

## **SPREP Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**

SPREP Meeting (20<sup>th</sup> : 2009 : Apia, Samoa)

Report of the Twentieth SPREP Meeting, 17 - 20  
November 2009, Apia, Samoa. – Apia, Samoa :  
SPREP, 2009.

73 p. ; 29 cm

ISBN: 978-982-04-0394-9

1. Environmental policy – Oceania – Congresses.  
2. Conservation of natural resources – Oceania –  
Congresses. 3. Environmental protection – Oceania –  
Congresses. I. Pacific Regional Environment Programme.  
II. Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment  
Programme (SPREP). III. Title.

363.7099

# Report of the 20<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting

17-20 November 2009

Apia, Samoa



Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme  
PO Box 240  
Apia  
Samoa  
T: (685) 21929  
F: (685) 20231  
E: [sprep@sprep.org](mailto:sprep@sprep.org)  
W: [www.sprep.org](http://www.sprep.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Agenda Item 1: Opening Prayer .....	1
Agenda Item 2: Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair .....	1
Agenda Item 3: Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures.....	1
Agenda Item 4: Action Taken on Matters Arising from Nineteenth SPREP Meeting .....	1
Agenda Item 5: 2008 Overview	
Agenda Item 5.1: Presentation of Annual Report for 2008 and Overview of progress since the Nineteenth SPREP Meeting.....	2
Agenda Item 5.2: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) on the 2008 Work Programme and Budget .....	3
Agenda Item 5.3: Audited Annual Accounts for 2008.....	5
Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues .....	5
Agenda Item 6.1: ICR Update.....	5
Agenda Item 6.2: Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) Update.....	7
<i>Agenda Item 6.2.1: Implementation Plan on Energy.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Agenda Item 6.2.2: Implementation Plan on Climate Change.....</i>	<i>8</i>
Agenda Item 6.3: SPREP Action Plan 205 – 2009 Review .....	9
Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues .....	11
Agenda Item 7.1: Report on Members’ Contributions .....	11
Agenda Item 7.2: Response to EC Institutional Assessment.....	13
Agenda Item 8: 2009 Triennial Reviews of Staff Terms and Conditions .....	14
Agenda Item 8.1: Professional Staff .....	14
Agenda Item 8.2: Support Staff.....	15
Agenda Item 9: 2010 Work Programme And Budget.....	15
Agenda Item 9.1: Island Ecosystems Programme Issues .....	15
<i>Agenda Item 9.1.1: Updates of the Regional Marine Species Programme .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Agenda Item 9.1.2: Regional Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System (TREDS)             Data Sharing and Exchange Policy.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Agenda Item 9.1.3: Capacity Building for the Implementation of Multilateral Environmental             Agreements (MEA) in the Pacific.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Agenda Item 9.1.4: 2010 International Year of Biodiversity.....</i>	<i>18</i>

Agenda Item 9.2: Pacific Futures Programme Issues.....	19
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.1: Solid Waste in the Pacific</i> .....	19
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.2: Review of the Regional Solid Waste Management Strategy</i> .....	21
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.3: Review of the Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme Strategy (PACPOL)</i> ...	21
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.4: Meteorological Services Support Update</i> .....	22
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.5: Urgent Review of Regional Meteorological Services</i> .....	24
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.6: GEF Matters and GEF-PAS Developments</i> .....	25
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.7: Regional Cooperation in GHG Mitigation in the Energy Sector</i> .....	26
<i>Agenda Item 9.2.8: Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) Outcomes</i> .....	27
Agenda Item 9.3: Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2010.....	28
Agenda Item 10: Corporate and Institutional Issues .....	31
Agenda Item 10.1: The Role of SPREP Ministers’ Forum in the Context of the SPREP Meeting .....	31
Agenda Item 10.2: Proposed Revisions to the Procedures for the Appointment of the SPREP Director .....	33
Agenda Item 11: Members’ Issues .....	35
Agenda Item 11.1: Streamlined Reporting by Pacific Island Countries to the Biodiversity-Related Multilateral Environmental Agreements – Progress Update .....	35
Agenda Item 11.2: Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on National Developments Related to the Climate Change Focus Area of the SPREP Action Plan .....	36
Agenda Item 12: Regional Cooperation .....	39
Agenda Item 12.1: CROP Executives Meeting Report.....	39
Agenda Item 13: Items Proposed by Members.....	40
Agenda Items 14: Statement by Observers .....	40
Agenda Items 15: Other Business.....	40
Agenda Items 16: Date and Venue of Twenty-First SPREP Meeting.....	40
Agenda Items 17: Adoption of Report .....	40
Agenda Item 18: Close .....	40
Annexes: .....	42
Annex 1: List of Participants.....	42
Annex 2: Official Opening Statements .....	49
Annex 3: Agenda.....	53
Annex 4: Overview of Annual Report by Director .....	54
Annex 5: Observer Statements .....	57

## INTRODUCTION

1. The 20<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting (20SM) was convened in Apia, Samoa from 17 to 20 November, 2009. Representatives of the following SPREP countries and territories attended: American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Republic of the Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and United States of America. Observers from a range of regional, international and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) also attended. A list of participants is attached as Annex I.

## OPENING CEREMONY

2. The Meeting was officially opened by the Honourable Faumuina Tiatia Liuga, Minister of Natural Resources and Environment of the Government of Samoa. Reverend Dr. Fa'afetai Fata blessed the meeting with a prayer and the SPREP Director, Mr David Sheppard, made some welcoming remarks. Entertainment was provided by the EFKS Vini Fou Choir and the Apia Harvest Centre Choir. Copies of the Director's and the Minister's speeches are attached as Annex II.

### AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING PRAYER

3. The current Chair of the SPREP Meeting, Federated States of Micronesia, represented by Mr Andrew Yatilman, called the meeting to order and welcomed delegates. The meeting was opened with a short prayer by the delegate of the Cook Islands, Mr Vaitoti Tupa.

### AGENDA ITEM 2: APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

4. The Meeting, in accordance with the SPREP Meeting Rules of Procedures, confirmed the

Representative of Kiribati, Ms Teboranga Tioti, as Chair and the Representative of Tokelau, Mr Jovilisi Suveinakama, as Vice-Chair.

5. The outgoing Chair thanked the Members for their cooperation and support during the last year.

### AGENDA ITEM 3: ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND WORKING PROCEDURES

6. The Secretariat confirmed that agenda items 8.3 and 9.2.9 had been removed from the provisional agenda previously circulated.

7. In response to a request from the Representative of Niue, the Secretariat confirmed that it would organise time during the meeting for delegates to visit the tsunami affected area.

8. The Meeting **adopted** the Revised Agenda (contained in Annex III) and its proposed hours and programme of work.

9. The Meeting also **appointed** an open-ended Report Drafting Committee comprising of a core group of Fiji, France, New Zealand, Niue and the United States of America with the Vice-Chair (Tokelau) chairing the Committee.

### AGENDA ITEM 4: ACTION TAKEN ON MATTERS ARISING FROM NINETEENTH SPREP MEETING

10. The SPREP Director, Mr David Sheppard, thanked the outgoing Chair for his leadership during the previous year, congratulated the incoming Chair on her appointment, and expressed his appreciation to the Deputy Director and the SPREP team for the meeting preparations.

11. The Representative of Tokelau advised the Meeting that on 21 October Tokelau had formally adopted its new flag and he presented the new flag to the Meeting for acknowledgement.

12. The Secretariat then reported on actions taken on decisions of the 19<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting (19SM). In making this presentation, the Secretariat explained that a number of items in the report would be further addressed in separate agenda items.

13. The Secretariat made note of the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PACC) which was currently being implemented in 13 member countries. All countries had now signed MOUs with the Secretariat enabling distribution of funds to countries. While there had been some initial challenges in establishing project coordination units, the Secretariat advised that this project was well on track.

14. The Meeting *noted* the paper and actions taken by the Secretariat on the decisions of the 19SM.

## **AGENDA ITEM 5: 2008 OVERVIEW**

### **5.1 Presentation of the Director's Annual Report for 2008 and Overview of progress since the Nineteenth SPREP meeting**

15. The Director tabled the Annual Report for 2008 and presented his overview of progress since the 19SM. He advised that the Annual Report was available in both official languages of SPREP. The Director acknowledged the work of the former Director of SPREP, Mr Asterio Takesy, and of the 2008 staff. He highlighted the need to celebrate successes and positive outcomes of 2008, mentioned key examples of practical SPREP assistance to its Members, for example the PACC project, emphasised climate change as the key issue for the region and noted that the way forward for the organisation was to consolidate this extensive work.

16. The Director's full annual report presentation is attached as Annex IV.

17. The delegates of American Samoa, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Tokelau, Tonga and Tuvalu thanked the Director for his comprehensive report. Delegates acknowledged the work of the SPREP staff and the leadership of Mr Kosi Latu, who served as Acting Director during 2009. It was suggested that more subsidiary awareness publications such as a calendar be considered to help communicate to donors, stakeholders and the general public, the significant amount of work being done by SPREP rather than relying merely on the Annual Report itself.

18. The Director also acknowledged the work of the Deputy Director, and noted that this would be reflected in the 2009 Annual Report.

19. The representative of PNG recommended that SPREP coordinate the sharing of successes and lessons learnt from various GEF-funded marine projects in the region and invited SPREP to be part of the Pacific Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI). The representative also invited other countries to participate in the CTI programme.

20. The representative of Kiribati indicated to the Chair that Kiribati had minor comments on the 2008 Annual Report and in the interest of time, the representative asked to submit comments directly to the Secretariat. Kiribati's written comments on the Report, together with requests for follow up on 2008 activities, were noted by the Secretariat and would be addressed in the course of its 2010 work plan.

21. The representative of Tuvalu acknowledged the efforts and contribution of the Secretariat to the special needs of Small Island States (SIS) and highlighted the need for the Secretariat to also build its capacity by recruiting new personnel.

22. The representative of Tokelau highlighted the Secretariat's need to not only consolidate but also to tailor assistance to countries such as Tokelau, which were still making initial progress. He suggested that for such countries, it would be beneficial to have SPREP's assistance in

coordinating access to successes and lessons learned in issues such as coastal management and reef management through south-south cooperation.

23. The Chair noted the consensus for the Annual Report to be adopted and thanked the Director and his team for the excellent work provided.

24. The Meeting **adopted** the 2008 Annual Report.

## **5.2 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) on the 2008 Work Programme and Budget**

25. In accordance with the SPREP Meeting Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat presented its internal Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) for 2008, explaining that the PMER provides a tool for the Executive and Management to identify emerging issues and challenges and to make adjustments in its work programme as needed. It was also noted that cross-cutting areas of communications, education and capacity building had been integrated into the thematic areas and the various activities under these areas had not been reflected separately. Details of all areas of work were available in the PMER report.

26. The delegates of American Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, France, French Polynesia, Samoa, New Caledonia, Niue and Kiribati thanked and congratulated the Secretariat on its work over the previous year and noted, with approval, the provision of detailed information, particularly the inclusion of useful graphs.

27. The representative of France thanked the Secretariat for its excellent outline of the decisions of the 19<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting, which would allow the representatives of the member countries and territories to appreciate the work of SPREP. He mentioned that France, while remaining a modest donor to SPREP, maintained its commitment in 2008. He confirmed the commitment of France to coral reef and biodiversity protection.

28. The representative of American Samoa noted the issue of lower participation of some of the smaller island states. He added that in American Samoa several different US federal agencies were responsible for working on environmental issues.

29. Samoa referred to the output relating to strengthening national meteorological and climatological capacity noting that the only new funding for the project was minimal (0.5 million euro). He stressed that additional human resources were needed to enable this area to function well. The Samoa delegate acknowledged the USA for its contribution to this area and asked for an update on an earlier suggestion that Australia would fund an additional meteorological officer position.

30. The delegate of Niue commended the Secretariat for assistance provided in National Capacity Self Assessments, on climate change policy, National Strategic Action Plans and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulation. He also registered Niue's interest in participating in the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), Ramsar, the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas and review of Niue's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. The Niue delegate also advised Members of the country support programme for multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and noted that Members had not yet accessed these funds. He suggested that SPREP may be able to assist countries to access these funds.

31. The delegate of French Polynesia echoed earlier comments regarding the quality of the report. He hoped that the diagrams showing, among other things, the involvement of territories in SPREP activities, would be made available to Member States. He acknowledged that the participation of territories had been low but added that French Polynesia had been participating in several regional marine conservation activities. He added that French Polynesia was currently hosting the region's first marine protected area (MPA) conference, which reflected its involvement in the region.

32. Several delegates, including the Cook Islands, Kiribati and Niue expressed the need for more resources and greater support to be directed to waste management, in particular, to address difficult waste such as disposal of asbestos.

33. The representative of Kiribati commended the Secretariat for continuing to provide significant technical support to his country and others despite a busy year and reiterated the issue of waste management as a priority requiring additional support.

34. The representative of the Cook Islands echoed concerns regarding asbestos and recalled previous discussions that New Zealand and Australia be approached to assist with removal of this waste. He commended Australia on its workshop to assist with environmental impact assessment training some years ago and requested that the Secretariat assign a staff member to assist with this type of training.

35. The representative of Fiji thanked the Secretariat for support to countries with work to meet various convention obligations and requested that consideration also be given to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). She requested that SPREP also consider assisting with improved regional coordination of terrestrial projects and their possible integration with marine and coastal planning activities.

