires further consultation but Mr. Lee noted that most-likely Korea does not possess this data.
- 5.1.10 For 'Loss of Species' data on number of endemic species is available, 20 years for fishes. 30 years for dominant phytoplankton and 20 years for zooplankton. Data is also available on other taxonomic groups, vulnerable species, listing and IUCN threat categories. No temporal scale was given for the latter.
- 5.1.11 For 'Degradation of Biodiversity: Changes in genetic diversity of important bio-resources tested by gene pool analysis', Mr. Lee stated that data on 'genes per selected species' was 'undefined at present'. Mr. Lee mentioned that he believes that Korea may have genetic information on more than 5 species.
- 5.1.12 The Chairman invited the First Institute of Oceanography (FIO), State Oceanic Administration (SOA), China to present the Biodiversity-related data and information collected for China during the past collection exercise.
- 5.1.13 Mr. Chen Shang of the FIO described the activities that the China group has undertaken for the data & information collection. He introduced the members of the data-collection group and described the contents of the planning meetings held for the exercise. Mr. Chen provided a view of some data in spreadsheet form.
- 5.1.14 For 'Habitat Loss' China has located information and reports for reclamation data but is not available now. China will acquire some remote sensing images to identify the information on this.
- 5.1.15 Mr. Chen also reported that there were different types of protected area recognised in China relating to different types of use of the zones, and their targets of protection.

- 5.1.16 China was only able to locate information and reports for 'marine functional zoning' of the Shandong Information from Jiangsu Province will be available in December, 2005 and information for Liaoning is not available as it is still being reviewed.
- 5.1.17 Mr. Chen further stated that only general information on 'Endemic Species' existed and that there was information on 10 taxonomic groups for 'Vulnerable Species'. For Genetic Diversity, information was available for more than 10 species. He also indicated that there were 'many' laws and regulations related to Biodiversity referring to an extensive list in the dataset.
- 5.1.18 Mr. Chen reported that they possessed data and information regarding distribution of important organisms (vulnerable, endemic, etc) and the population trend (plus causes of trends), however the data was still in the process of being translated.
- 5.1.19 He described the data for 'Introduced species' showing that they had data on the 'origin country' and 'first place of introduction', plus the references for each point of information. He stated that the data is only concerned with 'established species in aquaculture' and that there was no data to describe 'establishment of species in the wild', with the exception of the invasive plant *Spartina*.
- 5.1.20 He presented to the group some of the data and information he has collected on laws and regulations related to Biodiversity in China, showing details in the spreadsheet such as the issue date and approval department.
- 5.1.21 Mr. Chen proposed that a survey of coastal area be conducted to obtain more information on the status of exotic species and habitat loss, and he felt that this was more important to pursue than 'gene pool analysis'. He also stated that as they only possessed general information on endemic species and some vulnerable species, there is not much known of abundance and distribution therefore highlighted the need for a coastal survey.
- 5.1.22 He remarked in summary that the data and information that is currently available in China is 'not enough' to determine the status of biodiversity in the yellow Sea.
- 5.1.23 Mr. Chen stated that three data gaps existed: (1) lack of information on exotic Species, and the impacts from exotic species on native species; (2) lack of data and information on genetic diversity of aqua-cultured populations and wild populations; and (3) no current information on habitat loss.
- 5.1.24 Mr. Lee Tae Won noted an absence in both reports of data and information on species used in the 'restocking' of populations of native species, and suggested that this information be included if possible.
- 5.1.25 Both China and Korea reported that there is currently no data and information on re-stocking and suggested that re-stocking information should be considered by Fisheries in the mariculture section.

- 5.1.26 **The PMO agreed to discuss the 're-stocking' issue at the next RWG-Fisheries meeting on the 17th November, 2005.**
- 5.1.27 Mr. Tobai Sadayosi of the WWF/KORDI/KEI Yellow Sea Ecoregion Planning Programme (YSEPP) described some of the issues relating to same-species introduction citing the following examples: The Manila Clam – where introduction of the same species from China/Korea to Japan to augment wild populations has introduced foreign parasites in some populations; Also the importation of an octopus, thought to be the same species, from Korea (Jeju Island) to Japan, and introduction into the wild, has resulted in some identifiable ecological and biological changes, such as shift in the spawning season of the wild population.
- 5.1.28 **Both China and Korea reported that they possessed that type of data and agreed to include it in their data collection.**
- 5.1.29 Mr. Tobai also informed members that the YSEPP possesses a database of endangered species for the Yellow Sea region that may be useful to backup the data and information collected by the group.
- 5.1.30 **YSEPP agreed to distribute this information to the Chairs of each country's working group after the meeting.**
- 5.1.31 Mr. Archer asked both countries to agree on the national level that data would be collected to for each country.
- 5.1.32 **China agreed to collect habitat data at the 'city' level**, explaining that in China, the 'city' level may actually include several counties, for example, the City of Qingdao includes eight 'counties'.
- 5.1.33 **Korea agreed to collect habitat data at the 'do' level**, which is approximately equal to the Chinese 'city' level.
- 5.1.34 At the completion of the data and information reports, the group was invited to discuss the data presentation requirements for the RWG-B. The Secretariat described the requirements for presentation of the data and information for both the TDA in the immediacy and for GIS and public Awareness activities in the future.
- 5.1.35 The Chairman requested Mr. Tobai to give a brief overview of the data and GIS information developed by their programme and that is available for use by the YSLME.
- 5.1.36 Mr Tobai together with representatives from the GIS systems development company, Sundosoft, Inc, gave an overview of the data and information products from the YSEPP and explained for the benefit of new members and observers, how their designations of Ecologically Important Areas can contribute critical elements of the RWG-B data requirements for the TDA, and for use in the Strategic Action Programme (SAP).
- 5.1.37 Mr. Cho Woo Ik showed the GIS overlay maps and described some of the difficulties in defining the areas (polygon shapes) on the maps, and also how to integrate the data from both countries, and made suggestions for a coordinated GIS system (such as the Lambert Conformal Coordinate System) to record longitude and latitude information for both countries.

They recommended that the database software Microsoft Access be used as preferred data management software because of its usefulness and user-friendliness, although they stated, that Microsoft Excel was also suitable.

