PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 18 December 2009

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID[1]: **PROJECT DURATION: 36** Months
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:
COUNTRY(IES): Cook Islands, Nauru, Tonga, Tuvalu
PROJECT TITLE: Implementing the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work by integrating the conservation management of island biodiversity.
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (lead) collaborating with Conservation International
GEF FOCAL AREA (S)[2]: Biodiversity
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP3, supported by BD-SP2, BD-SP4, BD-SP7
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:GEF PACIFIC ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY (GEF PAS)

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	**Expected Dates mm/dd/yyyy**
Work Program (for FSP)	Jan 2010
CEO Endorsement/Approval	August 2010
Agency Approval Date	October 2010
Implementation Start	January 2011
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	July 2012
Project Closing Date	December 2013

* See guidelines for definition of milestones.

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Contribute to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity's Island Biodiversity Programme of Work by supporting an integrated ecosystem approach to biodiversity conservation management at local level in four Pacific countries.

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA[b]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing[a]		Indicative Co-Financing[a]		Total ($) c =a + b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
1. Conservation and restoration of priority species and ecosystems at risk in each of the countries' archipelagos, as identified in the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work (IBPOW)	STA	Improved conservation status of priority threatened species and ecosystems, consistent with selected outcomes set out in the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work (IBPOW). The following IBPOW targets are addressed for threatened representative ecosystems and indigenous species: Target 1.1: At least 10% of each of the islands'	All participating countries have defined the criteria for setting their priorities, and prioritized measurable conservation targets. All participating countries have conducted a gap analysis to identify priorities for implementing the IBPOW. This will include an analysis of ecological threats and mitigation needs. The results of this will be used to generate and trigger the implementation of an action plan. Successful models for site and	600,000	42%	820,000	58%	1,420,000

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Select only those focal areas from which GEF financing is requested.

		ecological regions effectively conserved Target 1.2: Areas of particular importance to island biodiversity are protected [or planned to be protected] through a comprehensive and effectively managed national and regional protected area network. Target 2.1: Populations of species of selected taxonomic groups restored, maintained, or their decline substantially reduced.	species conservation such as the Locally Managed Marine Areas concept will be applied in all participating countries. National and community-based integrated conservation management plans for priority conservation needs are developed (using a pilot programme approach if appropriate) and implementation planned or underway in all participating countries, to support the restoration of threatened, endemic, or ecologically/ culturally important species and ecosystems.					
2. Sustainable Use of island biodiversity through improved systems and processes including resource assessment and monitoring, legislation, capacity and awareness building.	TA	Outcomes consistent with Island Biodiversity Programme of Work target outcomes, including: Target 4.1: Island biodiversity-based products are derived from sources that are sustainably managed, and production areas managed, consistent with the conservation of biological diversity Target 4.2: Unsustainable consumption of island biological	Adequate capacity building systems and governance measures are planned or in place in relevant agencies, to support implementation of the IBPOW. The Ecosystem Approach and sustainable resource management (including traditional practices) are successfully applied in pilot projects in all participating countries, and results of selected case studies are documented and disseminated.	800,000	47%	900,000	53%	1,700,000

		resources and its impact upon biodiversity is reduced Target 4.3: No species of wild flora and fauna on islands is endangered by international trade						
3. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting				30000	33	60000	66	90000
4. Technical support and training by Executing Agency				170,000	85	30000	15	200,000
5. Project Management and training by EA				140,600	48	150,000	52	290,600
Total project costs				**1,740,600**		**1,960,000**		**3,700,600**

[a] List the $ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.
[b] TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

B. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE and by NAME (in parenthesis) if available, ($)

Sources of Co-financing	Type of Co-financing	Project
Project Government Contribution	In-kind from four countries ($177,500 per country) – likely to be increased during PPG implementation	710,000
GEF Agency(ies):	(select)	
Bilateral Aid Agency(ies): \ **Nauru** Rehabilitation Settlement Fund - Australia, New Zealand and Britain out of court phosphate mining settlement ($11m trust - USD 50,00 per annum for three years)	In kind	150,000
Multilateral Agency(ies): SPREP	(select)In kind from allied projects which will support this programme	980,000
Private Sector	(select)	
NGO: Conservation International	(select) In kind from Critical Ecosystem Protection Fund in-country projects	120,000
Others	Unknown at this stage - to be identified during PPG implementation	
Total Co-financing		**1,960,000**

C. INDICATIVE FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT ($)

	Previous Project Preparation Amount (a)[3]	Project (b)	Total c = a + b	Agency Fee
GEF financing		1,740,600	1,740,600	174,060
Co-financing		1,960,000	1,960,000	
Total		**3,700,600**	**3,700,600**	**174,060**

[3] Include project preparation funds that were previously approved but exclude PPGs that are awaiting for approval.