36. The representative of New Caledonia thanked the Secretariat for the assistance provided on MPAs and invasive species (in particular, rat) management. He further thanked the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and Conservation International (CI) for implementing projects that complement SPREP's activities. He also mentioned that the New Caledonian authorities had just decided to provide post-tsunami assistance to Samoa and Tonga.

37. The Director responded to the various comments noting that the Independent Corporate Review (ICR) had also called for increased engagement of territories, and that there had already been some recent positive developments. He suggested that donors and territories may wish to meet during the week to identify how they may best progress this issue.

38. On the issue of improving national meteorological capacity work, the Director advised that meteorological science was recognised as a priority but that funding limitations had prevented the SPREP meteorological officer position from being filled. He acknowledged, with gratitude, the current 0.5million euro being provided by Finland, noting that this would assist with regional training to enhance national meteorological officer skills. He added that a second, larger proposal to the same donor was under consideration. The Director also advised Members that the transfer of the Pacific Islands Global Ocean Observing System (PI-GOOS) and the Island Climate Update functions from SOPAC to SPREP provided opportunities to further strengthen this area. The Secretariat welcomed Members' suggestions to improve this work further.

39. The Director also apprised Members of the status of its work on pollution prevention and waste management, noting that there had been strong expression of interest from new sources for this work and that the Japanese and French governments (JICA and AFD) were key partners.

40. On the issue of CITES support, the Director noted that there were challenges to addressing all the various conventions, however, he made reference to the support of the Ramsar Secretariat in providing funding for a Ramsar officer position at SPREP and advised that he had recently contacted the CITES secretariat requesting similar support.

41. The Meeting *noted* the report.

### 5.3 Audited Annual Accounts for 2008

42. In accordance with the Financial Regulations, the Secretariat tabled the Audited Annual Accounts for the year ending 31 December 2008. The Director advised that the auditors had again provided a clean and unqualified<sup>1</sup> opinion of the Secretariat's financial operations for 2008.

43. The representative of Niue commended the Secretariat for its handling of its financial affairs and moved to adopt the report. The representative of France reminded the Meeting that he had expressed concerns in 2008 about the high level of SPREP's cash holdings, which showed that SPREP was not managing optimally its projects, since there was a delay between expenses and receipts. He observed that the cash flow, while remaining high, was lower than in 2007 and that this indicated a more fluid and efficient project management.

44. The Meeting **adopted** the audited Financial Statements and Auditors' Report for 2008.

## AGENDA ITEM 6: INSTITUTIONAL REFORM AND STRATEGIC ISSUES

### 6.1 ICR Update

45. The Secretariat reported on progress of implementation of the recommendations of the Independent Corporate Review (ICR) in accordance with directions from the 19<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting that the Secretariat report annually on this matter. It noted that an implementation progress report had been provided to the SPREP Special Meeting in July 2009. Two discussion papers were presented at that Meeting for feedback by Members. The papers related to ICR Recommendations 59, 60

and 61 (on core business) and ICR Recommendation 79 (on SPREP's governance arrangements).

46. In September 2009, a task force (comprising representatives from Australia, New Zealand, Samoa, Tokelau, United States and the Secretariat) met in Apia, and developed a proposed definition of SPREP's core business for consideration, prior to the 20<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting. The Secretariat also referred Members to an outline of its existing obligations arising from current Memoranda of Understanding and previous SPREP meeting decisions. It stressed that it was essential to first clarify what the Secretariat must do because these services are essential to the region and noted that this core business would require permanent funding from Members. However, the Secretariat advised that the task force had also acknowledged there was also other work that should be done in order to help the Secretariat draw on its comparative advantage or because the organisation may be uniquely placed to add value.

47. Regarding an earlier proposition by the Secretariat to establish a *chair's advisory committee or group*, it was noted that the task force had registered concerns about the breadth of the terms of reference and doubts about the likelihood that such an entity would improve communications between Members and the Secretariat. It requested that the proposal be revised to specify that the terms of reference focus on providing advice on budget and work programme matters, including the option of establishing thematic focal points.

48. The delegates of American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, FSM, France, French Polynesia, New Zealand, Niue, PNG, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and USA expressed their appreciation to the Secretariat and the ICR task force for the report.

---

<sup>1</sup> accounting term used to convey the fact that the accountants placed no caveats on their opinion

49. NZ expressed appreciation of its involvement in the ICR Task Force noting that there was much value in the ICR process and that there was a need for all SPREP members to participate especially in defining the organisation's core business. The representative of NZ also noted that there were linkages in this process with that of the upcoming review of the Action Plan in 2010.

50. The delegates from Australia, France, Tonga and Tuvalu sought clarification on the definition of core business, how it linked with the Action Plan review, whether it was in line with the SPREP Agreement, and its relationship to country contributions.

51. The representative of France asked for some clarification on the text of the recommendation (document 6.1, page 3, para 10): in the sentence on SPREP's core activities which "should be permanently funded through Members' contributions", regarding whether Member contributions are only made up of assessed contributions or the combination of assessed and voluntary contributions.

52. The representative of Tokelau suggested that a robust approach be adopted so that SPREP could move forward confidently into the future. He raised concern regarding the Secretariat's recent staff satisfaction survey report and requested information on how the organisation planned to address resource gaps. The Secretariat advised that work had already begun to address the staff satisfaction issue through improved communication and more regular meetings.

53. PNG, Samoa and Tuvalu proposed that the working paper and the proposed definition of core business was the way forward and agreed that this should be used at least in the interim to move things forward.

54. American Samoa sought clarification on funding of SPREP activities and relationships with country contributions and its core business and activities. He asked whether this should be apportioned on a ratio or percentage basis.

55. The Secretariat pointed out that the definition of core business suggested was one developed by the ICR Task Force and that the Secretariat would be guided by the Meeting. The Secretariat also highlighted the funding challenges it faced in matching activities and funding and stated that the ICR proposals could be adopted now and revised subsequently if they were found wanting.

56. In response to a suggestion by PNG, representatives of FSM and Cook Islands discussed the value of tasking the drafting group with reviewing the recommendation text and bringing the matter back for further consideration by the Meeting.

57. The delegate from USA pointed out that if an activity was not considered "core" it could still be implemented.

58. The delegate of French Polynesia wished that the Secretariat would provide more guidance for the work since SPREP Members cannot do everything. He noted that the definition of core functions, which remained vague, called for other definitions but indicated that he was ready to accept it as a first step. By contrast, he was not convinced of the usefulness of the advisory committee on the basis of the proposals made in the working paper. He did not see the need to replicate on a different scale the membership and work of the Meeting. He believed that it would be more worthwhile to include in this type of committee persons who are not SPREP Members. He therefore stated that he was not ready to adopt the last paragraph of the draft decision in its current wording.

59. Niue expressed concerns about the value of establishing an advisory group.

60. The representative of France noted that the sixth and last recommendation of paragraph 10 relating to SPREP's governance is totally separate from the first five, which all relate to the core functions of SPREP. This last recommendation

should be separated from the others. He added that he was not in favour of the establishment of a committee responsible for advising the SPREP Director, as it would be very difficult for France to attend both the officials and the committee meetings.

61. After further discussion it was agreed that the ICR task force would work further on drafting the text and that other delegates would be welcome to participate. Tuvalu welcomed the open invitation to participate on the ICR task force but raised concern regarding the participation and recommended that the Secretariat and the ICR task force make use of electronic communication technologies to facilitate participation. The Secretariat advised that although an electronic forum had been established for earlier consultations, this had not been utilised.

62. The Meeting:

- **noted** the steps the Secretariat has taken to implement ICR recommendations to date;
- **agreed at this time, and subject to further discussion and confirmation at the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting,** to define core business as *'The minimum set of capabilities SPREP must provide to Members on a regional basis, in accordance with its mandate as the regional environment organisation, which SPREP is best placed to deliver, and which should be funded through members' assessed and voluntary contributions.'*
- **agreed that Members would** engage with the Secretariat in further discussions in the context of a consultative strategic planning process on the revised Action Plan to define the functions and activities comprising the Secretariat's core business under two heads:

1. *Maintaining essential secretariat services, (for example circulating information, convening meetings,*

*framing decisions for members, managing institutional and human resources, overseeing follow-up work); and*

2. *Supporting activities that address priority regional environmental challenges and opportunities, and which require a regionally coordinated response, and for which SPREP is best positioned to deliver;*

- **decided** to extend the term and expand the membership of the ICR task force to finalise its work up to, but not beyond, the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting;
- **requested the task force** to address the above and to develop further proposals for improving engagement with Members in accordance with ICR recommendation 79.

## 6.2 Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) Update

### 6.2.1 Implementation Plan on Energy

63. The Secretariat outlined the steps regional organisations had taken to implement the reforms under the Regional Institutional Framework review relating to energy policy. Members were advised that the role of SPREP in energy policy is in relation to renewable energy development in the context of climate change. SPC is the CROP agency responsible for coordinating the regional energy programme as set out by the Energy Ministers meeting and subsequently endorsed by the Forum leaders at their meeting in Cairns in 2009.

64. In response to a request from the meeting, the representative of SPC confirmed SPC's role as the lead agency for regional energy coordination and noted that ICT and energy functions will be transferred from SOPAC to SPC in January 2010.

65. The Secretariat responded to queries from American Samoa, Samoa and Palau explaining that SPREP's role in renewable energy was in the context of mitigation for climate change; that the issue of co-locating PIGGAREP to Fiji was still a matter of discussion between the three CEOs; and that the renewable energy initiative, while focusing on mitigation, was also addressing economic and rural development.

66. The representative of France proposed that a reference to the coordinating responsibility given to SPC, at the RIF meeting held in Suva in July 2009, in relation to the energy sector, be included in the text of the recommendation (document 6.2.1, page 4, para 13).

67. With regard to a query regarding the Joint SOPAC-SPREP EDF 10 proposal, the Secretariat explained that this was a 9 million euro proposal developed from two separate earlier proposals by the two CROP agencies. Countries will be consulted on an ongoing basis as the proposal development progresses.

68. In response to concerns raised by the delegate of French Polynesia regarding the need for clear processes for absorption of SOPAC functions in the energy sector, the Secretariat advised that the transfer of SOPAC functions to SPREP would be discussed in a subsequent paper. It further stressed that, as SOPAC was primarily to be absorbed into SPC, it is that organisation that is taking the lead on the implementation plan for transfer and the three CEOs are in the process of addressing this.

69. The Meeting:

- **noted** that arrangements for the Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) reforms relating to energy policy and climate change were on track for implementation on 1 January 2010, as outlined in the implementation plan for the rationalisation of the SOPAC energy programme, recently approved by the SPC CRGA meeting;

- **noted** the coordination role of SPC in the energy sector in accordance with the decisions made in July 2009 in regard to the Regional Institutional Framework review;

- **noted** that the respective CEOs will continue to discuss the details of the implementation, and that the Secretariat plans to implement these reforms within its planned budget, and to review the level of resources it requires in 2010, following these discussions;

- **directed** the Secretariat to explore further roles and opportunities for SPREP in relation to energy policy and climate change, noting the need for improved coordination and cooperation among CROP agencies: e.g. by increasing joint implementation of PIGGAREP with SPC, PPA, USP and other project partners from January 2010; and

- **endorsed** that the Secretariat's component of the joint SOPAC-SPREP EDF 10 energy project proposal continues the momentum gained in the PIGGAREP, given SPREP's recognised role on energy and the environment.

#### **6.2.2 Implementation Plan on Climate Change**

70. The Secretariat outlined its strategy for transferring climate related functions from SOPAC to SPREP in accordance with existing agreements under the Regional Institutional Framework review. The July 2009 Joint Meeting of the Councils of SOPAC, SPC and SPREP decided to transfer four SOPAC functions to SPREP from January 2010:

- the Pacific Islands Global Ocean Observing System (PI-GOOS) – the Secretariat is discussing funding and recruitment arrangements with donors and stakeholders;

- the Islands Climate Update – in discussion with NZAID, the principal donor;
- the Climate Meteorological Database – in discussion with NZAID and NZ Ministry for Environment; and
- the component of the energy sector relating to monitoring and evaluation of greenhouse gases and the clean development mechanism (CDM).

71. The Secretariat advised that, if appropriately resourced and supported, the four functions would complement and strengthen existing activities within the SPREP programmes.

72. The delegation from USA thanked the Secretariat for participating in an earlier meeting with the PI-GOOS Advisory Committee which resulted in confirmation of the transition of the PI-GOOS post from SOPAC to SPREP. He also acknowledged NZ for funding capacity building in meteorology forecasting and data needs and requested that the Meteorology and Climatology Officer position be filled

73. The representative of NZ confirmed that funding for the functions supported by NZ would be up to 2010. She welcomed further discussions of what would be included in core business and invited members to consider making the important position part of core programmes in light of the review of the SPREP Action Plan. She also joined the USA in inviting support and views for the meteorological and climate data base position as core function. She invited Members to consolidate funding activities for Climate Change and Meteorological services under a common framework.

74. The Secretariat acknowledged the comments by USA and confirmed the importance of the meteorological position and encouraged

Members to consider this in view of consolidating Climate Change and Meteorological activities under a common framework.