- 5.1.38 Mr. Cho offered to the group for Sundosoft to review the data and information provided by the RWG and standardise the format of certain data so that it could be used in the development of GIS, and noted that Sundosoft would discuss the GIS requirements of the RWG-B (and the other RWGs) at an upcoming meeting with a representative of the China-Korea Joint Ocean Research Centre, currently being arranged by the PMO.
- 5.1.39 The group discussed in detail the requirements for visual presentation of the data and information.
- 5.1.40 In the light of the new data and information gathered during the collection exercise, the Chairperson invited the group to re-examine the table listing the parameters for 'data and information collection' and the list of 'perceived problems' which were identified at the first RWG-B meeting, and make any modifications to this list as necessary.
- 5.1.41 Mr Tobai noted that 'reclamation data' for China is available in a reference that he can provide it to the relevant parties at a later date.
- 5.1.42 Mr. Lee Yoon queried the definition of 'artificial' coastal line and suggested that the definition should include 'reclamated coastal line' utilising the reclamation data that is being collected.
- 5.1.43 **After discussion, members agreed that the term 'artificial' coastline would comprise of a number of different information types including the construction of concrete structures, reclamation of land, development of extensive erosion barriers, sea dykes, and coastal dam, etc.**
- 5.1.44 Participants entered into detailed discussions and made further modifications to the data table, adding information on the availability of each data item for both China and Korea. The final 'parameters for collection' data and information table showing the updated terms and temporal availability of data is attached in Annex III.
- 5.1.45 The Chairperson asked the group to consider the format of raw data to be presented to the PMO at the end of the data and information collection exercise and invited the Secretariat to present an example of a dataset table for both countries to use.
- 5.1.46 Mr. Cornish posed two recommendations to the group:
- 1) To utilise the existing YSEPP ecologically important areas in the data table in order to ensure data from YSEPP was directly comparable in terms of location and scale, and
 - 2) To utilise the basic 'causal chain columns' in the dataset spreadsheet to facilitate the causal chain analysis at a later date.

- 5.1.47 **The group discussed the recommendations and will consider to use the YSEPP ecologically important areas in the data table although anthropogenic data is already collated at city level in China (refer 5.1.32). Mr. Tobai was satisfied this scale was sufficiently detailed for a direct comparison. And will consider to utilise the basic 'causal chain columns' in the dataset spreadsheet in their analysis if it is appropriate.**
- 5.1.48 Members completed reviewing the data-entry templates and after making various comments and modifications finalised the spreadsheets. **The agreed spreadsheets are attached in Annex IV.**
- 5.1.49 **The group recognised the new data table format, and understood that completion of this table is not a necessary requirement for the signed data collection contracts, but a mechanism to synthesise the data and information between both countries. The group will try their best to collect data according to the new table format.**

6. CONSIDERATION OF THE COOPERATIVE STUDY CRUISE

- 6.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to present a summary of the Technical Meeting for the Co-operative Study Cruises (17-18 October 2005) (Document UNDP/GEF/YS/JC.1/3).
- 6.2 Mr. Archer presented the outcomes and agreements of the Technical Meeting for the Co-operative Study Cruises (17-18 October 2005), describing the agreements on cruise dates, survey route, sampling stations and transect locations, and the personnel allocations made for each working group that will be onboard during the survey. He also described the discussions and agreements on transportation of equipment and personnel, the role of Scientists and their responsibilities, the preparation of equipment and the research vessel, sample and data sharing and follow-up work.
- 6.3 He discussed the fact that the Biodiversity Component has since decided to send two scientists on the winter and summer cruises to survey seabirds and marine mammals, and provided an overview of the decisions made relating to this. He noted that the Chinese researcher has been chosen, but are waiting for the nomination from Korea.
- 6.4 Mr. Archer also noted that the Chief Scientist for China and Chief Scientist for Korea have both been selected for the cruise, and both have the appropriate authority and responsibility for the cruise. He also stated that the Captain of the ship was ultimately responsible for the safety of the ship and personnel and would make the relevant decisions based on this.
- 6.5 The Chairperson invited members to consider necessary technical details of the joint cruise, and to decide on the workplan and responsibilities to finalise the preparation of the Biodiversity component of the co-operative study cruise.
- 6.6 Mr. Lee Yoon suggested that participants on the cruise should include an expert on birds and one on mammals, and that Korea and China should work together to select a complementary specialist (seabird or marine mammal specialist) from their country.

- 6.7 **The members discussed this suggestion and the group agreed that the Chinese side would provide an expert on marine mammals and that the Korean side would try to provide an expert on seabirds. Both countries agreed to reassess the situation if Korea could not locate a suitable person.**
- 6.8 Ms. Choi Young Rae informed that there is a recommendation for one more expert from each field to attend the cruise to fully cover both sides of the ship, and also to develop a policy for the purchase and disposal of equipment for the survey.
- 6.9 Mr. Archer replied that the number of scientists on board was limited and allocation had already been made. The number of scientist participating on behalf of the Ecosystem Component had been reduced by 2 to accommodate the recent wishes of the RWG-B to send 2 scientist on the cruise. It would be difficult for the RWG-B to seek an additional 2 slots for more people at this time. However if the group agreed to it, the PMO would raise the issue with the relevant parties to request that the wishes of the RWG-B are accommodated. He also noted that the PMO are currently developing a policy paper to deal with the issue ownership and disposal of equipment from the Cooperative Cruise, and for the Project. He stated however, that it is the policy of the UNDP/GEF that all equipment purchased with project funds will remain the property of the GEF until such time as an agreement on its disposal was made.
- 6.10 **The group discussed this recommendation and agreed to not change the original number of scientists to represent the RWG-B on the cruise, but will consider this at a later date for the spring cruise later next year.**
- 6.11 Mr. Seo Kyung Suk raised the issue about the financial support to purchase a few items such as a telescope and digital video recording system for the Cooperative Study Cruise. And also mentioned that we need time to discuss about which item we are going to purchase. They would let the PMO know about this in two weeks. The amount of money will not \be dramatically different from that of the Chinese budget proposal.
- 6.12 China has already supplied the name of the nominated marine mammal specialist and the Secretariat urged Korea to provide their nomination as soon as possible so that they could initiate the visa application process. He also urged the two countries to collaborate and finalise the budgets for the cruise to provide to the PMO as soon as possible.
- 6.13 **Korea agreed to provide the name and passport details of the Korean specialist to attend the cruise, to the PMO by the 19th November, 2005.**
- 6.14 Mr. Tobai informed the group that an 'on-ship manual for seabird observation', developed by a North American Seabird Group and adopted by a Japanese Seabird Group for on-vessel observations of seabirds at sea that potentially could be adopted for this cruise.
- 6.15 **The Biodiversity group agreed to obtain copies of these guidelines and work with the biodiversity scientist participating in the study cruise to develop a manual and methodology for the observation of birds and marine mammals for use in this survey. Members agreed to submit this to PMO by December 10, 2005.**