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)[1]

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in $)		
			Project (a)	Agency Fee (b)[2]	Total c=a+b
UNEP	Biodiversity	Cook Islands	435,150	43,515	483,500
UNEP	Biodiversity	Nauru	435,150	43,515	483,500
UNEP	Biodiversity	Tonga	435,150	43,515	483,500
UNEP	Biodiversity	Tuvalu	435,150	43,515	483,500
Total GEF Resources			**1,740,600**	**174,060**	**1,934,000**

[1] No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

[2] Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:

Over the last two decades, environmental conservation and/or management in Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDs) has placed emphasis on thematic or sector based approaches. At its eighth meeting in Brazil, March 2006, the Conference of Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted the first-ever programme of work (POW) dedicated solely to the uniqueness and fragility of island biodiversity (Decision VIII/1). Within Decision VIII/1, the COP encouraged Parties in implementation of the islands biodiversity POW to take into account the ecosystem approach of the CBD as the logical planning and management tool for integral island policies. Further guidance from the COP included, "In determining national programmes of work, Parties are encouraged to pay due regard to the socio-economic, cultural and environmental costs and benefits of various options. In addition, Parties are encouraged to consider the use of appropriate and adaptive technologies, sources of finance, and technical cooperation, and to ensure, through appropriate actions, the means to meet the particular challenges and demands of their island ecosystems." Furthermore, the COP decision acknowledges "that islands are microcosms that offer great scope for the application, testing and refinement of a wide range of conservation tools and approaches, including the ecosystem approach."

However currently there are very few examples of and limited capacity for the application of the Ecosystem Approach in the Pacific. This project will address this critical gap by assisting participating countries in developing the required professional capacities and supporting the application of the Ecosystem Approach (EA) as appropriate to the Pacific context. It will also seek to develop and disseminate case studies on the successful application of methods that implement the EA.

There are two main inter-related components to the project that seek to implement the Ecosystem Approach: i) supporting the conservation and restoration of at-risk species and ecosystems in participating countries as identified in the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work, and ii) fostering the sustainable use of island biodiversity through the development of improved professional capacity, systems (including relevant traditional knowledge) and processes in the fields of biodiversity and natural resources assessment and monitoring, legislation, training and awareness raising. These objectives will be achieved via a gap analysis approach that establishes measurable and achievable conservation targets (eg National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans, Island Biodiversity POW, Protected Area POW), assesses the gaps in achieving these targets and identifies priority measures needed, including the incorporation of successful management models (eg the Locally Managed Marine Areas approach).

Expected global benefits include contributions to reducing the rate of extinction of global biodiversity, reducing the rate of degradation of natural ecosystems and restoring them. This project emphasizes integrating traditional communities living off the land and the sea in a sustainable manner without compromising natural assets (land and marine) and where appropriate protecting endangered assets such as threatened species. It is envisaged that reporting the country programmes will provide examples of best practice for Small Islands Developing States world-wide which can be shared on an on-going basis via the EA (SPREP) and IA (UNEP) networks.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL/REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

The countries involved in this project all identified various aspects of management of biodiversity as country priorities during the PPG phase of the GEF PAS, as well as in all relevant national priorities/plans outlined below for

each country. This project will also conduct a gap analysis to assess which of these country priorities have not yet been adequately addressed or justify special attention in each country.

The Cook Islands' NBSAP has eight themes and associated actions for the management and conservation of biodiversity. The themes are: (i) Endangered species management, (ii) Invasive species management, (iii) Ecosystem management, (iv) Equitable sharing of Benefits and Access to Biodiversity, (v) Management of knowledge related to biodiversity, (vi) Biodiversity Awareness and education, (vii) Mainstreaming of Biodiversity and (viii) Financial resources and mechanism for biodiversity. These eight themes has also been reproduced and integrated in the biodiversity component of the National Environment Strategy and Action Framework (NESAF). The Cook Islands' Sustainable Development Plan (NSDP) also addresses biodiversity concerns in their relationship to environment related issues, in particular, Goal 4 - Sustainable Use and Management of our Natural Resources and Environment and the National MDG Report, and Goal 7- Ensure Environmental Sustainability.