75. Responding to the question from Samoa on outstanding issues, the Secretariat confirmed that the three CEOs and their governing councils had identified a clear way forward to start implementation as per the Leaders' decision by January 1<sup>st</sup> 2010.

76. The Meeting:

- **noted** the status of the four SOPAC functions to be transferred to SPREP and the proposed next steps for each.

### **6.3 SPREP Action Plan 2005 – 2009 Review**

77. The Secretariat stated that the SPREP Action Plan for 2005-2009 represents the regional agenda for managing the environment of the Pacific islands region and is at the core of the Secretariat's planning framework, guiding the design of SPREP's Strategic Programme and annual Work Programme and Budget. The current Action Plan is due for review in preparation for a new SPREP Action Plan for the next five years.

78. Although the Action Plan review needed to take into account other relevant processes such as the ICR exercise on defining the core functions of SPREP, the Secretariat suggested that the review of the Action Plan need not wait until completion of that exercise and that potentially, these could run in parallel and be mutually beneficial.

79. The Secretariat then outlined a proposed process for review of the current Action Plan and development of a new Action Plan for 2010-2015.

80. The representative of Tuvalu noted that the Action Plan would only commence properly in 2011 and asked for clarification on a possible interim extension of the current Action Plan. The Secretariat responded that the time frame would be an issue and undertook to be as timely as possible, and added that the current work plans could be used to carry on the work of the organisation. The issues for the future would need to take account of strategic issues such as climate change.

81. The representative of Tokelau underscored the need to strengthen the organisation and noted that many valuable lessons had been learned. He suggested that the focus of the review should be more forward looking rather than retrospective and that the review recommendations should not be contentious.

82. The representative of Tuvalu stated that other processes such as the ICR and RIF would need to be reflected, in order to strengthen the organisation.

83. The representative of Papua New Guinea encouraged the Secretariat to prepare a summary for consideration by Members to accompany the questionnaire and for all Members to undertake their own consultations. In this manner Members could assist in reducing the costs of the review.

84. The representatives of American Samoa, French Polynesia, Samoa and Tonga expressed concerns regarding the costs involved in the consultation process, noting that the process should be cost effective and not onerous for the Members. The use of other options such as a smaller consultative group or alternatives such as teleconferencing were suggested.

85. The Secretariat advised that the components that would require the most funding would be for convening a regional workshop and that costs would be reduced by utilising planned country visits. It added that costs would vary by country as some countries would require funding

support for national activities. These costs could be reduced if Members agreed to carry out this work using their own funds. The Secretariat also reassured Members that additional funding was being sought and that cost savings would be used to the extent possible.

86. The representative of French Polynesia noted that the development of the Action Plan should be part of the core functions of the Secretariat. He further observed that the financial assessment appeared disproportionate and asked for clarification on the purpose of a regional workshop. He suggested that other regional meetings should be utilized for the consultative process and that in terms of national consultations, this should be up to each country and be financed through national budgets. The synthesised action plan recommendations could be taken up by the next SPREP Meeting, perhaps during a two day consultation to precede the SPREP Meeting.

87. The representative of France stated that he was in full agreement with the arguments put forward by French Polynesia against the recommendation and advised that he must express reservations about the recommendation, which he could not approve in its original wording.

88. The Secretariat provided a revised work plan and budget, outlined below, for reviewing the 2005 – 2009 Action Plan and developing a new Action Plan for 2011 to 2016 in light of the various discussions and concerns.

<b>Budget Estimates for Action Plan Review and Drafting</b>	<b>USD</b>
In-country consultations	0
Sub-Regional meetings (3)	30,000
Pre 21 <sup>st</sup> SM Meeting	30,000
Translation and interpretation	35,000
Report production	5,000
<b>Total Funds</b>	<b>100,000</b>
Secured Funds	40,000
Balance of funds required	60,000

89. The representative of American Samoa concurred with the revisions, and moved to pass the revised recommendation relating to the action plan.

90. In response to a question from the representative of New Zealand relating to the link between the action plan and the Strategic Programmes, the Secretariat advised that its work in 2010 would continue to be implemented within the framework of the existing Strategic Programmes document.

91. The Secretariat further advised the Meeting that as a result of the several changes to the review process, the budget had been reduced by 50%. US\$40,000 had already been secured and US\$60,000 was yet to be sourced.

92. In response to queries from the representative of Papua New Guinea, the Secretariat explained that a package of documentation would be circulated. It would contain the draft Action Plan as well as other papers and a questionnaire. The Secretariat also advised that in terms of timeline, it was seeking to have the Action Plan endorsed at the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting. It therefore expected that consultations would begin within the next 4 or 5 months.

93. The Secretariat also noted the availability of other options such as teleconferencing but added that not all PICT's had this technology. The Secretariat advised Members that the Director would also use his country visits to consult wherever possible when in country.

94. The representative of America Samoa suggested that PICT's fund their own travel costs, however the Secretariat would need to fund the Director and Deputy Director. The Director noted this as a good idea, observing that by contributing it would give Members a sense of ownership of the final product. He expressed his hope that countries and territories would consider this cost-saving option.

95. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the proposed process for the review of the current Action Plan and the development of a new Action Plan for 2011-2016;
- **encouraged** the Secretariat to explore the possibilities of streamlining SPREP's strategic planning processes, including incorporating the existing Strategic Programmes document into a new Strategic Plan that will be the action plan for the purposes of the SPREP Agreement;
- **noted** that work in 2010 will continue to be implemented in the context of the Strategic Programmes document;
- **considered** the budgetary implications and **directed** the Secretariat to identify the most cost-effective methods of completing the review and developing a new Action Plan, such as teleconferencing, identifying a suitable regional meeting likely to be attended by SPREP delegates or holding a regional Action Plan meeting immediately before the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting; and
- **reviewed** and **approved** in-principle the draft terms of reference for the review.

## AGENDA ITEM 7: STRATEGIC FINANCIAL ISSUES

---

### 7.1 Report On Members' Contributions

96. In accordance with Financial Regulation 14, the Secretariat submitted its report on Members' contributions.

97. The Secretariat outlined the schedule of Member contributions noting that as of 13 November 2009, the outstanding member contributions were US\$603,972. The Secretariat explained that of this amount, 12% of these

(\$72,476) accounted for voluntary contributions while 88% (\$531,496) accounted for the normal contributions of Members.

98. The representative of USA objected to the use of the term “arrears” noting that this was an inappropriate term for voluntary outstanding contributions. He also noted that the USA was late in providing the 2009 funds but that they would provide \$US200,000 in direct contributions with an additional US\$60,000 going towards addressing land based sources of marine pollution.

99. The representative of America Samoa noted that approximately 90% of PICTs had not paid their contributions and requested the opportunity for each delegate to explain their reasons for not paying as this tends to happen every year. He observed that the Secretariat had continued to provide support to Members despite the lack of payments.

100. The representative of Niue thanked the Secretariat for sending a number of reminder letters to his country. He advised that the Government of Niue had conducted an internal assessment of the benefits and assistance provided by CROP agencies, including SPREP, and after this review they had agreed to pay a significant amount of their required contributions.

101. The representative of FSM advised that FSM funds would be paid.

102. The representative of the Cook Islands advised that the SPREP focal point for his country is the Foreign Affairs Department and that SPREP funds were included in the budget of that department. He had made note of the shortfall and hoped that it would be reflected in the budget for the financial years of 2010 and 2011. He added that payment by PICTs was important if they wished to strengthen SPREP.

103. The representatives of Fiji and PNG requested that letters be sent to all focal points, both political and institutional, to be distributed

before the delegates departed and that future reminder letters be copied to the Minister responsible and to the Finance Minister. The representative of Fiji also suggested that SPREP officials hold discussions with focal points during various workshops and meetings. She also added that her government would continue to strive to pay its contributions and arrears.

104. The Secretariat agreed to provide a letter for delegates to convey to their Ministers and advised that it had also written to member countries several times since the 19SM offering a rescheduling of payment for those PICTs experiencing difficulties.

105. The Director stressed that payment of membership contributions was an important part of a partnership between Members and the Secretariat. He also acknowledged with appreciation, the contribution from the USA and added that these funds would be well used. In response to a suggestion by the delegate of American Samoa, the Director observed that other CROP agencies had adopted a policy where services are reduced or withheld until long-standing outstanding fees are paid. He also noted the recommendation from Tokelau for his country visits to include meetings with officials to discuss payment schedules.

106. The representative of Tuvalu called for all members to pay their outstanding contributions and added that this should be strongly worded in the final recommendations.

107. The representative of France questioned the meaning of the word “collectively” in the draft resolution, since Member commitments on such issues can only be individual. The recommendation was subsequently reworded.

108. The Meeting:

- **considered** the report and the substantial unpaid contributions problem;

- **encouraged** the SPREP Director to raise the issue of unpaid contributions with relevant senior officials when he is visiting countries; and
- **committed** itself to paying current and unpaid contributions in full in 2009.

## 7.2 Response To EC Institutional Assessment

109. The Secretariat outlined its plan to address the recommendations of the 2009 European Commission (EC) Institutional Assessment of SPREP, relating to the Secretariat's financial mechanisms. The Secretariat advised that the assessment had found the Secretariat wanting in some areas, specifically current accounting systems, risk management and procurement processes.

110. The Secretariat advised that it had already commenced work to amend the financial regulations, was developing a consolidated risk management plan and a draft framework for procurement procedures. It planned to have these in place by the end of 2009 with a view to a reassessment by the EC in early 2010.

111. The Director commented that the EC audit had been implemented at SPREP's request in light of Members' increasing partnerships with the EC. He also advised that the Secretariat was giving consideration to having in place a specialist officer on EC matters.

112. The representative of American Samoa observed that the matters raised in the document are vital and relevant to any organisation and moved that this issue be accepted.

113. The representative of Niue commended the Secretariat on the progress made on the issue, recalling concerns expressed at the meeting in Suva which appeared to have impacted some RIF decisions. He alluded to the fact that a significant amount of resources could be available from the

EU and noted that currently only 2 per cent of the Secretariat's funding was from the EU.

114. The delegate of Tokelau expressed the need for ownership of the process noting that it ought to be realistic and holistic and not merely be in response to the RIF outcome.

115. The delegate of New Zealand advised that the issues raised in the EU audit were important for the future of the organization in general. He considered it important that the issues covered by the EU audit needed to be highlighted and addressed and added that while it may have been appropriate in the past to have procurement procedures geared at small projects, future engagement with key donors will require different procedures. The EC's EDF 10 allocation for 2013, understood to be 40 million euros for sustainable development, offered opportunities for SPREP. Meeting the EC's financial requirements would place SPREP in good stead for accessing these funds. He welcomed the Secretariat's attempts to address the EC recommendations and registered his appreciation of the update provided. New Zealand endorsed the recommendations concerning amendments to financial regulations as put before the Meeting but sought clarification on the process for implementing the recommendations. The delegate suggested it would be useful for Members to be kept informed of progress and asked that SPREP provide such a report to Members.

116. The delegate of France stated that, as a Member State of the European Union, his delegation encouraged the Secretariat to make sure that this agreement with the European Commission materialised, as it would obviously benefit SPREP and its Member States.

117. The delegate of Samoa advised that his country deals a lot with the EU, and that the recommendation was supported by his delegation. He added that a broader approach may be considered that would take into account various procurement scenarios.

118. The Director commended the Meeting for the positive comments and advised of the Secretariat's commitment to complete these tasks in a timely fashion.

119. The Meeting:

- **noted** the Secretariat's plans to address the recommendations of the EC institutional assessment by putting in place by December 2009 accounting reforms, risk management improvements and procurement guidelines;
- **approved** the attached amendments to the SPREP Financial Regulations, to ensure the financial statements comply with International Accounting Standards;
- **directed** the Secretariat to provide a progress report on implementation of the EC recommendations to members, including on the risk management framework and procurement manual, in early 2010; and
- **noted** that the Secretariat intends to invite the European Commission to reassess the Secretariat's policies and procedures in early 2010.

## **AGENDA ITEM 8: 2009 TRIENNIAL REVIEWS OF STAFF TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

---

### **8.1 Professional Staff**

120. The Secretariat presented the outcomes and recommendations of the 2009 Triennial Review for Professional Staff, in which SPREP participates with five other CROP agencies to ensure a 'harmonised' approach to salaries and conditions in the region.

121. The 2006 review was conducted by Mercer HR and the 2009 review was conducted by a consortium of Strategic Pay Ltd and

PricewaterhouseCoopers. The consultants' recommendations and the 2009 Annual Market Data Review were tabled.

122. The Secretariat advised that many of the recommendations required no changes to SPREP's systems and regulations. Several were still being discussed within the CROP Harmonisation Working Group and proposals would be put, as required, to future SPREP Meetings. The key changes required were identified as: a new CROP-wide salary banding model, which would provide more grades spread over essentially the current job points; a revised freight allowance; and future job sizing to be done by an external consultant.

123. The representative of France thanked the Secretariat for the work done in conjunction with the other CROP organisations. Before a decision was reached, he wanted to know if the Secretariat had addressed the impacts of this proposal on its salary bill and, in turn, the operational budget of SPREP. The Secretariat advised that there were no financial implications arising from the 2009 review.