- 6.16 Mr. Cornish pointed out that 'genetic information' is not included in the list of data to be collected during the cooperative cruise, and suggested that this may be a good opportunity to collect such information.
- 6.17 Mr. Archer replied that it might be too late to include the collection of Gene Pool data during the winter cruise; however, there is an opportunity for that analysis in the spring cruise should we decide to pursue gene pool analysis in the future, and pending approval by the Project Steering Committee (PSC). **He stated that the PMO would discuss the acquisition and storage of samples with the other groups to determine whether the RWG-B could retroactively undertake genetic analysis should they decide to pursue this topic.**
- 6.18 The Chairperson invited the members to examine the workplan of the Cooperative Study Cruise (Document UNDP/GEF/YS/JC.1/3) and consider the activities of Biodiversity Component leading up to the cruise and after the cruise.
- 6.19 **After some discussion, members agreed to work with the seabird and marine mammal specialist on the development of the workplan when they are selected, with full consideration of the time constraints. Members agreed to finalise the workplan for the cruise and submit it to PMO by November 20, 2005.**

7. ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED DURING 2005 TO 2006

- 7.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to introduce Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/6 and describe the body of work that is required to be implemented prior to the 3rd RWG-B meeting.
- 7.2 Mr. Archer summarized the tasks of this agenda item and asked the members to familiarise themselves with the upcoming activities, the input required by both the members of the RWG-B and external consultants, the schedule of implementation of the work, and asked the members to propose appropriate candidates to undertake the consultant tasks.
- 7.1 He described the immediate activities of the RWG-B in lieu of the recent data and information exercise and considering the approaching deadline for inputs to the TDA.
- 7.2 Mr. Archer then described the mid-term activities that following these describing the discrete actions for the various sub-components:
- Habitat Conservation, Restoration, and Protection of Vulnerable Species.
 - Conservation of Genetic Diversity
 - Introduced Species, Impacts and Controls.
- 7.3 The Chairperson invited members to consider the activities of the RWG-B for 2005 to 2006, make any comments necessary and propose appropriate candidates for the required consultant activity.
- 7.4 Mr. Chen drew attention to the lack of exotic species data in the Yellow Sea and suggested that the RWG should undertake a survey on species diversity and habitat loss in coastal waters, referring to his proposal submitted to the

Chairperson in June, 2005. He added that the cooperative cruises do not include the coastal areas and will only yield information about basin-located species. He enquired to the PMO whether a survey of this nature was possible from a project point of view.

- 7.5 Mr. Archer replied that if it serves the purposes of the project, and a detailed proposal, workplan and budget for the survey were produced soon enough, then PMO could seek approval at the next PSC meeting. However, a full justification for the survey would be required and an assessment of the quality of existing data would need to be made to see if there is a lack of data to justify the survey. Without the above, it would be impossible.
- 7.6 **After much discussion members agreed that the reviewing of the existing data and information, and the identifying of data gaps should be completed first, before the issue of an additional coastal survey is discussed (at the next RWG-B meeting).**
- 7.7 **Both Korea and China agreed to provide proposals for candidates for the Biodiversity consultant contract by the 18th November, 2005.**
- 7.8 Mr. Tobai suggested the following items for possible inclusion in the Terms of Reference for the consultant contract for the regional strategy for biodiversity. These were:
1. To develop a procedure for the prioritization of demonstration sites for biodiversity conservation, especially for MPAs.
 2. To produce a draft result of prioritized demonstration sites based on the proposed procedure with datasets collected by the RWG-B and YSEPP.
 3. He also recommended that this should take place in the form of a training workshop.
- 7.9 **The PMO thanked Mr. Tobai for this critical input and agreed to discuss how the consultant TOR may be modified with WWF, to include this important element.**
- 7.10 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to introduce Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/7 and provide a brief description of governance analysis and the process that will be employed by the Investment Component to facilitate the overall governance analysis for the project.
- 7.11 Mr. Endo Isao, Environmental Economics Officer for the PMO, presented the process of Governance analysis for the Project describing the background, the components and a suggested implementation structure of governance analysis. He stated that during the reviewing of the implementation plan and discussions with experts, there is a need for a consultant to undertake a full governance analysis integrating the outcomes from each component. He noted that there is currently no budget allocation for this consultant activity and was seeking an agreement from all the component groups to present the proposal to the PSC meeting for approval so that funds for the consultant activity may be sought.
- 7.12 The Chairman invited comments from the group in response to Mr. Endo's presentation.
- 7.13 Mr. Chen recommended to the PMO to examine the possibility of a training workshop on governance analysis.

- 7.14 Mr. Huh Sik on behalf of KORDI offered to host and support this workshop at their institute.
- 7.15 Mr. Chen, on behalf of FIO also offered to support the workshop in Qingdao.
- 7.16 The group agreed with the recommendation and requested that the PMO examine the possibility of a training workshop on governance analysis to be held before the next RWG meeting.**
- 7.17 Mr. Kim Jong Deog made a number of suggestions regarding the governance analysis:
- That the scope of work might be too large to be complete in a proposed study period and that collecting data at the provincial level would be difficult and time-consuming, though he recognized the importance of the Governance Analysis for developing a strategy or a policy in the TDA/SAP process.
 - That the analysis should focus on country level and not at finer resolutions in order to complete the analysis in time for the TDA. The time and scope of work need to be considered to determine whether the work is feasible.
 - That local government, in addition to the public, should be informed about the YSLME Project before conducting a consultation for governance analysis with them.
 - Moreover, while agreeing with the proposed plan, pointed out the capacity of consultants (who would conduct the analysis) as a potential challenge for the actual implementation.
- 7.18 Korea provided several suggestions for Korean institutions that are capable of conducting such an analysis, such as the Korea Maritime Institute (KMI), the Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute (KORDI), the Korea Environment Institute (KEI), and the Seoul National University as well as other universities. He recommended that the KMI should be involved in this project, and that KORDI should also be considered as they have strong marine policy teams. They also mentioned that many of these institutions have commitments to complete before end of year, so that we should work fast to initiate any plans with these organisations.
- 7.19 China suggested the First Institute of Oceanography and the Ocean University of China (Qingdao) as potential candidates for the Governance Analysis, reporting that both organizations have extensive expertise and experience in this field.
- 7.20 The PMO replied that it would follow up on these suggestions and will eventually select an appropriate consultant to undertake the consultant for this task based on the rules and regulations of the UNOPS. The evaluation of the consultant will depend on their abilities to be able to complete the contract within the given amount of time. The PMO emphasized the due date for the finalization of the TDA and noted that we must be prepared to compromise on the outcome of the Governance Analysis due to the time constraint.
- 7.21 Mr. Chen emphasized the importance of hiring two consultants, one from each country (China/Korea) for the governance analysis.
- 7.22 Mr. Huh Sik recommended forming a 'governance analysis group' consisting of one designated member from each project component (5) as well as the

contracted consultant(s) who would be in charge of overall analysis and integration.