Nauru's National Sustainable Development Strategy: 2005-2025 - *Partnerships for Quality of Life,* under the theme of Economic priority area, identified as one of the key priorities to "fully rehabilitate topside (of the island) with a greater area of rehabilitated land utilised for livelihood sustainability including environment conservation and protection", and "increase revenue generation through the efficient and effective use of (amongst others) fish stocks." During the PPG phase of GEFPAS, Nauru identified the rehabilitation of terrestrial habitat on the island's top-side to revitalize the mining sites and integrated coastal management as key biodiversity priorities. The country is currently in the process of developing its NBSAP demonstrating its commitment to addressing biodiversity issues and concerns at the national level.

Tuvalu's *Te Kakeega II* - National Strategies for Sustainable Development: 2005-2015, identifies the sustainable utilisation of the country's natural resources as a key priority: "*Natural Resources*: Agriculture, Fisheries, Tourism and Environment. The traditional structure of Tuvalu society and its subsistence economy have been built on the sustainable use of the nation's limited, but nevertheless valuable natural resources, and the conservation and careful exploitation of the fragile atoll ecosystems. These are now under threat from changing attitudes in society and from a continuously growing cash economy. With traditional subsistence production in decline, the challenge is to reconcile these conflicting factors to create sustainable growth and greater stability." Tuvalu is about to start the development of its first NBSAP with support from UNDP/GEF.

Tonga's 8th Strategic Development Plan (SDP8): 2006/07 – 2008/09, *Looking to the Future, Building on the Past,* Goal 7: is to ensure environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction, which include environmental conservation and management and integration of environment costs in government decision making procedures as key strategies for SDP8. The country completed its NBSAP in 2006, with a vision that Tonga's biological diversity and natural resources are protected, conserved and enriched and are appreciated and enjoyed by her present and future generations and the rest of the world. Tonga is in the process of undertaking work on the Programme of Work on Protected Areas of the CBD with support from UNDP/GEF.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

This project directly implements Longterm Objectives 1 (Catalyze sustainability of protected area systems) and 3 (Safeguard biodiversity) and contributes to 2 (mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors. Within LO 1 all three Strategic Programmes will be addressed – especially integrating marine and terrestrial protected areas and the networks supporting them. Means to provide sustained resources for the Protected Areas will also be created. The related LO 3 will also be partly tackled by addressing the main threat to species and their habitats – invasive alien species (Strategic Programme 7). LO 2 is addressed in component two of the project ("capacity building systems and governance measures") – particularly SP 4 (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity). Finally, LO 4 (capacity on access and benefit sharing) will be receive some attention because it is envisaged that technical support will be facilitated by creating a sharing system (and contributing to existing ones like the Pacific Invasives Learning Network) for lessons learnt between countries so that islanders will be supporting islanders. This will be in turn facilitated by the EA (SPREP).

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES: A GEF grant appears as the most appropriate type of financing to ensure an appropriate incremental contribution to the limited national funding available and the limited professional capacities currently in place to support biodiversity conservation and the implementation of the IBPOW. The grant is also justified in light of the type of complex technical assistance and innovative scientific and technical analysis that will be supported through the project, for which participating countries have limited investment capacity nor sufficient funding available.

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

The project will be carried out within the context of the regional Round Table for Nature Conservation, which is the overarching coordination mechanism for implementing the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific. The Round Table reviews and provides a mechanism for sharing experiences and lessons learned in the development and implementation of NBSAPs, including monitoring and evaluation, and seeks to improve collaboration and coordination within its membership. The Round Table is coordinated by SPREP and IUCN Oceania and has significantly supported regional input into the development of the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work. The Roundtable and the current Action Strategy are guided primarily by the NBSAPs which also offer a mechanism to coordinate the work of external organizations at country level. The Roundtable would have a role in helping to coordinate efforts of NGOs and regional organisation partners to this project and in looking at synergies with other complementary initiatives. Further SPREP (plus other CROP agencies) and the World Commission on Protected Areas of IUCN (plus other NGO's) are providing technical support to countries to implement activities for protected areas.