124. The representative of New Zealand welcomed the proposed changes to the extent that they would improve CROP harmonization. He noted that as a consequence of the 2008 Market Data Review, the 2010 budget (addressed under agenda item 9.3) provided for some increases to professional salary rates.

125. The Meeting:

- **noted** the outcomes of the 2009 Triennial Remuneration Review for Professional Staff;
- **approved** the adoption of the proposed new salary banding model and direct the Secretariat to advise SPREP Members of an effective implementation date, and any other substantive issues relating to the adoption of the new banding model, either at the next SPREP meeting or earlier by circular, if necessary;

- **approved** replacing the existing entitlement for freight expenses on recruitment and repatriation with a maximum of a 20 foot container; and
- **noted** that future job sizing of SPREP positions will be completed by independent consultants using the SP10 job sizing methodology.

## 8.2 Support Staff

126. The Secretariat presented the findings of the 2009 Triennial Review for Support Staff, in which SPREP participates with five other CROP agencies. The main purpose of the review was to compare the SPREP support staff employment remuneration and conditions with the CROP labour market. The review was carried out by a Samoa-based consultant and was conducted in conjunction with similar reviews of support staff of other CROP agencies.

127. It was noted that this included the Annual Market Data Review which tracks CROP agencies' salaries against the local general labour reference market (Apia for SPREP).

128. The review findings demonstrated that the SPREP support staff salary scales were competitive and above the average pay line benchmarks of the CROP labor market. In response to these findings the SPREP management had decided to: 1) retain its current support staff salary scale and conditions until the CROP labor market catches up; and 2) have the SPREP Director review and make necessary changes to management policies affecting some of the support staffs' salary and employment conditions.

129. The Meeting:

- **noted** the outcome of the 2009 Annual Market Data Review for Support Staff and the Secretariat's intention to retain the existing salary scale; and

- **noted** that as an outcome of the 2009 Triennial Review, some policy decisions on support staff terms and conditions that fall within the discretion of the SPREP Director had been made.

## AGENDA ITEM 9: 2010 WORK PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

### 9.1 Island Ecosystems Programme Issues

#### 9.1.1 *Updates of the Regional Marine Species Programme*

130. The Secretariat made reference to decisions of the 18<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting (18SM), which adopted the Regional Marine Species Programme Framework, and provided an update to the Meeting on various aspects of it.

131. Regarding the decision of the 18SM to include sharks as a species of special interest to the regional marine species programme framework 2008-2012, the Secretariat advised that a working group consisting of SPREP, SPC, FFA and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Council (WCPFC) had worked together to progress the development of a regional action plan for sharks which would be finalized and launched in November 2009.

132. The Secretariat also advised on the development of regional arrangements for the conservation of cetaceans (whales and dolphins), dugongs and marine turtles under the auspices of the Convention for the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) in the Pacific Islands Region. It also noted the production of regional guidelines for whale and dolphin watching, developed in collaboration with the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) and Opération Cétacés, which were launched in March 2009.

133. Members were advised of the fact that the Oceania humpback whale population had been re-classified from “vulnerable” to “endangered” on the 2008 IUCN Red List Update and that, given this increase in threat status, the development of a recovery plan for Oceania humpback whales should be pursued. A process for developing such a plan was outlined.

134. The Secretariat further noted the dearth of information on marine turtle nesting populations in the Pacific Islands region and advised of a proposed study to identify major turtle stocks in the region. The study will involve the collection of turtle tissue samples for genetic analysis and will require collaboration amongst members and facilitation with necessary permits.

135. In response to a request from the representative of American Samoa on enforcement mechanisms for MOUs, the Secretariat advised that MOUs were not legally binding and enforcement was dependent on mutual collaboration rather than regulatory frameworks.

136. The Representative of France congratulated the Secretariat on, and noted his delegation’s full support for, this work. He gave general approval to the whole regional marine species programme and noted that France was particularly interested in the implementation of the sharks programme and supported the code of good practice for the observation of whales and dolphins. France supported in principle, a memorandum of understanding on sea turtles. Finally, he indicated that France had also signed the memorandum of understanding on dugongs.

137. In response to a request from the representative of Niue, the Secretariat confirmed that SPREP had been participating in activities of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) by attending meetings and making representations to the Commission for a number of years. It would continue to engage with the IWC.

138. The Representative of Niue also asked whether there was work proceeding in relation to the conservation of land crabs (coconut and mangrove). The Secretariat confirmed that although there was currently no programme of action in relation to the conservation of land crabs, the Secretariat would respond to any such request from Members.

139. The Representative of the USA endorsed the Secretariat’s work on turtles and suggested that an immediate priority was the programme of work identified in the SPREP marine turtle action plan.

140. Responding to the representative of New Caledonia, the Secretariat agreed to provide a list of the countries that had not yet signed the MOU on dugongs.

141. The Representative of Tokelau noted that Tokelau had not signed the MOUs relating to turtles and sharks and advised that there was a need for consultations at the national level to further progress understanding and support of these MOUs in Tokelau. With regard to cetaceans, the representative noted the conflict between fisheries development and conservation and again stressed the need for further consultation at the national level to progress conservation of these marine species

142. The Representative of New Zealand expressed strong support for progress made in the conservation of marine species, noted his delegation’s endorsement of the development of a Recovery Plan for humpback whales, and welcomed opportunities to explore how to further support initiatives under the programme.

143. The Representative of Fiji drew the Secretariat’s attention to the relationship between the programme of work on turtle sampling and analysis and CITES national regulatory requirements, and encouraged SPREP to liaise closely with the Fiji government and the University

of the South Pacific in relation to this programme of work in Fiji.

144. The Meeting:

- **noted** the status of the progress to develop the regional action plan for sharks;
- **noted** the outcomes of the second meeting of Signatories to the MoU on the conservation of cetaceans and their habitats in the Pacific Islands region;
- **encouraged** member countries that have not yet signed the MoU on the conservation of cetaceans and their habitats in the Pacific Islands region to sign;
- **noted** the outcomes of the “informal” meeting on a marine turtle arrangement in the region in Auckland, New Zealand, July 2009, in particular, the results of the gap analysis;
- **urged** Members who are parties to CMS and the CMS Secretariat, in collaboration with SPREP, to focus on prioritising key issues and securing funding at national levels to support the implementation of relevant actions in the Action Plan and to complete the questionnaire on their preferred option to help guide future work in this area;
- **encouraged** members that are dugong range states to sign the CMS MoU on the Conservation and Management of Dugongs and their habitats throughout its range;
- **encouraged** members to use the Pacific Islands regional guidelines for whale and dolphin watching in the development of national guidelines, conditions and regulations for whale and dolphin watching;
- **endorsed** the development and process for the recovery plan for Oceania humpback whales;

- **invited** nominations of appropriate national officials to be included in the Recovery Team for the recovery plan for Ocean humpback whales;
- **endorsed** the project to collect turtle tissues for genetic analysis and urge all members to fully cooperate in its implementation where possible.

#### **9.1.2 Regional Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System (TREDS) Data Sharing and Exchange Policy**

145. The Secretariat provided a summary of the Regional Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System (TREDS) noting that it was an important part of SPREP’s regional marine species management programme. It also advised that at the regional level TREDS could be used to collate data, provide back-up services to SPREP members and identify trends in turtle populations and migration patterns in the region.

146. In accordance with the requirements of the 2008-2011 Marine Turtle Action Plan, a TREDS Data Sharing and Exchange Policy and Protocol had been developed to ensure effective operations and management of the TREDS. The Secretariat advised that the policy provided a framework for accessing data exchange between the SPREP secretariat, SPREP members and other relevant individuals and groups that work together under the SPREP regional marine turtle tagging programme.

147. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the Regional Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System (TREDS) Data Sharing and Exchange Policy.

**9.1.3 Capacity Building for the implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) in the Pacific**

148. The Secretariat, in collaboration with UNEP, provided an update on the status of a regional initiative funded by the European Commission through UNEP and executed by SPREP. The project, under UNEP's Capacity building in relation to implementation of Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) in the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries, will be implemented over four years from March 2009, with a budget of USD 1.3 million.

149. Members were advised that the main outcomes of the project would be:

- i) strengthened capacity of SPREP to support Members as the Pacific Hub for Capacity Building in relation to MEAs;
- ii) strengthened capacity of Members (and Timor Leste, as a designated Pacific ACP Country) to implement MEAs; and
- iii) strengthened collaboration and coordination amongst CROP agencies to support MEA implementation.

150. Although Territories were not eligible for EC funding, SPREP had invited Territory governments to seek resources to participate in the project and benefit from the capacity building activities.

151. The Meeting:

- **noted** the measures taken by the Secretariat to have the Pacific participate and benefit from the project;
- **noted** the invitation to the Territory Governments;
- **noted** the participation of Timor Leste;
- **noted** the approach taken by the Secretariat to identify and work with national counterparts;

- **recorded** its appreciation to the EC for funding the project and to UNEP as the designated Implementing Agency assisting SPREP and the Pacific ACP Countries; and
- **endorsed** the outcomes of the inception Pacific MEA Conference and urged Members to take advantage of the assistance rendered through SPREP as the Pacific Hub for capacity building related to MEA implementation.

**9.1.4 2010 International Year of Biodiversity**

152. The Secretariat advised that 2010 had been designated the International Year of Biodiversity by the United Nations and that Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) had committed themselves to celebrating this.

153. A preliminary paper had been prepared in consultation with coordinators of the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and other national biodiversity conservation personnel. The paper was circulated to Members (via circular) and to a wider regional conservation audience (via email and the CBD List Serve) in April 2009. There had been limited feedback from this approach.

154. A draft Strategy had since been developed through consultations organized during the 2009 Nature Conservation Roundtable meeting and through individual consultations with government representatives and discussions within SPREP. The draft Strategy had earlier been distributed as an information paper at the Meeting and would be presented in detail at a side event during the Meeting.

155. The Secretariat stressed that the Year of Biodiversity could be best celebrated by working together with the Secretariat supporting national activities and requested that Members engage in further developing the draft Strategy and implementing activities through the Year.

156. Responding to the representative of Tuvalu, the Secretariat advised that the proposed theme, which was not finalized, was “Value Biodiversity – Secure our Island Homes”. Members were invited to provide their comments on this at the side event.

157. The meeting:

- **agreed** to celebrating the International Year of Biodiversity as a region; and
- **committed** Members to supporting and participating in the 2010 international year of biodiversity and making it a success in the region.

## 9.2 Pacific Futures Programme Issues

### 9.2.1 Solid Waste in the Pacific

158. The Secretariat introduced a proposal to develop joint annual Solid Waste Work Plans with Member countries. It advised that over the last few years, SPREP’s solid waste management focus had moved from regional and national strategies and technical resources to on-ground project implementation. In light of the need to build Members’ capacity to secure emerging funding opportunities, SPREP envisaged using project delivery as an opportunity for ‘action learning’ capacity development in widely applicable skills such as project management and community engagement on the ground.

159. Members were advised that the proposal would give clarity and certainty to both parties. The Work Plan would require both SPREP and the Member to deliver on agreed milestones to enable decision-makers to monitor progress and address any shortcomings. SPREP would continue its regional information dissemination and capacity development role as well as implementing regional projects.

160. The Secretariat stressed that the current mode of delivering assistance by SPREP was *ad hoc* technical engagement which was not sufficient for addressing country needs. It recommended high level engagement between SPREP management and countries to confirm needs and assistance needed from SPREP.

161. The representative of Tokelau noted that waste management was a priority for Tokelau and advised the Meeting of its agreement with the Government of Samoa for all solid wastes from Tokelau to be transported for disposal in Samoa. He noted that this raised the question of handling waste transportation and potential impacts on travelling people and goods.

162. The representative of Niue also highlighted waste management as a priority issue for small islands and noted that currently only two donors were supporting waste management in the region. He brought attention to the next GEF-PAS allocation for possible projects for wastes in particular the GEF5 allocation. Niue raised the issue of disposal of asbestos and request that SPREP prioritise this issue.

163. The delegate of the Cook Islands agreed with Niue and requested that SPREP address this matter as a regional issue.

164. The representative of FSM acknowledged SPREP’s assistance with its solid waste management strategy.

165. The representative of Fiji noted that Fiji had a range of experiences and lessons learned and requested that SPREP facilitate the sharing of these lessons with other Pacific islands.

166. The delegate of Samoa offered his country’s experience in solid waste management for other countries and acknowledged the support in this respect from the government of Japan. He also recommended the Fukuoka method for waste management for other countries.

167. The representative of Tonga also highlighted waste as a major problem and noted the need for sponsorship for training in waste management and suggested that this was an area in which SPREP could play a role. He also acknowledged the support of JICA in waste management.

168. The representatives of Kiribati and Tuvalu acknowledged the Secretariat's technical support and legal advice for waste management and in development of Kiribati's national strategy and Tuvalu's legislations. It was suggested that other countries could benefit similarly with assistance from SPREP on addressing particular needs such as project proposal writing and exploring funding assistance.

169. The representative of France welcomed the participation of SPREP in this initiative and confirmed the interest of AFD to contribute to it. However, he drew the attention of Members to the fact that the allocation of funds between AFD and GEF had not yet been decided and that no figures could be given at this stage. He stated that it was very likely that AFD's contribution would be lower to what had been announced in document 9.2.1 Attachment 1 and hoped that the GEF's contribution would permit the full funding of this initiative. He informed the Meeting that an AFD mission would be going to SPREP next week to discuss the details of the project.