- 7.23 **The PMO agreed to consider these recommendations during the consultation process.**
- 7.24 The PMO agreed to consider, if necessary, to reduce the scope of work, manage the schedule to produce the results in time, and discuss the challenges with the Investment Group at the next meeting.
- 7.25 Mr Archer noted that there are some implications to the RWG-B should there be an agreement, stating that there may be an additional data requirement from the Biodiversity Component to provide data and information for the governance analysis to assist the consultant and expedite the consultant activity to meet the deadline.
- 7.26 **The group agreed on the proposed governance analysis presented by the PMO, and expressed a continuous commitment and willingness to support the PMO and the consultants in the process of the analysis by providing additional relevant data if necessary. Both agreed to begin identifying the location of data after the meeting to be handed over to the consultant when they are selected.**
- 7.27 With the agreements made, the Chairperson further invited the members to consider possible data items for the Governance Analysis.
- 7.28 After careful consideration, members prepared a list of suggested data items relating to Biodiversity for the Governance Analysis. **The agreed list is attached in Annex V.**
- 7.29 The Chairman invited the PMO to introduce the original Causal Chain Analysis table finalized at the last RWG-B meeting and asked members to review it based on contemporary conservation and vulnerable species information and finalize the Causal Chain Analysis for input to the Draft TDA.
- 7.30 Mr. Chen Shang recommended that the term “Introduced Species” was changed to “Exotic Species” to cover a larger subset of organisms that are ‘foreign’ to the Yellow Sea, including: organisms intentionally introduced by man (for culture, aquariums, pets, ornamental, etc); organisms non-intentionally introduced by man (ballast-water and bio-fouling organisms) and; naturally invasive organisms (via currents, rafting and climate change).
- 7.31 **The members agreed that the term ‘Introduced Species’ should be replaced with ‘Exotic Species’. The PMO agreed to go through all documentation at a later date and make the necessary adjustments.**
- 7.32 **The updated causal chain analysis is attached in Annex VI.**

8. WORKPLAN FOR 2005 TO 2006

- 8.1 The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to introduce Document UNDP/GEF/YS/RWG-B.2/8, the project workplan.
- 8.2 Mr. Archer presented the schedule format of the current workplan for the Regional Working Group – Biodiversity, stating that some changes have been made to reflect the current situation. He invited members to review and revise the workplan for the RWG-B, for submission and approval at the 2nd PSC Meeting in December 2005.

8.3 The updated Schedule for the Biodiversity Working Group for 2005 to 2006 is attached in Annex VII.

8.4 The group recommended that a joint meeting with Pollution and Ecosystem (and any other necessary working group) be arranged to discuss tropic linkages, and other cross-component issues.

8.5 The PMO agreed to examine the budget and logistics for the additional separate meeting sometime around October, 2006.

8.6 The PMO also agreed to examine the agenda for the 3rd RWG-B meeting and determine whether there was time to hold a special meeting on Genetic Diversity during the RWG meeting, or whether an extra one-day meeting should be held after it.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 *The Chairperson invited Members to raise any other issues to be considered by this meeting.*

9.2 Mr Archer raised the issue of gene pool analysis and stated that an agreement on whether this group still wanted to pursue this as part of activities of this component was still required. If an agreement to proceed was reached then the PMO would need to present this requirement to the PSC to seek funding for these activities during the budget revision at that meeting.

9.3 The group recommended to continue collecting existing data for the genetic diversity and agreed to address the subject of gene pool analysis and produce an agreement on this subject at the 1 day workshop.

9.4 Mr. Chen suggested that two members participate in the next Regional Science and Technical Panel (RSTP) meeting to improve communications.

9.5 The PMO replied that the membership to the RSTP has been already been agreed and that we would need to seek approval for this. He stated that observers may be allowed at the RSTP meeting, and that this may adequately satisfy the request.

9.6 Mr. Archer encouraged better communications between members of working groups and between countries participating in the working groups, and emphasized that the mutual understanding and cooperative environment is a major desired outcome of the project.

9.7 Mr. Archer briefly introduced the UNOPS/PMO contracting procedure for the benefit of the group, describing the different contract modalities, contract types, the general contractual processes and procurement system, emphasizing the time it takes to complete the process and the urgency for expedient actions by members of the working group.

9.8 Members took the overview into consideration, appreciating the complexity of the process and agreeing to follow the UNOPS procedures in order to facilitate the process.

10. VENUE FOR THE NEXT REGIONAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

- 10.1 The Chairperson invited members to consider the venue for the third RWG-B meeting.
- 10.2 Mr. Archer noted that during the organisation of the 2nd round of RWG meetings for the different components many changes to the previously agreed meeting schedule. He emphasized that this had created a significant load of additional work for the PMO, and produced 'downstream' effects that may lead to the delay in other meetings and activities of the project. He requested that members consider their schedules when selecting a meeting date and venue.
- 10.3 **Members of the group agreed to have the 3rd RWG-B meeting in Chengdu, China, from the 24th to 27th July, 2006.**

11. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING REPORT

- 11.1 **The report was considered paragraph by paragraph and adopted as contained in this document.**
- 11.2 The Chairman moved the formal motion for the adoption of the report of the second Meeting for the regional Working Group for the Biodiversity of the YSLME Project which was passed by acclamation.

12. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

- 12.1 Mr. Archer, on behalf of the PMO, thanked all the participants for their hard work and dedication to producing a good final-product. He remarked that he was impressed by the broad spectrum of input in this meeting, due in part to the large number of observers, and also to the diverse range of expertise exhibited by the members of the group. He noted, that although some topics had to be repeated and issues had to be revisited during the meeting due to the attendance by many new members, he felt that the meeting had benefited from this overall by a greater range of input. He voiced his hope that the RWG-B membership would remain consistent in the future, and that observers would continue to participate in future meetings.
- 12.2 On behalf of Korea, Mr. Seo Kyung Suk gave thanks to the Chairman for his duty of managing the long meeting, gave thanks to his counterparts in China and the PMO for their hard work.
- 12.3 Mr. Chen Shang also gave thanks to the Chairman on behalf of the Chinese delegation and to the participants for their hard work.
- 12.4 The Chairperson thanked the participants of the meeting, the Project Manager, PMO staff and observers for their hard and constructive work, and formally closed the meeting at 20:00 hrs, November 12th, 2005.