All countries involved in this project are part of two other regional projects. They are: *Mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Management for Maintained Livelihoods (MEMML) in the Pacific* supported by the European Union commencing in 2011, and *Biodiversity, Livelihoods and Climate Change in the Pacific Islands Region* funded by AusAID and starting in 2010. SPREP as the implementing agency for both projects and as a member of the Roundtable for Nature Conservation would ensure that there is coordination between the different regional initiatives. Members of the Roundtable are engaged in other activities including, Locally Managed Marine Areas, community based conservation, institutional strengthening and so forth. The project will also build on lessons learnt from the LMMA and the outcomes of CRISP (Coral Reef Initiative for the South Pacific) and the CEPF (Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund). The latter is a five-year investment program (2008-2013) in the Polynesia-Micronesia biodiversity hotspot that is managed through a partnership of CEPF and Conservation International's Pacific Islands Program based in Apia, Samoa.

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :

The Ecosystem Approach is a cross-cutting approach which underpins biodiversity conservation planning world-wide. By identifying and disseminating new methods for implementing the EA and for achieving sustainable resource management, this project should advance the practical application of the EA globally.

The scenario without the proposed GEF-supported project would at best consist of scattered interventions at different levels, probably resulting in short-term or even one-time actions, limiting impacts to local levels and barely producing national let alone regional and global environmental benefits. This project will demonstrate for small island developing states how integrated management of the environment can sustain the natural assets in the ecosystem while allowing the communities to live in those ecosystems without compromising conservation objectives. Without the interventions planned in this programme the natural assets within each ecosystem will degrade.

The proposed project will support the strengthening of participating institutions, organizations and stakeholder groups in assessing, planning, integrating and implementing ecosystem management and ecosystem services approaches. GEF-support will also help catalyze support from the Non Government Organisation sector and involvement of non-environment actors at national and sub-national levels. The thus created multi-scale commitment is one of the key prerequisites for the mainstreaming of ecosystem services into development planning, resulting in global environmental benefits through demonstrating for Small Island Developing States improved biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and water resource management. Furthermore, the village initiatives will contribute to improving local livelihoods.

The project's focus on developing and applying locally adapted instruments for ecosystem services, as well as the emphasis on demonstrating the scaling up and replicability of these pilot activities at the global level (other regions with SIDS) justify investment.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING RISK MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:

There are many significant risks that could impact on the successful implementation of this project. All four countries are small and have limited capacity for managing projects of this scale and complexity. This problem will be mitigated by developing strong partnerships and synergies between countries, environmental NGOs, intergovernmental organizations (e.g. SPREP), donors, academic institutions and their relevant programmes (e.g. Pacific Round Table, LMMAs, Pacific Invasives Partnership). Further, countries will be encouraged and facilitated to continually exchange experiences and lessons learnt from the outset of the programme via new and existing networks such as the Pacific Invasives Learning Network.

The four countries involved in this project are ecologically diverse and vary in characteristics: from Nauru as a single coral island; to Tuvalu which is all atolls; to Cook Islands comprising volcanic, raised limestone and atolls islands and Tonga with scattered volcanic and raised limestone islands. While this provides a good sample of islands with scope to apply, test and refine a range of conservation tools and integrated approaches, there is a risk of taking a one-size-fits-all approach. The project design will ensure that country-specific situations are considered in applying different management tools, and that the multi-country arrangements ensure the project will be bigger than the sum of its four individual countries as parts.

The impacts of climate change on island ecosystems are unpredictable and good evidence-based scientific knowledge is required to predict changes in resilience or vulnerability of ecosystems to climate change. The regional technical support mechanisms (such as the Pacific Invasives Learning Network, Secretariat for Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Pacific Round Table) will ensure that science-based knowledge is made available to support national initiatives and will link these national level initatives to other projects and activities in development.

There is always the tendency to address biodiversity issues through the lens of environment as a sector. Right from the outset, the project will strive to highlight that this will not be a series of disjointed separate activities, rather the emphasis will be on integrated and multidisciplinary approaches that promote and facilitate cross-sectoral sustainable decision making and integrated conservation and use of the targeted areas through realization of the management plans developed.