170. The Director commented on the importance of sharing experiences and on the need to focus on country needs. He acknowledged the work of JICA in the region and looked forward to cooperation with AFD. The Secretariat also advised that it would look at specific assistance as suggested by Members and would consider possible GEF-PAS funding with regard to asbestos disposal.

171. The Meeting:

- **reviewed** and **endorsed** the proposal for delivery phase of solid waste work:

- Re-focus waste delivery onto a country-specific project basis while maintaining regional information dissemination, particularly on the best practice countries and projects to alert decision-makers to improvements in waste management.
- Senior SPREP management negotiate a year long work program with milestones at Ministerial level and gain significant public profile for the agreement to improve waste management.
- Trial a new approach of SPREP staff spending a much longer period in country to try to build momentum and also help with the difficult initial project implementation phase. Regular return visits with capacity building sessions would be scheduled as the project proceeds.
- Initial projects would be chosen for their likelihood of success and public profile as well as their impact on the waste system in order to build momentum and political / public support. Projects would be those identified by Members as among their highest priority.
- All projects to have a strong community engagement strategy and capacity building to build and maintain support.
- Assist Members to seek sponsorship (if necessary) for each project.
- Use project delivery to enhance capacity for generic skills like project management, not just technical skills. In this way, capacity building would be "action learning" based on the project and would have a very strong project management and communications component. This would make the process more useful

and attractive for those more peripheral to the core of the waste project.

and

- **committed** itself and all members to fully supporting and participating in implementing the activities contained in the proposal.

### **9.2.2 Review of the Regional Solid Waste Management Strategy**

172. The Secretariat introduced the draft regional Strategy for Solid Waste Management for 2010-2015 advising that it would replace the 2005-2015 strategy, which had been the regional guiding document for waste management. The new strategy is an outcome of the mid-term review of the previous strategy, which was completed in September 2009.

173. The Secretariat noted that the strategy review and development was carried out in consultation with stakeholders and partners through sub-regional workshops. The outcome was a sustainable and socially acceptable process, that the PICTs can sustain into the future.

174. The Secretariat stressed that poor waste management was a major threat to sustainable development in the region and noted that it had negative and serious consequences for developmental areas such as health care, environmental quality, water resources, tourism, trade and food security. The key priority areas in the revised strategy are: Economic & Financial Issues; Integrated Waste Management; Legislation; Awareness, Communication and Education; Capacity Building; Waste Collection; Environmental Monitoring; Policy, Planning and Performance; Solid Waste Industry; and Medical Waste.

175. The representative of NZ commended the work of the secretariat, noting with appreciation that this regional work responded to national

priorities and was outcome oriented. This initiative was an excellent example of good practice. NZ also noted that priority areas had been identified. The representative further noted his delegation's appreciation of the support of JICA in this regard.

176. The delegate of Niue echoed NZ's comments and noted that a sub-regional approach was welcomed. However, he noted that emphasis on resource mobilization should be strengthened, particularly on how the region might work together to address financing for sustaining waste management. He added that resources had been announced in the context of the PALM meeting and asked who was coordinating dispersal of funds from that opportunity.

177. The Secretariat advised that financing was addressed in the relevant chapter of the Strategy but noted that they were seeking to move away from dependence on assistance. With regard to PALM, the Secretariat advised that there had been a call for proposals to be developed but that this was still a work in progress, with decisions to be expected in the next few months.

178. The meeting:

- **reviewed** and **endorsed** the draft Strategy for Solid Waste Management in Pacific Islands Countries and Territories, 2010-2015; and
- **committed** itself and all members to fully support and participate in implementing the strategy.

### **9.2.3 Review of the Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme Strategy (PACPOL)**

179. The Secretariat outlined the process for and progress in preparation of a draft *Strategy for the Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Program (PACPOL)* for 2010-2014 and advised that the strategy would be finalized by the end of 2009.

180. The Secretariat advised that it had been implementing PACPOL in partnership with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) since 2000 and that a consultant had been hired to review the existing programme, specifically to review: the effectiveness and sustainability of the activities carried out; and the arrangements for management of marine pollution from ships.

181. The Secretariat outlined some of the findings of the consultancy and advised Members that the redrafted PACPOL strategy would be made available by way of a circular for comment in January 2010. Members will be given four weeks to provide comments.

182. The representative of USA welcomed the presentation and noted the value of the activities, adding that his delegation was particularly interested in the regional spill response team. He noted that assessing similar arrangements in the region would be valuable and should be encouraged. He made reference to the existence of the Oceania Regional Response Team (ORRT) and suggested that it should be engaged in the process. The Secretariat advised that it was a fully supporting partner the ORRT, of which the US Coast Guard was coordinator, and added that cooperative activities had been carried out under the previous strategy. This partnership would be continued.

183. The Meeting:

- **noted** that the final draft of the Strategy for the Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme (PACPOL) 2010-2014 will be completed and circulated for comments by way of a circular by the end of 2009. Members will be given four weeks to provide comments;
- **endorsed** the process for approval of the strategy as it will be too long to wait for the next SPREP Meeting;
- **encouraged** feedback and comments on the draft from key stakeholders in SPREP Member countries, such as maritime and port administrations;

- **noted** that the success of the PACPOL Strategy will depend on adequate resources to support its activities and implementation; and
- **confirmed** and **committed** itself and all Members to fully support and participate in regional activities to prevent and address marine pollution.

#### **9.2.4 Meteorological Services Support Update**

184. The Secretariat updated Members on its activities in meteorology and climatology support, particularly: the recommendations of the 13th Regional Meteorological Services Directors and related meetings (Fiji, May 2009); a new capacity building partnership with the Finnish Meteorological Institute; and the Secretariat's proposed process for finalising a proposal for a Pacific Meteorological organisation.

185. The Secretariat advised that the regional partnership with the Finnish Meteorological Institute would support training in quality management systems and the strengthening of communication skills and capacity for meteorological services in the region. The project provides funding of 500,000 euro.

186. The Secretariat further advised that the review of the strategic action plan for meteorological services in the region will begin in December 2010 and will be presented to the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting (21SM).

187. The Secretariat also advised that work on the proposal for establishment of a Pacific meteorological organisation had begun in May 2009 and will also be finalized for presentation at 21SM.

188. The Representative of USA reminded the meeting of the urgent need for a Pacific Climatology and Meteorology Officer position and recalled that USA had also raised this at 19SM. He

urged the Secretariat to take action on funding a SPREP Climatology and Meteorology Officer position and questioned why there was no allocation of funding for personnel to administer the programme funded by the Finnish Meteorological Institute. He also sought clarification as to how the Secretariat would manage the SPREP/Finnish partnership.

189. The representative of France was of the opinion this was not about establishing a new organisation through an international treaty or agreement but rather about establishing a committee based on the existing directors' meeting. In the absence of a mandate to support the establishment of a new organisation, he proposed to replace in the draft decision the term "organisation" with "committee".

190. The Meeting agreed to delete references to the word "organisation" and replace it with "committee".

191. The Representative of French Polynesia expressed the same doubts as France, noting that Members are engaged in the RIF process which aimed to reduce the number of agencies and organisations. He reminded the Meeting that the SPREP meteorology position had been vacant for too long. He sought clarification on the role of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), which also had a regional dimension. He requested clarification as to how the proposed new committee would be reconciled with the Pacific Office of WMO.

192. The representative of WMO clarified that the regional office of WMO covers Region 5 of WMO and that this includes five countries of South East Asia in addition to the Pacific Island countries. The representative highlighted the need for a separate mechanism to coordinate and support the needs and activities of the Pacific region and reaffirmed the value of the Regional Meteorological Services Directors' meeting to fill this role.

193. The representative of New Zealand raised concerns on the sequencing and overlap of existing initiatives and proposed new initiatives. New Zealand welcomed the recommendations but queried the Secretariat's capacity to undertake this work, given current resource constraints. The representative of New Zealand noted the need to consider long term needs of climate and meteorological services in the region to prioritise actions and examine sustainable mechanisms for delivery of services. New Zealand urged the Secretariat to complete the two reviews currently underway before embarking on new proposals and before new institutions and mechanisms were considered.

194. The representative of Tokelau urged the Secretariat to identify needs and then to identify the appropriate mechanism to address those needs.

195. The representative of Cook Islands confirmed that support for the establishment of a Climatology and Meteorology Officer position at the Secretariat and the establishment of a Pacific Meteorology Committee.

196. The representative of PNG identified the need to expand the scope of SPREP's engagement with the region to include greater support for the development of meteorological services at the national level.

197. Responding to the various queries, the Secretariat advised that the development of a regional Pacific meteorological organisation was based in part upon the experience of the Caribbean Meteorological Organisation and that although it agreed with the Meeting's recommendation that a committee be established rather than an organisation, it also noted that it was important to integrate some aspects of the Caribbean model into the proposed mechanism. In particular, the Secretariat noted the issue of institutionalizing sustainability of meteorological services in the region. The Secretariat also confirmed that it would be looking at ways of

integrating and consolidating the role and activities of the existing council of Meteorology Directors into the proposed Pacific Meteorological Committee.

198. With regard to managing the SPREP/Finnish project, the Secretariat advised on the establishment of a project management board to provide oversight of the project. This Board included SPREP staff and representatives from national meteorology departments.

199. The Representative of USA sought clarification from PNG on what was meant by national development assistance plans.

200. The representative of PNG stated that national plans need to precede regional plans and that a needs assessment at national level must precede regional plans. The representative of PNG encouraged SPREP to widen the scope of its work to include national development of meteorological services.

201. The representatives of French Polynesia and the USA urged the meeting to note the lead role of SOPAC in relation to hydrological services in the region and to be mindful of this in the drafting of recommendations for the meeting to endorse.

202. The Meeting:

- **noted** the 13RMSD and the Joint Meeting of the Meteorological Services Directors and National Disaster Managers recommendations, and **endorsed** those directed to SPREP members and those involving the Secretariat;
- **noted** the new partnership between the Finnish Meteorological Institute (FMI) and SPREP in their joint 3 year regional project, and to provide assistance and facilitation at the national level where requested for the successful implementation of and participation of

national representatives to project activities with particular reference to the Review of the Strategic Action Plan; and

- **endorsed** the proposed process for the Secretariat to lead on the development of a fully fledged proposal for the consideration of the SM21 in 2010, on the development and establishment of an institutional response to Pacific meteorological needs, including any links to hydrological services.

### **9.2.5 Urgent Review of Regional Meteorological Services**

203. The Secretariat advised Members on the progress made in 2009 towards the Urgent Review of Regional Meteorological Services, as called for by Pacific Forum Leaders in 2008. A policy oversight group was formed, and the review team coordinated by SPREP convened at SPREP Headquarters on 10-13 November 2009. The team was scheduled to submit its draft report to the Secretariat in December 2009, with a final report due in January 2010. The review team had now agreed on a work plan and a division of responsibilities, and had commenced country visits.

204. The Secretariat noted the growing interest in provision of meteorological services in the region and explained that the reasons for this were two-fold. Firstly, there was increased realization of the importance of meteorological services to the livelihoods of the peoples of Pacific islands; and secondly, concern over the sustainability of regional services provided by the Fiji Meteorological Service, which plays a central role in provision of weather services in the region. The Secretariat acknowledged the generous support of AusAID and NZAID and indicated that the final report would be tabled at the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting in 2010.

205. The USA indicated its interest in working with other SPREP Members, and stressed the need to ensure this work was consistent with the longer-term plan for meteorological services for the region. The USA further suggested that the review team may wish to visit the Honolulu national weather service in early December. The Secretariat indicated it was in dialogue with donors to ascertain the feasibility of such activities.

206. In response to a query from the USA, the Secretariat confirmed that it intended to share the draft report with SPREP Members and with the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) for comment before it was finalized and that it would allow a period of up to five months of consultation before it was tabled at a SPREP Meeting.

207. The Meeting:

- **noted** the 2008 decisions of the Forum Leaders on regional meteorological services, and that the Secretariat is currently actively pursuing the implementation of this activity with its partners; and
- **noted** the updated report from the Secretariat and **urged** the Secretariat to continue the implementation of this activity and to report inter-sessionally with a view to submitting a final report to Members at the 21SM in 2010.

#### **9.2.6 GEF Matters and GEF-PAS Developments**

208. The Secretariat advised that a number of reports since 2004 had highlighted that Pacific SIDS experienced significant difficulty accessing and applying for Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding to national and regional programmes.

209. To address this issue, the position of GEF Support Advisor for Pacific Island Countries had been established and stationed at SPREP.

210. The Secretariat advised Members of the current status of the GEF-Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS) programme, noting that, as at April 2009, the total sum of project concepts approved under GEF-PAS was US\$63,188,700. A balance of US\$35,649,220 had yet to be accounted through approved GEF Project Identification Forms (PIFs), which had to be submitted for inclusion in the November Council work programme. There was a risk that, if not included, the indicative amounts may be subject to reallocation.

211. The Secretariat stressed that there was a need for Members to collaborate closely with an effective and efficient Implementing Agency to ensure timely submission of PIFs, detailed development of project documents and subsequent implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

212. With regard to the GEF-5, the Secretariat highlighted a number of issues raised during development of GEF-PAS and suggested that these issues would need to be addressed in terms of what approach PICs would seek for GEF-5.