Annex I

List of Participants

PARTICIPANTS OF THE MEETING

People's Republic of China

Dr. CHEN Shang

Research Professor
First Institute of Oceanography. S.O.A.
6 Xianxialing, Qingdao, Shangdong Province,
2660061, P.R. China
Tel: 86-532-8896-7476
Fax: 86-532-8896-7548
Email: schen@fio.org.cn

Dr. WANG Zongling

Research Professor
First Institute of Oceanography. S.O.A.
6 Xianxialing, Qingdao, Shangdong
Province, 2660061, P.R. China
Tel: 86-532-8896-7447
Fax: 86-532-8896-7548
Email: wangzl@fio.org.cn

Dr LI Ruixiang

Research Professor
First Institute of Oceanography. S.O.A.
6 Xianxialing, Qingdao, Shangdong Province,
2660061, P.R. China
Tel: 86-532-8896-7451
Fax: 86-532-8896-7548
Email: liruixiang@fio.org.cn

Republic of Korea

Dr. LEE Yoon

Senior Researcher
Plankton Ecology Division
National Fisheries Research & Development
Institute (NFRDI)
408-1, Sirang-Ri, Gijang-eup, Gijang-gun
Busan, 619-902, Republic of KOREA
Tel: 82-51-720-2240
Fax: 82-51-720-2266
Email: yoonee@nfrdi.re.kr

Prof. LEE Tae Won

Professor
Department of Oceanography
College of Natural Science
Chungnam National University
Taejon 305-764, Korea
phone: +82 42 821-6433,
fax: +82 42 822-8173,
email: twlee@cnu.ac.kr

Dr. KIM Jong Deog

Head of Coastal Management Team
Marine Environment and Coastal
Management Research Division
Korea Maritime Institute
1027-4, Bangbae 3-Dong, Seocho-Gu, Seoul,
137-851
Tel: 82-2-2105-2770
Fax: 82-2-2105-2779
Email: jdkim65@kmi.re.kr

Dr. KANG Hyung-Ku

Senior Research Scientist
Marine Environment Research Dept.
Korean Ocean Research and Development
Institute (KORDI)
1270 Sa-dong Sangnok-gu Ansan-si
Gyeonggi-do 426-744, Republic of KOREA
Tel: 82-31-400-7723
Fax: 82-31-408-5934
Email: kanghk@kordi.re.kr

PARTNERS

Mr. TOBAI Sadayosi

Yellow Sea Ecoregion Planning Programme
Ecoregion Coordinator
WWF Japan
Nihonseimei Akabanebashi Bldg., 6Fl.
3-1-14 Shiba Minto-ku,
Tokyo 105-0014
Japan
Tel: 81-3-3769-1783
Fax: 81-3-3769-1717
Email: tobai@wwf.or.jp

Mr. CORNISH Andy

Director of Conservation
WWF Hong Kong
No.1 Tramway Path, Central
Hong Kong
Tel: +85-2-25254499
Fax: +85-2-25300864
Email: wwf@wwf.org.hk

OBSERVERS

Mr. CHO Woo Ik

FM & Natural Resource Dept.
Sundosoft, Inc.
World Meridian Venture Center
II 15F, 426-5, Gasan-Dong
Geumcheon-Gu, Seoul
Korea
Tel: +82-2-2025-6800
Fax: +82-2-2025-6511
Email: wicho@sundosoft.com

Mr. OH Jung Hee

Team Manager
FM & Natural Resource Dept.
Sundosoft, Inc.
World Meridian Venture Center
II 15F, 426-5, Gasan-Dong
Geumcheon-Gu, Seoul
Korea
Tel: +82-2-2025-6800
Fax: +82-2-2025-6511
Email: jhoh@sundosoft.com

Mr. Sik Huh

Director
International Cooperation Division
Ocean Policy Center
Korea Ocean Research and Development
Institute (KORDI)
Ansan P.O. Box 29, 425-600
Korea
Tel: 82-31-400-7750
Fax: 82-31-406-6925
Email: sikhuh@kordi.re.kr

Ms. Young Rae Choi

Researcher
International Cooperation Division
Ocean Policy Center
Korea Ocean Research and Development
Institute (KORDI)
Ansan P.O. Box 29, 425-600
Korea
Tel: 82-31-400-7757
Fax: 82-31-406-6925
Email: yrchoi@kordi.re.kr

Mr. Li Lifeng

WWF China
Room 1609
Wen Hua Gong
Beijing Working People's Culture Palace
Beijing 100006
China
Tel: +86-10-65227100 ext.3266
Fax: +86-10-65227300
Email: lfli@wwfchina.org

Dr. PARK Hong Sik

Senior Scientist
Korean Ocean Research and Development
Institute(KORDI)
1270 Sa-dong Sangnok-gu Ansan-si
Gyeonggi-do 426-744, Republic of KOREA
Tel: 82-31-400-6228
Fax: 82-31-406-6925
Email: hspark@kordi.re.kr

Dr. SEO Kyung Suk

Researcher
National Fisheries Research & Development
Institute (NFRDI)
408-1, Sirang-Ri, Gijang-eup, Gijang-gun
Busan, 619-902, Republic of KOREA
Tel: 82-51-720-2550
Fax: 82-51-720-2266
Email: dino_seo@hotmail.net

**UNDP/GEF Project Management Office
(PMO)****Mr. ARCHER Jeffrey**

Fisheries Officer
UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project
Korea Ocean Research and Development
Institute
1270 Sa-dong Sangnok-gu Ansan-si
Gyeonggi-do 426-744
Republic of Korea
Tel: (82-31) 400 7832
Fax: (82-31) 400 7826
Email: jeff@yslme.org

Mr. ENDO Isao

Environmental Economics Officer
UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project
Korea Ocean Research and
Development Institute
1270 Sa-dong Sangnok-gu Ansan-si
Gyeonggi-do 426-744
Republic of Korea
Tel: (82-31) 400 7793
Fax: (82-31) 400 7826
Email: isao@yslme.org

Mr. PARK Sungjun

Finance and Administration Officer
UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project
Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute
1270 Sa-dong Sangnok-gu Ansan-si
Gyeonggi-do 426-744
Republic of Korea
Tel: (82-31) 400 7828
Fax: (82-31) 400 7826
Email: sungjun@yslme.org

Annex II

Agenda

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

- 1.1 Welcome addresses
- 1.2 Introduction of the members

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

- 2.1 Documentation Available to the Meeting
- 2.2 Organisation of Work

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

4. EXPECTED OUTPUTS FROM THE 2ND RWG-B MEETING

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE ON-GOING ACTIVITIES UNDER THE BIODIVERSITY COMPONENT

- 5.1 Review of collected Biodiversity data and information

6. CONSIDERATION OF THE COOPERATIVE STUDY CRUISE

7. ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED DURING 2005 TO 2006

- 7.1 Regional Data and Information Synthesis
- 7.2 Data and Information Input for TDA
- 7.3 Habitat Conservation, Restoration and Protection of Vulnerable Species
- 7.4 Conservation of Genetic Diversity
- 7.5 Introduced Species, Impacts and Controls