H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:

The project builds upon the efficient and well-connected operational structures of executing partners which are well established and active for several decades in the Pacific region (SPREP, CI etc.). The projects will also take full advantage of and contribute to existing fora to foster the continued dialogue and exchange of information among all island states in the region (especially using the Pacific Round Table mechanism and thereby empowering this relatively new forum). This set-up is therefore designed to take full advantage of effective implementation arrangements and project implementation capacity already largely in place, taking stock of the wealth of contacts, baseline information and data which is already at the disposal of executing partners.

From the technical point of view, it should be noted that the Protected Areas in participating countries were mostly established in response to circumstance and opportunity, and there is a lack of a cohesive long-term framework to allow for the development of a comprehensive and representative system of protected or managed natural areas throughout the participating countries. The lack of national capacity for integrated management between local owners and government agencies has resulted in a disjointed approach to managing resources. This project will ensure that the management of Protected Areas and community-based management areas is coordinated in an integrated manner, which builds on lessons learnt from past and current activities and is consistent with the principles of the Ecosystem Approach (CBD). This should contribute to the cost-efficiency for managing the countries natural and protected areas.

The diverse biogeography of the four participating countries provides an opportunity for applying and testing a range of integrated management tools and for developing best practice in applying the Ecosystem Approach. The tools and lessons learnt from this project will be useful resource for other Pacific small island developing states.

I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:

Capacity building and scientific technical assistance, development of technical documents and tools, and expert know-how and dissemination of best practice guidelines are the forte of UNEP. The project will promote the integration of management plans with national capacity building activities; promote common formats for information exchange and joint development of awareness raising materials. Additionally, UNEP's strength and long experience in working with complex regional initiatives and wide range of partners such as governments, NGOs, research institutions and community groups will be a significant asset to this multi-country project. The UNEP has a declared focus on

ecosystem management which has been articulated in its 2010/11 Programme of Work Sub-Programme 3 (Ecosystem Management) which has as its objective "To ensure countries utilize the ecosystem approach to enhance human well-being" which is recognized as a cross-cutting need integrated into a number of its Divisions. Comparative advantage will be result from having access to the full range of technical expertise from these UNEP Divisions. The executing agency (Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme) is also a focal point for regional expertise (e.g. hosts the Pacific Invasives Learning Network, until recently supervised the Pacific Round Table for Nature Conservation and has work programme Memoranda of Understanding with programmes such as the Pacific Invasives Initiative, IUCN Oceania Office and others. Therefore the programme will be able to draw on expertise at a global and regional level, capitalizing on the expertise generated from running related programmes.

Particular objectives of the POW include drawing together ecosystem management with the everyday livelihood of local communities and focusing activities on single countries to better guarantee required outputs. Thus this programme includes only four countries where the objective is to ensure model outcomes which can be used as examples elsewhere in the region. This will be facilitated by designing the project at the outset to be as inclusive as possible of other UN Agencies' programmes. (e.g. Country Self Sustainable Development Programme run by UNDP Samoa/Fiji offices).

The programme will also support UNEP POW sub programme 4 – environmental governance whose objective is "To ensure environmental governance at the country, regional and global levels is strengthened to address agreed environmental priorities". The intention is for the four projects to serve as models for integrating ecosystem management with the management of the day to day affairs of villages, within the context of traditional customs. The lessons learnt will be disseminated on an ongoing basis with in-country programme staff educating their peers within and outside their countries. This will be facilitated as above using existing network mechanisms managed by the EA (SPREP – e.g. Pacific Round Table and its working groups and others). The results of the lessons learnt will also be reported more widely throughout the UNEP network and similarly, lessons from similar scenarious outside the Pacific region will be brought to bear within the present programme.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

(Please attach the country endorsement letter(s) or regional endorsement letter(s) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(Month, day, year)*
Vaitoti Tupa	Director	National Environment Service, Cook Islands	10/15/2008
Mataio Tekinene	Director	Environment and GEF Focal Point, Tuvalu	10/29/2008
Russ Kun	Secretary for Commerce Industry and the Environment	Commerce Industry and the Environment, Nauru	10/?/2008
Dr. Sione N K Halatuituia	Secretary for lands, Survey, Natural Resources & Environment	Lands, Survey, Natural Resources & Environment, Tonga	09/28/2008

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller Director, DGEF/UNEP		14/9/2009	Dr. Greg Sherley, Task Manager, UNEP/DGEF, Apia, Samoa	+685 23670	Greg.sherley@undp.org