213. The representative of Niue pointed out that there had been some confusion about GEF-PAS coordination and wondered how this could be improved for the next cycle. He encouraged the Secretariat to consider acting as an implementing agency, and suggested that effort be put into progressing the solid waste project. He drew the Secretariat's attention to the fact that Niue was not listed as one of the countries under the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) project.

214. The Secretariat responded that location of the GEF coordination unit was now being discussed by GEF Secretariat and the World Bank. The Secretariat's position was that a decision to house the unit at SPREP had already been made but it awaited the outcome of these discussions. The Secretariat suggested that the Meeting may wish to consider this issue and reinforce it at a forthcoming meeting in PNG. The Secretariat noted its agreement that it was now time to consider the region's plans for GEF5.

215. The representative of Kiribati thanked the Secretariat and its partners for establishing the position of GEF Support Adviser and for their work in this area.

216. The representative of New Zealand observed that GEF funds could only be disbursed through UN and development bank implementing agencies, and that if SPREP had a role in programme coordination, it would need to partner with a relevant agency to do so. Pacific countries could assist by engaging in discussions with GEF and implementing agencies to encourage them to partner with SPREP.

217. The Secretariat clarified that all GEF funding must pass through one of 10 designated implementing agencies and noted that some of the implementing agencies had expressed reservations about conflicts of interest should SPREP house the coordination unit. With regard to the exclusion of Niue from the POPs project, the Secretariat advised that several other countries had also not indicated interest at the time of submission of the POPs proposal to GEF. It was suggested that Niue might consider submitting a proposal under the upcoming GEF5 allocation.

218. The Meeting:

- **noted** the progress made concerning strengthening GEF coordination within the region;
- **noted** the discussion in the paper concerning current institutional arrangements for GEF coordination in the region, issues relating to continuing such arrangements; and
- **confirmed** support for the agreement by Pacific SIDS GEF Focal Points that GEF-PAS coordination, including monitoring, evaluation and communications functions, be physically located within SPREP.

### **9.2.7 Regional Cooperation in GHG Mitigation in the Energy Sector**

219. The Secretariat provided a summary of the energy sector-related greenhouse gas mitigation collaborations in which it was involved. These included:

- The third year of the Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP);
- SPREP's lead role on renewable energy and greenhouse gas mitigation in the CROP Energy Working Group;
- Facilitating access to Global Environment Facility resources for climate change mitigation projects; and
- Collaboration with funding from the European Development Fund.

220. Other related SPREP work was mentioned, including the organisation's work on reduction of ozone depleting substances, for which SPREP had been awarded the USA EPA award in 2009. The Secretariat also reported on its work with other CROP partners; noted the Forum Leaders' formal recognition of renewable energy as enabling grassroots access to affordable clean energy and progress toward a low carbon future; and the achievement of national GHG reduction targets settings for the regional GHG reduction target.

221. The Secretariat highlighted its various partnerships with CROP agencies, such as SOPAC, USP, and recognized the leadership role of SPC in the energy sector. It noted that currently funding for these activities were mainly through two key donors – GEF and EU but that other donors were also contributing.

222. The Secretariat advised that under the EU UNEP-SPREP MEA Capacity building project, USD700,000 had been allocated for capacity building on the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Other donors included Australia which had

provided AU\$1.5 million for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Program for the Pacific (REEP) initiatives accessible by PICs and AU\$25 million for clean energy development in the Pacific. The Secretariat noted that there were also other emerging bilateral and multilateral collaborations that called for increased coordination and it looked forward to being an active partner in greenhouse gas mitigation the energy sector under the leadership of SPC.

223. The representatives of American Samoa, Niue and Tokelau acknowledged the report.

224. American Samoa requested information on what renewable energy resources have been identified as most suitable for the Pacific.

225. Tokelau thanked the governments of France and New Zealand and the UNDP for enabling Tokelau to complete its energy plan, and asked for strengthening of south-south arrangements for its renewable energy needs.

226. Niue noted that his country had benefited from this work and recommended an assistant to the SPREP PIGGAREP officer in light of the mounting coordination needed for the various resources mobilized to assist PICs.

227. The Secretariat advised that there had been further discussions with SPC on close collaboration on the energy sector and that SPREP was fully supportive of SPC's leadership role in this respect. In response to American Samoa's query the Secretariat explained that this matter seemed to depend on the geographical location of countries, for example, if they were closer to the equator they may have more solar energy potential than those farther away, where options of wind, current or hydro power may be options.

228. The Secretariat noted the need for coordination capacity to be increased in tandem with increasing mobilization of resources and advised that steps were being taken to address

this need. The joint EDF10 SOPAC-SPREP renewable energy project proposal includes a position to assist the PIGGAREP manager.

229. The Meeting:

- **noted** the various collaborations on GHG mitigation in which the Secretariat was involved; and
- **noted** the close coordination of the Secretariat's GHG mitigation effort with those of the CROP Energy Working Group and the Climate Change Roundtable processes.

#### **9.2.8 Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) Outcomes**

230. The Director introduced the PCCR outcomes by drawing the attention of Members to the display in the centre piece of the Meeting seating arrangements. The display was set up to convey the message of the challenges that Pacific islands face with climate change impacts.

231. The Secretariat provided an overview of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR), which was held in Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands, 19-21 October 2009. Specific issues of adaptation to climate change, ecosystem based adaptation approaches, financing as well as specific problems of low lying atolls were discussed, along with an assessment paper on the implementation of the Pacific islands Framework to Climate Change (PIFACC). A major recommendation of the PCCR was that there be a mid term review of the implementation of the PIFACC process.

232. The representative of Kiribati commented on the issue of human rights and relocation, noting that this was not reflected well in the recommendations and needed far more emphasis.

233. The delegate of France recalled that his country had already shown on numerous occasions, that it fully shared the climate change concerns of Pacific island States. Concerning the draft decision submitted for approval, he questioned whether it would be possible to adopt a report that was not yet completed. He sought clarifications on the governance system referred to in document 9.2.8 Attachment 1 and asked whether this system would sit within or outside SPREP and what would be the budgetary impacts. Finally, he highlighted that the feasibility analysis of a regional adaptation fund should largely focus on an evaluation of its added value relative to the instruments to be decided upon within the framework of UNCTAD.

234. The Secretariat responded to these comments, advising that the actual recommendations (as contained in the attached paper) had already been adopted by the PCCR but that the full report, which was still under development, was a good opportunity for addressing these detailed issues. With regard to linking the PCCR to the regional energy working group, the Secretariat explained that the proposal was for a more full formal role of this regional working group under the PCCR. In terms of UN climate convention processes and SPREP's role in climate change, the Secretariat advised that it considered that any new facility should contribute to these processes and structures and that a concept note would be developed in this respect.

235. The Meeting:

- **noted** the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Meeting Outcomes and recommendations, and **considered** and **endorsed** those directed to SPREP members and those involving the Secretariat; and
- **noted** the proposal for a mid-term review of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC) and **provided support** for implementing this review.

### 9.3 Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2010

236. The Chair advised that the Meeting, having addressed the detailed work programme and financial performance of the Secretariat in the past year (2008) and the key components of the Secretariat's 2010 work programme under earlier agenda items, was now required to address and decide on the Secretariat's proposed 2010 work programme and budget.

237. The Secretariat introduced its proposed 2010 Work Programme and Budget, which was a balanced budget of US\$10.4 million. It advised that the budget was financed through donor grants of US\$8.0 million; member contributions (which had not increased since 2004) and other income, such as interest and programme management charges, of US\$2.4 million.

238. The proposed budget included the 2008 salary adjustment approved by the CROP Heads in light of the Annual Market Data Review for Professional Staff. A contribution increase was avoided because funding for this was sourced internally, including using a surplus of \$100,000 from the previous year.

239. The Secretariat's presentation was given by the Director and the Finance Manager. The Director outlined his vision for SPREP for the period to 2015.

240. The representative of Cook Islands thanked the Secretariat for the presentation, supported approval of recommendations, and noted that the budget increase was mainly due to increased programmatic funding. The delegation indicated its approval of the information presented.

241. The representative of American Samoa thanked the Secretariat for the presentation and vision and supported this vision and the 2010 Work Programme and Budget. He recommended that consideration be given to prioritising a few issues that were of pressing concern to many of the island states and territories. The representative also observed the size of the budget devoted to travel-related expenses and asked whether this indeed covered all travel expenses related to SPREP activities. He also asked whether the income and budget matched, or whether there were any discrepancies which PICTs might need to make up, and if so what amount this might be.

242. The Secretariat responded that it was indeed necessary to prioritise and requested Members' guidance in this process, adding that, for example, requests to increase the priority of waste management would be acted on. Members were advised that the travel budget was always high due to the necessity of travelling in the course of SPREP activities, but that means to reduce this were under consideration, including video-conferencing. The Secretariat confirmed that income did match expenditure and that no increase on Member contributions over the budget presented was proposed. It also confirmed that the travel budget did cover all travel-related expenses of participants and staff. The Secretariat drew attention to the increase in the budget allocated to climate change for 2010.

243. The delegate of Niue commended the Secretariat for its presentation which took into account recommendations made in 2008, and observed that most contributions were from traditional donors. Niue requested that waste management resources be increased. The delegation also noted that several posts were vacant and unfunded and highlighted the potential for GEF and EU funding to SPREP's activities. Niue asked whether there was a set programme management fee or whether this varied between projects.

244. The representative of Samoa appreciated the presentation and donor support, noted a large increase in the training budget (including workshops and meetings), and asked if this could be broken down to separate meetings from workshops, and isolate allocation to the SM, to highlight how much goes to capacity building in countries.

245. The representative of France echoed the commendations of the other delegations, understood that no contribution increase was requested for 2010 but might be for 2011, and asked how much this might be. The delegation also found it difficult to reconcile SPREP figures with those provided by French funding agencies, and will send details of French funding for reconciliation with figures by SPREP.

246. The representative of Tuvalu noted the significant components of the budget and that the core functions of SPREP were closely linked to Members' contributions, and commended this approach. He noted with satisfaction the balanced budget and asked how consistent programme management fees were charged across CROP agencies. He also questioned the US\$96,970 surplus in the revised 2009 budget whether that affected the surplus from prior years in the 2010 budget. The representative further noted that there was much potential with other donors including the EU, and requested SPREP to develop capacity to provide technical assistance with complying with funding agency conditions.

247. The representative of Australia commended the vision, work programme and the clear and balanced budget, which would raise Members' confidence in the organisation. Australia confirmed that its core contribution would continue, in addition to AU\$1.4 million for climate change, and hoped that this new money would assist in the incorporation of SOPAC functions in this area. Australia further confirmed its willingness to work with the Secretariat regarding programme development.

248. The representative of New Zealand appreciated the vision and presentation and noted that from 2010 New Zealand's contributions would be denominated in NZ\$ (previously paid in US\$). The NZ delegation asked the Secretariat to highlight how it had approached allocation of its core budget, and noted that this would be sufficient for Executive and corporate support but that some were to be allocated to programmes.

249. The representative of FSM echoed the congratulations of other delegates, especially on the vision, and encouraged efforts to translate this into action. FSM supported the budget as presented.

250. The representative of Tokelau congratulated the Secretariat and donors for their support, and for the balanced budget. He stated that Tokelau would like to see all vacant positions filled, and asked about the allocation of core funds. The representative requested assurance that core resources would match the demands of the high level of funding under the programmes.

251. The Secretariat appreciated the positive comments from Members, acknowledged with appreciation its donor support, looked forward to delivering benefits concomitant with this support and responded to the various questions.

252. With regard to the comments on SPREP's coordination role, especially in finding funds, and the Secretariat requested Members to promote this role to their governments.

253. The Secretariat advised that further support for waste management was under discussion with donors and that it was increasing its capacity building budget in 2010. It was also increasing consistency of both the budget presentation and programme management fees.

254. The Secretariat advised that there was in fact no plan to increase Members' contributions in 2011. No indicative increase figures for 2011 were included because discussions were under way to

go into multi-year budgeting from next year (2010).

255. The Secretariat noted that there was no EU funding for 2010, but that it hoped to remedy this soon. The Secretariat noted that the increase in programme funds was due to the efforts of SPREP programme staff.

256. On the subject of programme management fees, the Secretariat advised that this was a standard 10%. A previous SM had approved a programme management fee of 10- 15% but the Secretariat had been charging only the minimum since then. The Secretariat advised that details of expenditure on meetings and training were included in the budget papers (pp 55-57). The revised budget included a \$100,000 surplus carry over from 2009 due to the 2009 revised budget which has a surplus of 96,970. Some funds from the core budget were extended to programme support, to the extent of \$126,000. This included, for example, support for the Environmental Legal Adviser position, which also served as legal adviser to the Secretariat. The core budget was balanced by not filling certain positions during 2010, while staff responsibilities had been streamlined. These positions included the Corporate Services Manager and others in corporate and executive. The format of the 2010 budget permitted revision in the mid-term, which would allow the Secretariat to take into account Members' new priorities.

257. Members were invited to provide their specific budget questions to the Finance team.

258. In response to a request from American Samoa for clarification of the actual Members' contribution figures for 2010, the Secretariat responded that there would be no additional voluntary contributions for 2010.