8. WORKPLAN FOR 2005 TO 2006

9. OTHER BUSINESS

10. VENUE FOR NEXT REGIONAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

11. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING REPORT

12. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Annex III

Updated 'Parameters for Collection' Table

| Problem | Indicators/Information Needed to Detect Problem: | Type: | Unit: | Temporal Requirements: | Spatial Requirements: | Availability: | | Priority: | Trans boundary?: |
|---------------------|--|---|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------|------------------|
| | | | | | | ROK | CHINA | | |
| Habitat Loss | Change in extent (Area and Length) of selected marine and coastal habitats | Reclamation Data (includes developing and approved) | Area, % | 20 - 30 Years | Coastal Areas of Yellow Sea | For last 30 years (since 1963) | For last 20 years (only have 10 years data) | H | Y |
| | | Artificial vs. Natural Coastline (artificial = concrete structures, reclamation, erosion barriers, sea dyke, coastal dam) | Length, % | 20 - 30 Years | Coastal Areas of Yellow Sea | Yes (more than 40 years) | Yes (only have 10 years data) | | |
| | | Habitat Type (e.g using RAMSAR Classification System for Wetland types) | Area, % | 20 - 30 Years | Coastal Areas of Yellow Sea | Yes, less than 20 years (have 15 years) | Yes (only have 10 years data) | | |
| | Percentage change in marine and coastal habitats under protection | International Registered, National (all relevant departments), Provincial, County (local), by protection type. | Number, Total Area and map and GIS info where possible | 30 Years | Coastal Areas of Yellow Sea | National, Provincial, County (local), 20 years (20 years for each category) | National, Provincial, County (local), more than 10 years (No County info, 10 years only) | H | Y |
| | Percentage change in marine and coastal habitats utilised for sustainable use (e.g. to encourage | Zoning Plans, National (all relevant departments), Provincial, County (local). | Number, Total Area | NA | Coastal Areas of Yellow Sea | National, Provincial, County (local), 10 years (10 years for | National, Provincial, County (local), 10 years (No County Info) | H | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | Ecotourism)* | | | | | each category) | | | |
| Habitat Conversion | Change in extent (Area) of selected marine and coastal habitats. e.g mariculture, salt pans | Habitat Type before and after, by utilisation (salt pan, mariculture, estuary barrages, etc) and by non-utilisation | Number, Area, number of barrages and size | 20-30 Years | Coastal Areas of Yellow Sea | Y (mariculture 2 years, saltpan est. 10 years) | Y (10 years) | H | Y |
| Introduced Species (includes natural and human-related) | List of all species introduced for culture | Species, Origin and date of introduction | Number of species | 30 Years | | Y (50 years) | Y (A few species 30 years, most 10 years) | H | Y |
| | All species introduced to the wild through culture | Species, location, date of introduction | Number of species, date. | 20 Years for some | Yellow Sea | Info for some species, but cannot determine date (not have - except mussel M. edulis) | Info for some species (a few species, mostly Spartina and some fishes from fisherman only) | H | Y |
| | Abundance of introduced species | Species, abundance and distribution | No. Species, abundance and distribution | 20 Years for some | Yellow Sea | Need consultation (none) | Info for some species (only Spartina) | H | Y |
| Loss of Species | Endemic Species | Species | Number | 50 Years | Yellow Sea | Need Consultation (only name list, found site) | Need Consultation (only name list, found site) | H | Y |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | Vulnerable Species | IUCN Threat Categories, IUCN Red List, National Vulnerable Species Listings | Number species in each threat category | 20 Years | Yellow Sea | Y (20 years, mainly fish and marine mammals and seabirds) | Y (some fish 20 years) | H | Y |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Degradation of Bio-Diversity | Changes in genetic diversity of important bio-resources | Gene Pool Analysis | Genes per selected species | Undefined at present | Undefined at present | Y (many species) | Y (some papers on some species) | M | Y |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | * Recommend to refer this issue to relevant RWG | | | | | | | | |

Annex IV

Agreed Data Format Tables

The following are the agreed parameters for data and information collection and data entry.

Protected Area

| Site Name (or ID) | Site | | | Location (range) | | Objectives of Protection | Area (ha) | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | Province | City or County | Description | Long | Lat | | Total | Core Area | Buffer Area | Experiment Area | Map of Distribution |

| Habitat | | | Community type | | Human Activities | Management institution | | | | | References | Remarks |
|---------|------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|---------|
| Type | Area | Trend | Important Species | Major Communities | | Level | Responsible Department | Date of Establishment (Approval Date) | Active Management | Staff No. | | |

Reclamation

| Name of Reclaimed Region | Site | | | Location (Range) | | Date | Reclamation Rstatus |
|--------------------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----|------|---------------------|
| | Province | City or County | Description | Long | Lat | | |

| Natural Coastal Habitat | | | Artificial Coastal Habitat | | | Impact by Human Activities | | References |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------|------------|
| habitat type | area km ² | length km | habitat type | area km ² | length km | rank 1 | rank 2 | |

Habitat Conversion

| Site Name (or ID) | Site | | | Location (range) | | Date |
|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----|------|
| | Province | City or County | Description | Long | Lat | |

| Habitat Type | Habitat Area km ² | Major Utilization | Human Activity | | | References | Remarks |
|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------|--------|------------|---------|
| | | | rank 1 | rank 2 | rank 3 | | |

Functional Zoning

| Site | | | | Location (Range) | | Area | Major Function | Current Utilization | Approval Year | Approval Government | References |
|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----|------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------|
| Site Name (or ID) | Province | City or County | Description | Long | Lat | | | | | | |

Vulnerable Species

| Group Name | Latin Name | English Name | Chinese Name | Korean Name | Distribution in YS (Description) | Quantity or catch | |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | | | Date of Peak Catch | Date of Lowest Catch |

| IUCN Threatened Categories | Trend | Major Causes | IUCN Red List | China Red List Category | Korean Listing (To be defined) |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | ↓ or ↑ | | | | |

Endemic Species

| Group Name | Latin Name | English Name | Korean Name | Chinese Name | Distribution in YS | Found Date | High-level Year | Low-level Year |
|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|

| Threatened Categories | Trend | Major Causes | China Red List | Korean List (to be defined) | IUCN Red List | References |
|-----------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------|
|-----------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------|

Exotic Species

| Latin Name | English Name | Chinese Name | Korean Name | Pathway of Introduction | Objective of Introduction | Date of Introduction | Origin of Import |
|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------|

| Rearing Site (Place or Facility Broodstock Held or Raised) | Date of First Record in Wild | Site of First Record in Wild | Wild Population Yes or Not | Wild Population Distribution | References | Remarks |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|---------|
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|---------|

Genetic Diversity

| Group Name | Latin Name | English Name | Chinese Name | Korean Name | Genetic Information | References | Remarks |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|------------|---------|
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|------------|---------|

Laws and Regulations

| Group Name | Name | Issued Date | Issued By | References | Remarks |
|---|-------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | |
| Biodiversity-related laws | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Biodiversity-related regulations | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Biodiversity-related standards | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Biodiversity-related international agreements | | | | | |

Annex V

List of Recommended Data and Information to be Included in Governance Analysis

- I. List of stakeholders of the Yellow Sea
- II. List of management related departments (e.g. government structure, including county level)
- III. List of biodiversity related laws and regulations and standards, etc
- IV. List of current and planned developments (e.g., Marine Protected Areas - MPAs)
- V. Current and planned relevant national and provincial budgets, systems, legal basis, and person in charge of each responsible entity (government organizations which are responsible for the conservation efforts). Focus on identifying the budget allocation, rather than suggesting the specific revision on the budgets.

Annex VI

Causal Chain Analysis after the 2nd RWG-B Meeting

| Problem | Impact | Immediate cause | Underlying cause | Root cause | Governance analysis | Priority rank |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---------------|
| | Reduction in habitat area, quality and community | Reclamation, erosion, sand extraction, ocean dumping, construction activities. | increased demand for coastal land resources, building materials, waste disposal field, natural change | Requirement for more land for rapidly growing population | Inadequate planning, management practices, and coastal development systems, lack of knowledge and or infrastructure base, weak enforcement | |
| | Change in extent (Area and Length) of selected marine and coastal habitats | Extensive reclamation, development of Mariculture, construction of estuary barrage | increased demand for coastal land resources between 1970's and early 1990's | requirement for more land for rapidly growing population | Development-oriented policies in coastal and marine areas, Inadequate planning, management practices, and coastal development systems, lack of knowledge and or infrastructure base, stakeholders interests, legislative loop-holes encourage reclamation, inadequate laws, weak enforcement | |
| Habitat Loss | Change in marine and coastal habitats under protection | Designation of protected areas, Development of habitat management plan | Decreased coastal and marine development pressure since late 1990's | Extended knowledge for the importance of coastal and marine habitats | Lack of an integrated coastal and marine management authority, International agreement, treaties and conventions for environment and living resources | |
| | Change in marine and coastal habitats utilised for sustainable use (e.g. to encourage Ecotourism) | Demand for sustainable coastal development | New demand for multi-purpose use in coastal and marine areas | Improved standard of living | Intentions for sustainable use for marine resources and conservation of marine ecosystem | |
| Habitat Conversion | Change of habitat structure | Reclamation for culture and salt production, and recreational activities | Increased demand for food and salt | Requirement for more food and salt for rapidly growing population | Inadequate planning, weak enforcement for marine function zoning practice (especially local government) | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Exotic Species (includes natural and human-related) | Impact on native species | Increased demand for culture, and from ballast water, climate change | Demand for food, increased shipping transportation | Requirement for more food and salt (deleted) for rapidly growing population, inadequate knowledge | No or weak management practice, inadequate regulations, weak controls on greenhouse gases |
| Loss of Species | Reduction in Species Diversity | Improper use of bio-resources, Over-exploitation, habitat degradation and loss of spawning and nursery grounds, introduced species, change of community structure and food web | Improperly utilisation, pollution, dumping, | Inadequate knowledge | Inadequate management practice, weak enforcement, poor policy for habitats and living resources |
| | | | Improperly managed and controlled fisheries systems, lack of knowledge of intentionally introduced spp. (physiology, ecology etc), and poor education of importance of species diversity. | Lack of knowledge of function and mechanism for ecosystem | Inadequate planning, management practices, and coastal development systems, lack of knowledge and or infrastructure base. Lack of integrated inter-ministerial approaches |
| Degradation of Bio-Diversity | Changes in genetic diversity of important bio-resources | Release of cultured species to the natural environment | | Inadequate knowledge | None, or weak management practice, inadequate regulations |