259. The Meeting:

- **considered** and **approved** the proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2010.

---

**AGENDA ITEM 10: CORPORATE AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES**

---

**10.1 The Role of SPREP Ministers' Forum in the Context of the SPREP Meeting**

260. The Secretariat advised Members that the 2008 Environment Ministers' Forum had raised the issue of the status of that meeting and the nature of its decision-making powers in relation to the SPREP Meeting. The Secretariat also noted that the issue relating to the decision making powers of the Ministers had been raised at the 19<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting. The immediate cause for this arose from the perception of at least two ministers that the Ministerial Forum could make final decisions, including over-riding decisions made by the SPREP Meeting. The debate had been in relation to the recommendation for selecting a new Director.

261. The Secretariat advised that the SPREP Agreement did not confer legal decision making powers to the Ministerial Forum and that it is the SPREP Meeting that has final decision-making power. He further noted that delegates to the SPREP Meeting do represent their Governments and Ministers.

262. Members were invited to consider this issue, bearing in mind that any decision to grant greater decision-making powers to the Ministers' Forum would mean a change to the Agreement Establishing SPREP.

263. The representative of the Cook Islands noted the challenging nature of the issue, and reflected on the proceedings of the Ministerial Forum at the 19<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting, and the views expressed by Ministers. Any amendments to the rules of procedures would need to be considered in the appropriate manner. A Minister from the Cook Islands had not attended the Ministerial Forum due to the lack of such decision making powers. The representative reiterated the position that Ministers should have a role in the decision

making, especially since the meeting schedule was decided on a bi-annual basis. His Government would like the Ministers to have decision making powers in particular on the appointment of the Director and the Deputy Director.

264. The representative of Fiji noted that the Ministerial Forum should be convened as necessary to strengthen political will and approve programmes developed and approved by the SPREP Meeting and that the Ministerial forum do not have the final decision making powers, otherwise decisions made by officials for the good of saving and protecting the environment of the region might be compromised.

265. The representative of American Samoa stated that there was no need to change the regulations, and that decision making powers delegated to the Ministerial Forum would create a politicized structure for the organization, particularly in light of the different political arrangements of Members.

266. The representative of French Polynesia recalled the difficult situation Members were confronted with the previous year in relation to the respective roles of the SPREP Meeting and the Ministerial Meeting. Further to the Secretariat's analysis, he proposed that Ministers who wished to do so could act as heads of delegation when important decisions had to be made by the Meeting. He did not wish to see the establishment of an additional body giving a decision-making role to Ministers only. He suggested that the Meeting could agree that the Ministers meet every two years for instance, to discuss at the political level specific environmental issues or matters critical to the organisation.

267. The representative of Tuvalu noted the practice of hosting SPREP Ministerial meetings every two years but found that their roles are not so clear. He agreed with Cook Islands that a clearer demarcation of the Ministers' role needed to be developed and spelled out. The SPREP Meeting could make recommendations that would be

decided upon by Ministers; otherwise the decisions should merely be referred back to individual Members' Cabinets for action.

268. The representative of Tokelau observed that the issue should be viewed from the perspective of good governance and transparency. Comments raised by other delegations had been illuminating, and perhaps the SPREP Meeting procedures should be considered in view of the recommendations of the ICR. The organization should not be politicized but should embrace transparency.

269. The representative of Niue noted that there should be a single meeting taking final decisions, and that the Ministers could attend as Heads of Delegation and take part in the decision making process, with a Ministerial segment to endorse those decisions. He noted that there were costs involved in ensuring that Ministers were able to attend, relating to hospitality and protocol, especially for Smaller Island States hosting the SPREP Meeting.

270. The representative of Samoa recalled the active discussion on the issue in Pohnpei. The role of the Ministers and the Ministerial Forum was very important to ensure political commitment to the work of SPREP, that could not necessarily be guaranteed in the same manner by Officials. The representative noted that her delegation would like to see the continuation of the Ministerial Forum on a biennial basis.

271. The representative of FSM welcomed the legal analysis put before the meeting, and he viewed this analysis as correct. The perception that Ministers do not have a role was incorrect in his view, as officials do represent their Ministers and Ministers could be present as Heads of Delegation. The current practice should be maintained, but with an improved working mechanism for Ministers to be more engaged in the SPREP Meeting when decisions were taken.

272. The Chair invited the meeting to find a compromise solution, and commended the revised text. She offered to set up a small group to further consult on the issue.

273. The Secretariat responded to comments by delegates that the *status quo* was supported by many, with some delegates calling for greater decision making powers for Ministers, and suggested that the proposal from French Polynesia may be a suitable compromise, with Ministers participating in the relevant parts of the agenda at the appropriate time. He noted that officials were under instructions from their Ministers, and also advised that changing the Agreement Establishing SPREP would be a time consuming exercise.

274. The representative of Cook Islands stated that the way forward would be to leave the decision as it was and for the issue to be taken up at the next SPREP Meeting when Ministers would be present, and that officials would advise their Ministers that this issue would require their decision at that meeting.

275. The representative of Samoa thanked the Secretariat for the legal interpretation, but called attention to Article 1 of the Agreement Establishing SPREP and the possibility to reinterpret the work programme to accommodate the Ministerial Forum. If the Ministerial Forum could be a part of the SPREP Meeting instead of being a separate meeting then confusion could be avoided.

276. The representative of Tuvalu agreed that a final decision should be taken at the next Meeting, and that the confusion that existed at Pohnpei could be clarified by the Secretariat preparing a clearer guidance for Ministerial participation.

277. The representative of FSM sought clarification on how other CROP meetings ensured Ministerial participation, and that perhaps lessons could be drawn from those processes.

278. The representative of American Samoa reiterated that the different political structures represented around the table needed to be taken into account, and there needed to be a full consensus on any changes. In his view there was as yet no confluence of views on the need for any changes.

279. The representative of PNG also recalled Article 1 and observed that this allowed for leeway to accommodate the participation of Ministers, and that a task force should be established to look into how Ministerial participation could be enhanced, rather than for the Meeting to amend the article at this stage.

280. Following a suggestion from the Chair, a small group was established to consider and develop the recommendation. The Secretariat reported that after fruitful discussions a compromise suggestion for a text had been agreed in a small drafting group. The meeting agreed to the revised text.

281. The Meeting:

- **noted** the important role of regional environment ministers and **reiterated** the fact that there is no procedural obstacle to ministers attending SPREP Meetings to lead their delegations and take part in the Meeting's decisions; and
- **decided** to establish a high-level segment within the agenda of the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting, and every second SPREP Meeting thereafter, to discuss strategic issues that deserve the consideration of the environment ministers of the region; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to consult SPREP Members on the issues to be discussed during the high-level segment at the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting.

## 10.2 Proposed Revisions to the Procedures for the Appointment of the SPREP Director

282. The Secretariat advised that at the previous year's SPREP Meeting there had been wide-ranging discussion over the procedure for appointing the Director. Some Members had stated that the rules of procedure for appointment should be more detailed; others that the rules were sufficient and should be flexible but depended on wise implementation by the chair of the selection advisory committee.

283. The Secretariat explained that the rules could be changed if the Members so wish. However it was also necessary to monitor the procedures of the committee, though there was currently nothing in place to achieve this, because of the confidentiality involved. The Secretariat suggested that it would be helpful if past selection committee chairs could indicate whether they felt the rules were sufficient and whether the Secretariat should be relied on more to provide procedural advice.

284. The Secretariat advised that currently the Director was chosen at the SPREP Meeting by consensus. If Members wanted this to be by voting, it would necessitate a change to the Agreement Establishing SPREP.

285. The representatives of American Samoa, the Cook Islands, Samoa, Tuvalu and French Polynesia recommended appointing a task force to examine this issue and to review the rules of procedure in more detail, given that any changes may require altering the articles of the SPREP Agreement.

286. The FSM representative noted the number of delegates present who were involved in previous selection processes and suggested that the rules should be amended somewhat. He added that the rules should not be too prescriptive, but aim to give more clarity on the steps the selection

advisory committee should take. At present, the lack of clarity in the rules of procedures for the selection advisory committee allowed for too much discretion to the chair or the committee to interpret its own rules of procedure, which could give rise to a lack of transparency.

287. The delegate of Samoa recalled that the previous selection exercise had been eye-opening and a learning process. In that light, it would be timely to change the rules of procedure. She gave the example of rule 6 (work of the selection committee in submitting recommendations to the SPREP Meeting) and noted that the rule should make it clear that the position should be offered to the next ranked suitable applicant should the preferred candidate not accept the offer of the position. The delegate of French Polynesia seconded this suggestion in light of the experience in the last process.

288. The representative of Tuvalu agreed that the committee was not currently required to submit detailed and useful information to the SPREP Meeting on the preferred candidate, and recommended reviewing the practices of other CROP agencies for comparison.

289. The delegate of French Polynesia agreed with the comments made around the table on this issue. He noted that the working group needed to reflect on this issue which was critical to the proper operation of the organisation. It was crucial that the selection process continue to be merit based, as in the other regional organisations. Supporting the interventions of Samoa and Tuvalu, he stated that what was missing from the last selection process was the provision of information supporting the choice of the selection committee. He added that rule 6 of the procedures, which deals with the nomination of the Director, should be amended accordingly. Finally, specific provisions covering the withdrawal of a successful applicant would need to be included in the procedure.

290. NZ noted that the ICR task force already had before it a number of complex issues.

291. The representative of Tokelau noted that he had participated in both of the previous selection committees and in his experience, the process was merit-based. He called for clarity on whether the question to be addressed was the process of selection of the director or the composition of the selection advisory committee.

292. The Secretariat convened a task force to address both the question of the role of the Ministers' Forum and the procedures for the selection of the SPREP director. The task force reported back with a series of recommendations which were accepted, with amendments, by the Meeting.

293. The Meeting:

**Considered** the Rules of Procedure for Appointment of Director and:

- **reiterated** that the process should continue to be based on the merits of the candidates;
- **tasked** the Secretariat with:
  - i. proposing amendments to the rules in order to ensure that, when the SPREP Meeting is asked to consider the recommendations of the selection advisory committee, the SPREP Meeting will be provided with a transparent justification of and commentary on the recommendations regarding the candidates, provided this material remains confidential;
  - ii. developing a template to guide the selection committee's processes and recommendations to the SPREP Meeting, to ensure that the committee can arrive at a clear order of suitability/ preference of the candidates, and

- iii. proposing amendments to the rules to ensure that in the event that the most preferred candidate declines the offer of the position, the next most highly ranked suitable applicant should be offered the position; and
- **agreed** to address the Secretariat's proposed revised rules at the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM 11: MEMBERS' ISSUES**

### **11.1 Streamlined Reporting by Pacific Island Countries to the Biodiversity-Related Multilateral Environmental Agreements – Progress Update**

294. The delegate of Australia outlined the paper regarding the current stage of the project on streamlined reporting to biodiversity multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) aimed at reducing the MEA reporting burden on PICs as approved by the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> SM.

295. A streamlined reporting template had been trialed in eight countries and consultations carried out with the secretariats of five biodiversity MEAs (CBD, CITES, Ramsar, CMS & WHC). There was positive support for this from the PICs that were involved in the trial. Regarding consultation with secretariats, it was noted that the CBD was highly positive; CITES was positive but was not comfortable with reporting cycles; Ramsar was silent and CMS and WHC were hesitant as they had their own reporting formats and cycles. In general, there had been strong support from the secretariats of the idea of reducing the reporting requirements of countries. The reporting template was now very easy to work with and captured the main requirements in each of the five biodiversity MEAs.

296. Australia advised that most important in moving this project forward was getting the endorsement from all of the five MEA Secretariats and the following was proposed: 1) propose the idea to the Biodiversity Liaison Group in which the five MEAs were trying to synergize and harmonize their activities; and 2) raise the issue to the members of the concerned conventions and have these discussions in the main forums of these conventions such as their upcoming conference of the parties.

297. The representative of Niue stated that this was one of the important issues discussed in previous SPREP meetings, not only in relation to the biodiversity-related MEAs but also others. Niue was not one of the countries that had been selected for the trial but had used the project template in producing their fourth report to the CBD. He advised that although the report was not accepted by the CBD, Niue had found it more appropriate and more useful as a small island with limited resources.

298. The representative of France thanked Australia for this initiative. He indicated that he would like to submit the proposed template to the experts in charge of monitoring the MEAs concerned, but could not find it in the documents for the current session nor in those of the previous year. He would like to forward a copy to his colleagues who would be representing France at the upcoming conferences of the parties to these agreements.

299. The representative of Australia acknowledged with appreciation, Niue's use of the trial template. He also clarified that Australia meant to lead on raising the initiative at MEA forums with the PICs support. In response to France, Australia advised that they would work on a way of making the reporting template available on the internet for Members to access.

300. The Secretariat thanked Australia for the progress of this initiative, noting that it was important in helping PICs with their reporting requirements and further noting the importance of working together with CBD and CITES secretariats which had shown positive support of the initiative. Regarding the recommendations for the way forward, the Secretariat would follow up with Ramsar and would ensure the full consideration of this initiative under the EU-UNEP-SPREP MEA capacity building project. It would ensure the full support of the Secretariat for Australia and Members in raising the initiative at MEA forums, and proposed to add the Secretariat indication of support into the recommendations.

301. There being no further comments the Meeting endorsed the recommendations with the suggested additions from the Secretariat.

302. The Meeting:

- **reviewed** the progress report and recommendations on the streamlined reporting project;
- **agreed** that Australia should bring the project to the attention of the Biodiversity Liaison Group, in particular its Working Group on National Reporting, for discussion and consideration; and
- **asked** Australia with the support of Pacific island countries to raise the project at the 15<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES) in 2010; and
- **requested** an update on this matter to the 21<sup>st</sup> SPREP Meeting.

#### **11.2 Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on National Developments Related to the Climate Change Focus Area of the SPREP Action Plan**

303. The Director advised that a briefing would be held the following day for countries going to

UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen. He also advised that a special briefing would take place in Copenhagen on 14 December.

304. The Secretariat then drew Members' attention to a reporting template they had been requested to complete prior to the meeting. Members were requested that this be completed at their earliest convenience and returned to SPREP for inclusion in the climate change database and at the Copenhagen UNFCCC COP15.

305. Members were then invited to speak on the status of their country activities relating to climate change.

306. The representative of the USA stated that meeting the climate change clean energy challenge is a top priority for President Obama. He also noted that action by the United States alone was not enough and the USA was engaging other countries on several fronts – aggressively seeking an international agreement through the UNFCCC negotiating process, established dialogue among 17 of the largest economies and elevating climate and clean energy to a top priority issue in key bilateral relationships.

307. The representative of Tokelau indicated that the change in leadership in Tokelau was expected to bring more positive changes in the climate change area, due to the strong environmental background of the new leadership. He thanked the working group, comprising of SPREP, UNDP, NIWA, SOPAC, Meteorological Services of NZ and the Government of NZ, for developing a climate change policy framework for Tokelau to consider.

308. The representative of the Solomon Islands outlined progress of work in adaptation - the Solomon Islands completed a National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA), which was presented to the UNFCCC in 2008 and had worked with the World Bank to help finalize a PIF for submission to GEF. The PACC inception project workshop will take place on 25 November with implementation

starting after the Christmas break. The Solomon Islands has started work under the Australian Climate Change Initiative. As per work regarding mitigation, the Solomon Islands advised that it had completed an energy sector strategy with assistance from SPREP. The government was also focusing on renewable energy (solar and hydro) in rural communities. The Solomon Islands was also working with the World Bank and the EU in doing a feasibility study on a hydro power generation project for Honiara and surrounding communities.

309. The representative of Samoa welcomed the opportunity for a climate change briefing the next, which, he noted had been the practice for SPREP in the past, particularly with regard to identifying techniques for tackling pertinent issues of climate change. He noted with interest, the presentation of the delegate of the USA and welcomed progress on clean technology, stating that Samoa was still of the strong view that work is needed on reducing emissions and that there was a need to be open to all technologies and not to any one particular avenue. The representative advised that Samoa was in the process of finalising its second national communications and implementing the NAPA, which was now moving into the next phase. Samoa was also working on a project to implement climate change into the health and agriculture sector and a similar project was being undertaken with the World Bank on coastal infrastructure.

310. The representative observed that in 2006, the Samoa project had drawn a lot of interest as it took other sectors into consideration when it came to climate change. Samoa also noted post-tsunami that these plans had assisted families with responses and saved lives that would have otherwise been lost. Samoa was launching its coconut oil fuel initiative the following week, at the start of the national environment week for Samoa. Recently a joint mission from World Bank and ADB supported by UNDP regarding climate change adaptation visited Samoa and was surprised by Samoa having considered adaptation in most plans. Samoa has legislation on

environmental impact assessment to ensure development is implemented sustainably, and was willing to share its experience with other countries and assist with the development of national communications if needed.

311. The representative of Papua New Guinea noted they would not make a statement on climate change as PNG had a separate office of climate change. The representative offered to arrange for information to be forwarded to the Secretariat for records of their progress.

312. The representative of Palau noted its sub-regional work with other countries. Regarding adaptation, Palau had the Micronesia Challenge that was launched in 2007. A summit in Guam would monitor progress of this initiative and the delegate stated that this information could be made available to SPREP. Regarding mitigation work, the delegate advised that Palau's President supported the GEM initiative and would launch this at Copenhagen. The GEM commits Palau to 30% renewable technology 20% efficiency. The delegate of Palau advised that she would provide the Secretariat with documents for other countries.

313. The representative of Niue advised that Niue had recently drafted its climate change policy under the PACC project, which was a mainstreaming exercise to coordinate and mainstream all climate change activities and it was expected to be complete by the end of the year.

314. The representative of NZ noted the Forum Leaders' statement made in Cairns and advised that NZ has compiled extensive material on (for example) adaptation, governance issues, GHG reduction and international partnership, and they were willing to make these available in electronic form for sharing.

315. The representative of New Caledonia advised that in the energy sector, his government's intention was to reach a target of

20% of renewable energy by 2020 which, given current and future industrial development, would mean a ten-fold increase in the production of this type of energy.

316. The representative of the Republic of the Marshall Islands noted that he was with the Foreign Affairs Ministry, but that RMI has an office that deals specifically with climate change. He would forward information to SPREP. He also noted their Ambassador in New York had made a statement to the UN Secretary General calling for a legally binding agreement at Copenhagen in December.

317. The representative of Kiribati advised that Kiribati is currently implementing its Kiribati Adaptation Programme (KAP), which is funded by GEF, AusAID and NZAID and World Bank as the implementing agency. It focuses on two main components, water and coastal component and it comes to an end at the end of 2010. Kiribati indicated that further information would be provided in writing to the Secretariat.

318. The representative of French Polynesia advised that French Polynesia had established an observatory office on climate change and had noticed that greenhouse gas emissions average three CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent tonnes for French Polynesia per head per year. The Government has an ambitious project on renewable energy which will lead to tax incentives, on any kind of new energy such as solar, hydro and wind. Bora Bora has a thermal plant which is very useful for providing air conditioning.

319. The representative of France stressed that his country's actions are set within a European framework. Under the French presidency, the European Union adopted in 2008 the "Climate Energy Package", made up of a series of regulatory instruments operationalising the political intentions of the European Union in the fight against climate change. He also stressed that France already had expressed on a number of

occasions its support to Small Island States within the framework of the ongoing climate negotiations, and in particular last September during a meeting with the AOSIS group.

320. The representative of Fiji noted that a more detailed document would be provided to the Secretariat in future. Fiji already has a climate change policy and is working on mainstreaming it into other policies. It now has a dedicated officer in the Environment Ministry to coordinate and facilitate new projects including the GTZ REDD project, the formulation of a climate trading policy which would hopefully facilitate institutional and coordinating arrangements for carbon trading, NGO-Community partnerships on carbon trading projects and a number of renewable energy projects in the country.

321. The representative of FSM advised that in the past, environment related programmes and activities had been spread across different ministries. Under the current government all environment activities have been aligned to the one ministry. FSM is working on its Second National Communications (SNC). FSM noted that it experienced capacity challenges in carrying out the second component of the SNC and requested the Secretariat's assistance in identifying a pool of consultants to help Members. FSM had also mainstreamed climate change into its national strategic action plan. He noted that the climate proofing aspect of the Kosrae Coastal Road project is the first climate change adaptation project for FSM (under the PACC). FSM is in the process of getting its draft climate change policy approved.

322. The representative of the Cook Islands noted that all climate change programmes and projects were now being implemented. Cook Islands has completed the questionnaire by the Secretariat. The delegation advised the secretariat that they were now working under a country team – "Climate Change Country Team" which included all government ministries, departments and all NGO's. The Country Team makes decisions relating

to climate change for the government. The Cook Islands Environment Service also has two experienced personnel in the office.

323. The representative of Australia noted that the Australian Government Department of Climate Change focuses its work in 4 main areas: (1) International negotiations; (2) Science; (3) Mitigation (inclusive of development of technology); and (4) Adaptation. He noted that Australia had submitted its country profile report but wanted to add that Australia is providing considerable money in the region to help with mitigation and adaptation and he encouraged Members to access these funds as appropriate.

324. The representative of American Samoa noted that programmes on climate change were in three areas: compliance; enforcements; and awareness and education. An executive order had been passed prohibiting any vehicles which did not meet specific emission control requirements, burning of plastics or toxic materials and cutting of trees was prohibited.

325. The SPREP Director noted the various positive activities by PICTs and requested delegates to submit all papers and interventions to the Secretariat.

326. The Meeting:

- **noted** the verbal presentations made by Members on progress of national actions in regard to the priority area under the SPREP Action Plan relating to climate change, and
- **further noted** the written reports already submitted or to be submitted by Members to the Secretariat regarding their country profiles.

## AGENDA ITEM 12: REGIONAL COOPERATION

---

### 12.1 CROP Executives Meeting Report

327. The Secretariat tabled the Summary of Decisions of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) Chief Executives meeting of 10-11 June 2009.

328. The Secretariat drew attention to the key areas of interest to SPREP.

329. For instance, one of the tasks for the CROP executives each year is to discuss priorities for each CROP agency and the relationship of these to the processes of the Pacific Plan Action Committee – once these items are endorsed they are proposed for inclusion in the communiqué of Forum Leaders.

330. The CROP executives discussed reporting and recording processes and the need for a CROP publication that would explain the linkages between different agencies and aspects of the Pacific Plan.

331. A key link between SPREP and other CROP agencies is through the CROP Harmonisation Working Group, was and efforts to review the effectiveness of CROP working groups generally.

332. CROP executives also noted other high level summits in the past year, such as PALM 5 in Japan, which indicated new funding to come for Forum island countries' environmental activities, for which criteria and modalities for accessing these funds will be forthcoming.

333. The Meeting:

- **noted** the report.

---

### AGENDA ITEM 13: ITEMS PROPOSED BY MEMBERS

---

334. No items were proposed by Members.

---

### AGENDA ITEM 14: STATEMENTS BY OBSERVERS

---

335. Statements were made by representatives of the Asian Development Bank (ADB); Conservation International (CI); International Maritime Organization (IMO); International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII); Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS); Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC); Secretariat of the Pacific Applied GeoScience Commission (SOPAC); United Nations Environment Program (UNEP); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

336. Texts of the statements are attached as Annex V.

---

### AGENDA ITEM 15: OTHER BUSINESS

---

337. There was no other business.

---

### AGENDA ITEM 16: DATE AND VENUE OF TWENTY-FIRST SPREP MEETING

---

338. The Secretariat advised that the *Rules of Procedure for the SPREP Meeting* (Rule 3.1) allows for each SPREP Meeting to decide the venue and timing of the next meeting. PNG had earlier offered to host the Meeting.

339. The delegate of PNG requested that the Meeting tentatively agree that her country host the 21st Meeting in 2010 but allow her time to

follow up on this and receive official communication and confirmation from her Government.

340. The Secretariat concurred, noting that the SPREP meeting was generally held in September of each year.

341. The delegate of New Caledonia advised that his country could host the meeting if PNG experienced any problems and that if this was not necessary then his country would host in 2012.

342. The Meeting:

- **agreed** to tentatively accept the offer of PNG to host the 21st SPREP Meeting and to allow one month's time for confirmation; and
- **noted** that the Secretariat would provide PNG with information on requirements for hosting the SPREP Meeting.

---

### AGENDA ITEM 17: ADOPTION OF REPORT

---

343. The representative of Tuvalu thanked the representative of Tokelau for Chairing the Drafting Committee and moved to adopt the Report.

344. FSM and PNG seconded this and the Meeting adopted the Report.

---

### AGENDA ITEM 18: CLOSE

---

345. The delegates of Australia, FSM, France, New Caledonia, PNG, Tuvalu and USA, thanked the Secretariat for hosting the meeting and for the report.

346. Members expressed their appreciation for the manner in which this Meeting had been conducted, noting that only good things could be

said. They congratulated the Chair, the Members of the drafting committee, the interpreters and translators and the logistics team for organising and running the Meeting smoothly and for delivering the Report of the Meeting.

347. Samoa thanked the Secretariat and the delegates to the Meeting, wishing them a safe trip home. He added that the Government of Samoa had done its best to keep things in order after the tsunami.

348. The representative of Tuvalu recognised the contribution of the Government of Samoa, adding his nation's condolences to the communities affected by the recent tsunami.

349. The Director acknowledged the comments noting that the Secretariat was guided by the wisdom of the Meeting during challenging times. He observed that delegates had indicated appreciation for the detailed presentations on various programme of work of the Secretariat and that he felt confident that the organisation was ready to move forward with its work. In particular he noted the development of a new strategic plan which will guide the work of the organisation.

350. He added that the Secretariat aimed to ensure that every SPREP meeting would be better than the last. He thanked the Chair for enabling a well run Meeting and the Deputy Director for his work. He thanked the drafting committee and its Chair for the report and the staff who had worked behind the scenes during the Meeting.

351. The Director presented gifts of appreciation to the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Meeting. He also recognised the interpreters and translators for their valuable contribution.

352. The Chair thanked Members for working collaboratively despite differences in views and opinions. She thanked the Government and people of Samoa and congratulated the SPREP Director and Deputy Director, Programme Managers and Support Staff noting they had demonstrated high quality achievements in meeting their targets.

353. The Chair then declared the 20<sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting closed.

-----