Annex VII

Updated Biodiversity Workplan After the 2nd RWG-B Meeting

| ID | Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | 2005 | | | | 2006 | | | | 2007 | | | | 2008 | | | | 2009 | | | |
|----|---|------------|--------------|--------------|--|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|
| | | | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| 1 | OBJECTIVE II: BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION COMPONENT | 1155 days? | Tue 05-04-19 | Tue 09-09-15 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2005 Q1 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | IIA: HABITAT CONSERVATION AND VULNERABLE SPECIES | 986 days? | Tue 05-04-19 | Wed 09-01-21 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2005 Q1 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | ACT 1: Review existing national practices of coastal habitat use, c | 394 days? | Tue 05-04-19 | Mon 06-10-16 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2005 Q1 to 2007 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | WG Meeting 1 (Qingdao) | 4 days | Tue 05-04-19 | Fri 05-04-22 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | <u>Contract to relevant national institution(s) (Contract)</u> | 155 days | Tue 05-08-30 | Fri 06-03-31 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | WG Meeting 2 | 4 days | Wed 05-11-09 | Sat 05-11-12 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Finalise national outputs and synthesis | 23 days | Mon 06-05-01 | Wed 06-05-31 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Consider cross- component meeting with other WGs to discuss tropi | 2 days? | Sun 06-10-15 | Mon 06-10-16 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | <u>Prepare a regional synthesis (consultant)</u> | 113 days | Wed 06-03-01 | Fri 06-08-04 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Present outcomes of national assessment in WG Meeting 3 | 4 days | Tue 06-08-08 | Fri 06-08-11 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Publish the outcomes (printing) | 44 days? | Sat 06-08-12 | Tue 06-10-10 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Inputs to final TDA | 4 days | Fri 06-09-01 | Wed 06-09-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | ACT 2: Develop regionally coordinated strategies of conservation : | 397 days? | Mon 06-05-01 | Thu 07-11-01 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q1 to 2008 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | <u>Prepare draft regional strategy (Consultant)</u> | 66 days? | Mon 06-05-01 | Mon 06-07-31 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Discuss and modify the draft (WG Meeting 3) | 4 days | Tue 06-08-08 | Fri 06-08-11 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Revise the draft accordingly | 90 days | Sat 06-08-12 | Tue 06-12-12 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Finalise strategy (WG Meeting 4) | 4 days | Mon 07-09-03 | Thu 07-09-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Inputs to regional SAP | 4 days | Mon 07-10-29 | Thu 07-11-01 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | ACT 3: Implement regional strategy for conservation areas and the | 30 days | Fri 07-09-07 | Thu 07-10-18 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q3 to 2007 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | <u>Prepare draft implementation plan (consultant)</u> | 30 days | Fri 07-09-07 | Thu 07-10-18 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | ACT 4: Implement regional strategy for conservation areas | 4 days | Fri 08-08-01 | Wed 08-08-06 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q4 to 2007 Q1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Adopt implementation plan (WG Meeting 5) | 4 days | Fri 08-08-01 | Wed 08-08-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | ACT 5: Implementation of regionally coordinated strategies for protec | 120 days | Thu 08-08-07 | Wed 09-01-21 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q4 to 2007 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | <u>Implement the strategy (contract to national focal points)</u> | 120 days | Thu 08-08-07 | Wed 09-01-21 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | IIB: GENETIC DIVERSITY | 538 days | Mon 05-12-19 | Fri 08-01-04 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q1 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | ACT 1: Determine situations of genetic degradation of important bi | 89 days | Mon 06-05-08 | Wed 06-09-06 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q2 to 2007 Q1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Meeting to discuss Genetic Diversity at end of RWG3 | 1 day | Sat 06-08-12 | Sat 06-08-12 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | <u>Prepare draft of current status of genetic degradation of important bi</u> | 70 days | Mon 06-05-08 | Fri 06-08-11 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | Discuss and finalise current status (WG Meeting 3) | 4 days | Tue 06-08-08 | Fri 06-08-11 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | Inputs to TDA | 4 days | Fri 06-09-01 | Wed 06-09-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | ACT 2: Develop regional consensus on the requirements for conse | 443 days | Mon 06-05-01 | Fri 08-01-04 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q2 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | <u>Prepare draft list on conservation of genetic diversity (consultants)</u> | 23 days | Mon 06-05-01 | Wed 06-05-31 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | Training course on genetic techniques [delete this] | 44 days | Thu 06-06-01 | Tue 06-08-01 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Agree list on genes (WG Meeting 2 delete) (during addition working | 1 day | Wed 06-06-14 | Wed 06-06-14 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | <u>Prepare a plan for the conservation (consultant)</u> | 140 days | Thu 06-06-15 | Fri 06-12-22 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Finalise the plan (WG Meeting 3) | 4 days | Mon 06-12-25 | Thu 06-12-28 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | Input to SAP | 4 days | Tue 08-01-01 | Fri 08-01-04 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | ACT 3: Prepare recommendations for conservation measures | 25 days | Mon 05-12-19 | Fri 06-01-20 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q1 to 2006 Q2] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | The activities will be incorporated into activity 2 | 25 days | Mon 05-12-19 | Fri 06-01-20 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | IIC: EXOTIC (INTRODUCED) SPECIES | 768 days? | Tue 05-04-19 | Fri 08-03-21 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2005 Q1 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | ACT 1: Document introduced exotic species and their pathways, as | 364 days | Tue 05-04-19 | Wed 06-09-06 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2005 Q1 to 2007 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | WG Meeting 1 | 4 days | Tue 05-04-19 | Fri 05-04-22 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | <u>Contract to relevant national institution(s) (Contract)</u> | 155 days | Tue 05-08-30 | Fri 06-03-31 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Discuss and modify the draft (WG Meeting 2) | 4 days | Mon 06-04-03 | Thu 06-04-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | Revise the draft accordingly | 80 days | Fri 06-04-07 | Thu 06-07-27 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | Finalise the strategy (WG Meeting 3) | 4 days | Tue 06-08-08 | Fri 06-08-11 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | Inputs to TDA | 4 days | Fri 06-09-01 | Wed 06-09-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | ACT 2: Develop proposals for regulation and control of exotic spec | 378 days? | Fri 06-07-28 | Thu 08-01-03 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2006 Q3 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | <u>Prepare draft regulation to control exotic species (consultant)</u> | 60 days | Fri 06-07-28 | Mon 06-10-16 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | Discuss the draft (WG Meeting 3) | 4 days | Tue 06-10-17 | Fri 06-10-20 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | Training course on the implementation of the regulation | 105 days | Mon 06-10-23 | Fri 07-03-16 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | Revise the draft accordingly | 120 days? | Mon 06-10-23 | Fri 07-04-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | Finalise strategy (WG Meeting 4) | 4 days | Wed 07-08-08 | Mon 07-08-13 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | Submit for approval of governments | 99 days | Tue 07-08-14 | Fri 07-12-28 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | Inputs to regional SAP | 4 days | Mon 07-12-31 | Thu 08-01-03 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | ACT 3: Implement strategies for regulation and control of introduct | 60 days? | Mon 07-12-31 | Fri 08-03-21 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2007 Q4 to 2008 Q1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | <u>Upon approval, prepare an implementation plan (consultant)</u> | 30 days | Mon 07-12-31 | Fri 08-02-08 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | Implement the regulation | 30 days? | Mon 08-02-11 | Fri 08-03-21 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | Inputs to regional SAP | 30 days | Mon 08-02-11 | Fri 08-03-21 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | IID: SYNTHESIS OF REVIEWS AND DEVELOPMENT OF COORDINATE | 387 days | Mon 08-03-24 | Tue 09-09-15 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2008 Q1 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | ACT 1: Synthesize reviews from IIA, B and C | 34 days | Mon 08-03-24 | Thu 08-05-08 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2008 Q1 to 2008 Q2] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | <u>Consultant to synthesize output from activity HIGH of IIA, IIB, IIC (c</u> | 30 days | Mon 08-03-24 | Fri 08-05-02 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | Inputs to final TDA | 4 days | Mon 08-05-05 | Thu 08-05-08 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 | ACT 2: Develop coordinated strategy for biodiversity protection | 387 days | Mon 08-03-24 | Tue 09-09-15 | [Gantt bar spanning from 2008 Q1 to 2009 Q4] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | <u>Synthesize 3 regional strategies and 3 implementation plans to prep</u> | 65 days | Mon 08-03-24 | Fri 08-06-20 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | Discuss and prioritise actions in regional SAP (WG Meeting 5) | 4 days | Fri 08-08-01 | Wed 08-08-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | Revsie the draft accordingly | 30 days | Thu 08-08-07 | Wed 08-09-17 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | Finalize strategy (WG Meeting 6?) | 4 days | Fri 09-05-01 | Wed 09-05-06 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | Inputs to regional SAP | 30 days | Thu 09-05-07 | Wed 09-06-17 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | Accept the Regional SAP | 30 days | Thu 09-06-18 | Wed 09-07-29 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | Submit for approval of governments | 30 days | Thu 09-07-30 | Wed 09-09-09 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | TDA COMPLETE | 4 days | Fri 08-05-09 | Wed 08-05-14 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | SAP COMPLETE | 4 days | Thu 09-09-10 | Tue 09-09-15 | [Task bar] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |